

**CITY OF PARK RAPIDS
CITY COUNCIL MEETING
SEPTEMBER 8, 2020, 6:00 PM
Park Rapids City Hall Council Chambers
Park Rapids, Minnesota**

1. CALL TO ORDER: The September 8th, 2020, Regular Meeting of the Park Rapids City Council was called to order at 6:00 p.m. by Mayor Ryan Leckner, and the Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

2. ROLL CALL: Present: Mayor Ryan Leckner, Councilmembers Tom Conway, Erika Randall, and Robert Wills. Absent: Councilmember Liz Stone. Staff Present: Administrator Ryan Mathisrud, Planner Andrew Mack, Treasurer Jeremy Jude, and Clerk Margie Vik. Others Present: Sue Tomte, Kathy Peterson, Cynthia Jones, Apex Engineer Jon Olson, and Robin Fish from the Enterprise.

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA: A motion was made by Conway, seconded by Wills, and unanimously carried to approve the agenda with the following additions: Additional Information was presented for Item #9.2.A. Public Comments for the Proposed Body Worn Camera Program, and Item #9.5. Complete Count Committee Update for the US Census, was added to General Business.

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

4.1. City Council Regular Meeting Minutes-August 25, 2020: A motion was made by Conway, seconded by Randall, and unanimously carried to approve the August 25th, 2020, City Council Regular Meeting minutes as presented.

5. FINANCE:

5.1. Payables & Prepaids: A motion was made by Randall, seconded by Wills, and unanimously carried to approve the payables in the amount of \$82,263.23, and the prepaids in the amount of \$89,448.82, for a total of \$171,712.05

6. CONSENT AGENDA: A motion was made by Conway, seconded by Wills, and unanimously carried to approve the following consent agenda items:

- 6.1. Approve Plumber's Permit to Work in the City of Park Rapids in 2020 for L&S Plumbing & Heating LLC and BDT Mechanical LLC.**

- 6.2. **Approve Pay Request in the Amount of \$8,910.00 for Sanquist Construction Inc for Services Rendered to Demolish House at 301 Fifth Street East.**
- 6.3. **Approve Pay Request in the Amount of \$48,117.00 for Apex Engineering for Professional Services for Various Projects in the City of Park Rapids.**
- 6.4. **Approve Public Facilities Use Permit for Nemeth Art Center c/o David Welle for Deane Park Pavilion at 19382 Eagle Pointe Trail on Saturday, September 19th, 2020, from 2:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m. for a Fundraising Event.**
- 6.5. **Resolution #2020-132 Approving Wage Adjustment and Step Increase for Full Time Park Rapids Police Officer Kelli Seitz.**
- 6.6. **Resolution #2020-133 Accepting the Resignation of Park Rapids Urban Forestry Committee Member Steve Jones.**
- 6.7. **Resolution #2020-134 Authorization to Execute Minnesota Department of Transportation Grant Agreement for Airport Improvement Excluding Land Acquisition.**
- 6.8. **Resolution #2020-135 Approve Wage Adjustment and Step Increase for Full Time City Administrator Ryan Mathisrud.**

END OF CONSENT AGENDA

7. COMMENTS FROM CITIZENS: There were no comments.

8. PLANNING:

8.1. First Reading Ordinance Zoning District Boundary Amendment Request from Barry Munson to Rezone Lot 5 Block 1 Hockings Acres from R-1 Single Family Residential to R-2 Single, 2 Family and Townhouse Residential District, PID#32.38.91050: Andrew Mack stated I will present all of Mr. Munson's cases as part of one staff report. He is requesting rezoning from R-1 to R-2 for these three properties with the intent of building single family twinhomes. That is a requirement from our zoning ordinance for the R-2 district. Public hearings were held on all of these items before the Planning Commission. Staff and the Planning Commission are recommending approval of the first reading for rezoning from R-1 to R-2, of these three properties, 32.38.91050, 32.38.91101, and 32.38.92010, all in the Hocking Acres Addition, for Mr. Munson.

Conway questioned is there already duplexes in that neighborhood? Mack stated correct. There are several twinhomes surrounding these properties. Conway questioned so approving this request would be consistent with what has already been done. Mack stated yes, once these are adopted all of the houses will be zoned R-2. There is another townhouse farther away and because it's not contiguous with twins on either side, and it's on the opposite side of Maple, I chose not to include that property in the rezoning. The city had a previous ordinance that allowed twin homes to be built with a conditional use permit. That ordinance was subsequently changed to eliminate the need to have a public hearing, in preference of creating rezoning. With these rezoning's, we're creating an R-2 neighborhood.

Mack stated there were no citizen complaints or concerns, just a few simple questions that were answered at the hearing. These homes will all be one-story, slab on grade twin homes, which is much more in demand right now with the increasing age of our population.

A motion was made by Conway, seconded by Randall, and unanimously carried to approve the first reading of the Ordinance Rezoning Land to R-2 in the City of Park Rapids, PID #32.38.91050.

8.2. First Reading Ordinance Zoning District Boundary Amendment Request from Barry Munson to Rezone Lot 10 Block 1 Hockings Acres from R-1 Single Family Residential to R-2 Single, 2 Family and Townhouse Residential District, PID#32.38.91101: A motion was made by Randall, seconded by Wills, and unanimously carried to approve the first reading of the Ordinance Rezoning Land to R-2 in the City of Park Rapids, PID #32.38.91101.

8.3. First Reading Ordinance Zoning District Boundary Amendment Request from Barry Munson to Rezone Lot 1 Block 2 Hockings Acres from R-1 Single Family Residential to R-2 Single, 2 Family and Townhouse Residential District, PID#32.38.92010: A motion was made by Wills, seconded by Conway, and unanimously carried to approve the first reading of the Ordinance Rezoning Land to R-2 in the City of Park Rapids, PID #32.38.92010.

8.4. First Reading Ordinance Zoning District Boundary Amendment Request from City to Rezone seven lots located on Spruce Lane, Oak Boulevard and Balsam Lane from R-1 Single Family Residential to R-2 Single, 2 Family and Townhouse Residential District, PID#32.62.02000; 32.62.02010; 32.62.02100; 32.62.02200; 32.62.02210; 32.62.02300; and 32.62.02310: Mack stated the remaining seven lots subject to rezoning are north of Balsam Lane, and west of Oak Boulevard. These are properties that all have twin homes, except the corner lot, which was built with a single home. There is a low area here, which is probably why it wasn't built as a twin. This rezoning would allow that to someday be added on or created as a twin or a duplex. All of the neighbors were notified and were in support of this. The particular owner of this property wasn't in attendance at the hearing. Some concerns were raised about drainage on his property. The city engineer, the public works supervisor, and I went out and looked at that. There has been cooperation from Mr. Munson in light of these concerns, and to address the drainage concerns as a part of the construction of twin homes on that parcel.

He'll be required to get a survey to split the lot. When he does that, he will draw in a grading plan for the site. He will provide onsite ponding on private property as a part of this rezoning process through the stages of the lot split and the building permit. So we will address it administratively at that time. We have the seven parcels also requested through a city-initiated rezoning from R-1 to R-2 in one ordinance. Both the Planning Commission and staff are recommending approval on the first reading.

A motion was made by Wills, seconded by Randall, and unanimously carried to approve the first reading of the Ordinance Rezoning Land to R-2 in the City of Park Rapids, PID #32.62.02000, 32.62.02010, 32.62.02100, 32.62.02200, 32.62.02210, 32.62.02300, and 32.62.02310.

8.5. Third and Final Reading of the Ordinance Amending the City Code of Ordinances of the City of Park Rapids, Chapter 34 Finances and Chapter 152 Rentals, Authorizing the Permitting of Short-Term Rentals and Prescribing

Standards: Mack stated this is the third and final reading of the ordinance regulating short term rentals. This is an item from the joint worksession with the Planning Commission that was identified as a high priority in the community. The Planning Commission worked with the staff to develop an ordinance. It was sent to the Council with a recommendation for approval. At the second reading you did receive some input from the real estate community. As a result, you referred this item back to the Planning Commission.

Mack stated the Planning Commission held two more public hearings on it and discussed the item over the course of four months. They have sent back to you a revised ordinance addressing the primary concern raised by the real estate community having to do with the buffer requirement, the spacing between how close any short-term rentals could be. They were unable to arrive at a compromise on the distance for spacing, ranging anywhere from zero, no buffering, to five hundred feet, which was the recommended standard. As a result of that, they decided to completely remove the buffer standard from the ordinance. They changed the approval process from administrative annual staff permit to a one-time public hearing process interim use permit. These permits, once issued, for interim use, they run with the applicant. So, if the property is ever sold, the permits expire. There is a process that they could come in if a new owner buys it, it would short cut the formal proceedings. If there were no issues, complaints, or concerns, there would be a streamlined administrative process for renewing that interim use permit. You have done one for Walmart, and a used car lot. You adopted that ordinance in January establishing interim use permits in the community. We have removed the administrative provisions. We still have all of the other standards in the ordinance that was supported by the real estate community. The Planning Commission and staff are recommending your adoption of the ordinance regulating short term rentals for Park Rapids on its final reading this evening.

Randall questioned when it was an annual permit process, did that come with an annual fee to renew it? Mack stated the recommended fee was \$100.00 a year. The interim use permit, instead of writing a check up front for \$55.00 for a three-year rental license for inspection, plus a \$100.00 annual permit, it would be a one-time interim use permit. The escrow is \$750.00 and the application fee is \$175.00. For them to come in and have the hearing they write a check for \$925.00 plus the \$55.00 license one-time fee for the rental. Which we would approve as a condition after the interim use permit is approved. They would come in for the one-time permit fee, and then they would not be charged

annually after that, except once every three years for the license for the rental inspection. Randall stated so the \$55.00 is not a one-time, it's every three years. Mack stated correct. Conway questioned but the \$925.00 is for the price of the hearing and all of that. Mack stated that would be a one-time charge at the front end. Conway questioned do we know what the cost to the city is to facilitate that? Mack stated it's approximately \$175.00 for the handling, the staff report, the processing through the hearings. Out of the escrow fees we take publication and recording charges. That would be for a variance, conditional use permit, it's the same fee. There is not any increase or charges to the fee that we are currently charging.

Randall stated I do have concerns about this process. Any time you switch things to an interim use permit you run the risk of granting one to one person and then the next person may not get it. That creates potential for appeals to the Council. For this interim use permit the Planning Commission would have the final say. Mack stated it would be the City Council that makes the final decision. They would make a recommendation to the Council for a final decision. Randall stated I have run into this with conditional use permits in the past where if you don't grant one, they wonder why and they compare it to a permit that was granted last year. We have to make sure that our Planning Commission is very well educated on how you grant these and how they are supposed to be looked at. That's where I've seen a lot of Planning Commissions, at the city and county level, run into problems. They ask the wrong questions. They are comparing things incorrectly. I do think it can cause a lot of trouble, especially when you have turnover on Planning Commissions.

Mack stated with the January ordinance adoption, it established very clear criteria for review of these applications. It is very well written in the ordinance what the criteria are for consideration. I think that the Planning Commission in wanting to go to a case by case basis was to overcome the concern that the buffer requirement wouldn't allow two homes to be side by side. Part of the concern they started with was they didn't want to look at creating a party row scenario in selected areas in the community. They did look at what might be the high probably that these types of uses would develop over time. I think there are some expectations and evidence that leads us to believe that this might become more prevalent over time. They felt that it afforded the Council and the city a greater degree of control and flexibility all built into one. That's why they have come forth with this recommendation.

Randall stated right, but what are the conditions in the ordinance, the criteria that they follow does not say how many in a location. You're completely removing this buffer zone and so there is a potential to get yourselves in hot water because if there are two next to each other and there is a third, that's where there are going to be problems, because now people realize we have three in a row so we are going to say no just because we don't want that saturated of an area. That's not part of the criteria.

Mack stated that amount of discretion is afforded to the city. If the concern is that an area is becoming too saturated, there is an impact on neighborhood character. There is criteria within the ordinance. It's a basic finding. Randall stated I think it opens up the city for getting sued. Conway stated I would agree with you. If you denied the wrong people you could set yourself up for a discrimination suit.

Randall stated I'm frustrated that they couldn't agree on a buffer zone. They just threw it out the window and said we give up because we're not going to agree, and then say we'll deal with it every time. Conway questioned don't we have other ordinances that

would apply to regulating the use of the property? Leckner stated this is just basically going back to what we originally had. Randall stated no. Conway stated originally we had you couldn't have two properties next to each other. Mack stated when we started this we had nothing. Leckner stated we were trying to adopt an ordinance for these short term rentals. Randall stated we're not saying we're not doing anything. We're trying to regulate what we want to regulate. I'm worried about this regulation of it. With the buffer zone that the Planning Commission all agreed upon, and because a realtor showed up, at the wrong meeting, I want to point that out, he showed up at the second reading, then it was referred back to the Planning Commission and now they all completely doing away with the buffer zone. The Planning Commission's first draft of this was based on what other communities are doing. A lot of lake communities are doing ordinances about short term rentals. I think we have too. I question why we're getting rid of a buffer zone and then making the Planning Commission and the Council review every single one.

Conway questioned can an ordinance change between readings? This third reading is not the same as the first reading. Mack stated the City Clerk and I discussed that. Based on the fact that you did hold two readings on the ordinance, and some modifications were requested to be made to it, then this is the third reading, procedurally we are on solid ground. Policy-wise, it's a different discussion here.

Mack stated Randall's concern was brought up during the public hearing process, dealing with these on a case by case basis, and the potential of consistency concerns. That's one of the reasons you do appoint a Planning Commission. They can do the heavy lifting for you and take into account neighborhood concerns and input. I have to give credit to the chair of the Planning Commission. He attempted to the best of his ability to bring the whole group together, but they weren't able to come to agreement on the buffer. I thought they were getting close between five hundred and one hundred feet. The number three hundred would be separated by two lots, but they couldn't arrive at that. The chair felt strong that they couldn't come to agreement on the buffer distance. Randall stated I have no doubt that the Planning Commission has worked very hard on this. I appreciate their time and efforts.

Randall stated my concern in addition to having the Planning Commission in the future having to spend the time reviewing every single one of these case by case with a public hearing on each one is if you have a developer that wants a short term rental on Potato Lake, and their neighbor rallies the troops in that neighborhood and comes and makes comments against it. The Planning Commission feels compelled by all of these comments to not grant it. Then you have a house on Fish Hook Lake and somebody wants to do that one, but that person didn't rally any troops and just one neighbor came, and everything else being equal, and that one is granted. It's only because of peer pressure from a group of people that may or may not be reasonable. That's what you're going to get. In some situations, you're going to get the rallying of the troops who will be reasonable and unreasonable in their opposition to these. That could persuade the Planning Commission, and that is my concern. All of those folks could come to the Council. It doesn't make a lot of sense to do it case by case. I think it could lead to inequities.

A motion was made by Conway, seconded by Randall, to refer this back to the Planning Commission again to come to alignment on a buffer or some other equivalent process so that this doesn't have to be reviewed case by case.

Discussion: Randall stated its unfortunate that Liz Stone is not here today since she is our representative on the Planning Commission. I know she would have some insight into this which she could have shared with us.

Mack stated it would be helpful if you could give some direction. If you want to see this buffer put back in, if you would provide some direction with your referral back to the commission for a new hearing on what that distance between zero and five hundred feet should be. I think that would be very helpful.

Randall stated I don't have a position on the buffer. That's not my issue. I want to see something that this isn't reviewed every single time on a case by case basis. Conway stated something that doesn't leave it to the Planning Commission either because they could make a discriminatory decision just as easily as we could, and not intentionally. It wouldn't even have to be a bad decision, it would just have to cause the perception of a bad decision.

Mathisrud questioned was the first draft an administrative process? Mack stated the very first standard involved an interim use permit. As the research evolved, I studied twelve northern tourist destination communities in Minnesota from the north shore to here. The model that the Commission built off of was from the former City Planner Dan Walker's. He developed this administrative procedure. He felt that it was something that would likely work well here. Everybody liked it. But the Planning Commission from the outset felt that they needed some spacing between these permits so that they didn't develop into a party row on any one given neighborhood street, which was their concern. That's why they added that in. Then they did remove the interim use process in favor of administrative. I thought that was a very good way to go. It addressed the exact concern you are referring to of I got one and you didn't get one. Bemidji went through this. It was a terrible situation. They went from no regulations to interim use permits, to completely hearing all kinds of problems around Lake Bemidji, and they ended up prohibiting the use and taking it completely out of the community and grandfathering in what was left. Randall questioned Bemidji went to an interim use permit for their short term rentals and then scratched it after problems? How many of the other cities you studied are currently using an interim use permit? Mack stated I'd have to go back and look. The interesting thing about the study is no two cities were the same. We were trying to do what made sense for Park Rapids. From the outset the administrative process really seemed to make sense. It just broke down over this buffer standard, which was principally the only concern identified from the real estate community.

Conway stated I'm looking for a set of criteria where either you meet it or you don't, and it's not well you get to this stage and it goes either to the Planning Commission or the City Council and just flip a coin and decide. Either you are going to meet the requirements or you don't. Randall questioned you said there is criteria that the Planning Commission has been instructed that they would follow? Mack stated that is correct, and it's within the ordinance. There was an exception built in that we would follow, like a variance process, and it could have been granted by a Planning Commission recommendation to the City Council. There was still some discretion in that.

Randall stated you said with the interim use process there would be criteria and the saturation would be taken into account. It would have been helpful for me if I could have seen the criteria that the Planning Commission is following when they are assessing these

interim use permits. So we could get an idea of how consistent you can be. I know what some of the criteria that's looked at in conditional use permits. I'm aware of it, but I also know there's more for a lot of interpretation and a lot of different outcomes on what people perceive to be the same kind of project. That's my concern.

Conway questioned could you write the criteria into the resolution? Randall stated Mack said it was already in the ordinance, so I'm confused because this is the ordinance. Mack stated it's a separate ordinance that you adopted in January describing various factors that you look at when you are considering interim and conditional uses permits, in general. These are specifically, short term rentals. Randall stated maybe this comes back from the Planning Commission and they are going to say, this is our recommendation again, interim use permits, this is what we are going to recommend again. I want to see the criteria, separately. That should have been in here so we could have gone through it and seen what the Planning Commission has been looking at. Conway stated we have to have it set up in a way so that ten years from now when you're reviewing a case you know what criteria it's supposed to be measured against. Randall stated the Planning Commission isn't going to be thrilled if this gets thrown back at them, but it doesn't stop them from proposing the exact same thing saying we can't come up with anything else, but at least I made my request to see what the criteria are that the Planning Commission will be looking at.

Leckner stated with that motion to refer it back to the Planning Commission, they have had three public hearings that they have dealt with the public to get their input and that's the decision our Planning Commission came up with out of those meetings. Randall questioned how many people showed up at those meetings? Mack stated at the last public hearing, none. The realtor that I provided the information to said he was satisfied with the changes that the Commission had made, and that's why he didn't attend the last public hearing. Randall stated we're still not getting public comments if only one person shows up. I understand we publish these things but are they really getting noticed to understand this. Just because a public hearing has been held certainly doesn't tell me that the public has spoken.

Conway stated despite that we've had public hearings and who has responded to them we have an obligation to look after our fiduciary responsibility to our city to not cause a liability. If we believe that passing this ordinance would make the city liable for a lawsuit then I don't think we should be passing it. If there's a better way to write it to remove that liability then I think that's what we need to look for. Do I have that answer? No, but I don't think I could vote for an ordinance if I have reason to believe that it can make the city liable to a lawsuit. Leckner stated is it any different with any other conditional use permits we have? If we give someone a conditional use permit to have a hair salon, it's always up to the Planning Commission and the Council. I think it's the same thing. Randall stated we just don't have a separate ordinance in the city covering hair salons. I think this gets more scrutiny because it's designed towards these short-term rentals. Conway stated by the nature of what we are trying to regulate, and the reason that we are trying to regulate it, makes it an item that could cause more dissent. These would become more of a liability than us allowing a hair salon. Hair salons generally aren't blasting music by my lakefront home at 2:00 a.m.

Randall stated this has been done all over Minnesota and this interim use is not the one that I've heard a lot about. I'd like to take some of the ability of the Planning

Commission and the Council out of it to make a decision on this. I don't think that we should be the ones making the decision every time on who gets this and who doesn't. There's a lot of room for emotion here if people are buying what they believe to be an investment which they are going to turn into a short term rental and there's emotion on both of their neighbors. We could say there were three public hearings on this and you didn't say anything. It's very different when it's a reality next to you.

Mathisrud questioned for this version the primary change is the fact that they removed the buffer standard? Mack stated correct. Mathisrud questioned in the first version that was an administrative permit and now it's an interim use permit? Mack stated correct. Mathisrud questioned is there a way to have this as an administrative permit without a buffer standard and have the Planning Commission review that? Mack stated they were satisfied with the majority of the standards, no late night parties, hours of limitation on noise, posting of the rules in each one of the places. We addressed all of the concerns. It boiled down to this buffer standard and the administrative process. If it goes back to the Planning Commission and if they had just a little direction, you don't necessarily take them through another public hearing each and every time, including the ones that are already operating, they'd be required to come in and get permits. Leckner questioned is that an option for them to leave the buffer out but have an administrative permit so they don't have to come here. Mack stated I think you'd see the Commission split again with what you just described.

Randall questioned because they want to make the decision and not the administrator, or what? Mack stated they felt that they needed some control over how many are right next to each other, and if they weren't able to arrive at a distance between these short term rentals, it has to do with controlling density in a given neighborhood, not just how close one is to the other. It's also total impact on any given neighborhood.

Randall stated that's where we need to see this criteria because we need to see if the criteria even allows for the Commission to control density based on those criteria, because if it doesn't, and they interpret that it does, that's where the city gets sued. People can look at criteria very differently. That's why it would be helpful for us to see the criteria and that it actually gives them that power that they think they have. Right now they think that this is going to give them the power to control the density. I don't see that because I don't see these criteria that they are going to be looking at. Mack stated without that density buffer standard in the ordinance it would not give them that specific authority. Randall stated you just said that's why they wanted it to come back to them so that they can control the density. Mack stated they did want that originally. Randall stated they believe they can control the density in a neighborhood based on an interim use permit, but I'm not seeing anywhere where this allows them to have that control, and if they don't have that control then this is not the way that we should be going. The biggest concern all along was the density issue.

Conway amended his motion to refer this back to the Planning Commission to review it compared to the criteria that's been set forth in the other ordinance and represent either a new ordinance or this ordinance with the criteria that allows the controls that the Planning Commission feels that they need to control the density, assure that that control is there, present the ordinance back to the Council, in conjunction with those criteria so that we can see the controls they believe are in place, actually are in place.

Further Discussion: Randall stated that's what I want to hear. How are they going to, you just said they want it to come back to them because they want to be able to control the density in the neighborhood. How are they going to do that? If this happens where three is going up next to one and two, how does the Planning Commission have that control and that ability to do that legally? Mack stated I understand your concern and I can definitely have them address that. Randall stated they should also go back and explore the possibility of an administrative review process versus this interim use process. Then it would take it out of their hands. That's what's most concerning to me, is that they want it back so that they can control it, but I'm not seeing how they can control it. I'm actually more comfortable with an administrative review process being more consistent.

Mayor Leckner called for a second.

Wills seconded the motion.

The vote was called.

The motion carried unanimously.

8.6. First Reading Ordinance Amending the City Code of Ordinances of the City of Park Rapids, Chapter 36 Fee Schedule, Regarding Changes to Planning & Zoning and Building Permit Fees:

Mack stated in January we created the fees for interim use permits, but it was never put into the fee schedule. It's the same fee amount as a conditional use permit. We also have some other fees that we currently charge based on the first reading here. It will come back to you as part of a larger review, a study that was done. In light of the corona virus that has effected the way we are doing business, we held off on a further review for increases in the fee schedule this year, but given the fact that we do have interim use permits now available to folks, we wanted to establish this fee schedule. This is establishing fees that we are already currently charging. There's no increases and no changes.

Mack stated we are recommending that the Council adopts this, primarily for the building permit fees, which is the clarification on how the fee is calculated. It looks like these are all new escrow amounts but they're not. They are currently charged when they sign an application, they also sign an escrow agreement. These escrow amounts were established as a part of the administrative permit process. I felt that since we were amending the ordinance that the escrow amounts should be in the fee schedule in the ordinance. There are not changes, these are the same amounts that are currently being charged at the application stage when they sign the escrow agreements. We recommend that we do this to establish official ordinance provisions on current fee collection practices.

Randall questioned this doesn't change the building permit fees? Mack stated no. Randall stated there is some confusion over the current way the building permit is calculated. Is that being worked on as well? Mack stated I will tell you that I'm looking at bringing the city a little further along. We're about two steps back behind most other communities in the state on the state fee schedule. But I didn't feel that this is the right time to bring that discussion forward. There was quite a bit of research done last year on preparing for a fee schedule discussion. As part of this budget process, in the spring, getting ready for the new construction season, but based on the state of the state, and the

state of the nation, I didn't want to look at increasing fees at this time. It didn't seem to be an appropriate discussion.

Randall stated my question was is it being looked at, not if there was an increase. I felt there was a lot of confusion over how the number for a building permit fee came about. Mack stated this clarifies part of that. On the first part of the building permit fees where we calculate, this is plan review, is part of the permit fee, and not the total permit value.

Conway stated explain that to me. What's the difference between the permit value? Mack stated permit value is the total cost of the construction. We have three different components within how we develop the total check that they write for a building permit. There's the total project value, which is the building permit. Number two is the plan review fee, which is associated with the review of the plans for the building, and thirdly, there's a state surcharge. The calculation that is the current practice of the office is to calculate the plan review fee based on the total valuation of the project, and not the total value of the actual building permit fee itself. In light of that there's a much substantial higher plan review fee being collected than there should be.

Conway stated so changing the term value to fee does have a material effect on what the city is going to collect. Mack stated yes it would. Part of the practice of the new building official is that we are not routinely charging plan review fees anymore. If there is not a full and complete plan review conducted by the building official, this has to do with liability on behalf of the building official with the State of Minnesota. If there is actually a plan being reviewed it's a new home, there's a plan review. If it's a simple addition, where most of those decisions where the plan review is made, in the field, the building official has instructed us not to charge a plan review fee. This is helping us to bring the plan review fees more in line with the way that the state has established their fee schedule, which is the plan review fee is a percentage of the total of the building permit fee, not of the total building value.

Randall questioned the plan review is separate from the building permit? Mack stated it's a different calculation line in the table. Randall questioned how do you come up with that if you don't know, they just seem to go together so I'm confused as to how you come up with this fee. Mack stated the line in the building permit application starts with the total project value. Based on that value our ordinance prescribes a base fee and so much per \$1,000.00, between ranges of \$2,000 to \$25,000, etc. That's how the valuation establishes the building permit fee. Then our schedule is about ten years behind the state's currently adopted schedule. We're about two cycles back. That's established as the total project value, that number is provided to us either by the contractor or the homeowner. Then that project value consists of materials and labor.

Mack stated Councilmember Randall might have some concerns about how we are calculating labor if we have situations where we know what the total value of the materials are and often times it's difficult for homeowners to establish what their labor rate is if it's not a contractor that has provided a total bid on what the project value is for the homeowner or for the business itself.

Conway questioned what kind of revenue do these fees give the city on an annual basis? Mack stated there are substantial. Conway questioned how much are we affecting it by saying okay to changing it from value to fee? Mack stated I would say that we would have to do more analysis on that to give you a better handle on that. In terms of the plan review it would be negligible. The main value is in the actual building cost itself. That's

were the primary amount of the revenues come from. Conway stated there's a possibility that we could be making a material effect to the revenue by passing this. Mack stated I would say it would be negligible, but I don't have a number for you. This is basically how it's being currently done in practice. The concern was to make sure the practice matches the ordinance. This really wouldn't change anything.

Leckner stated it wouldn't change the building permit fee, but it changes the plan review fee. Mack stated it wouldn't change the plan review fee either. All we're doing is clarifying in ordinance the current practice. Conway stated I understood you to say there would be a significant change in cost by changing this term from value to fee. Randall stated that's what I heard too, there would be a decrease. Mack stated there would be if we were not doing it the way we are proposing to change the language in here. This is the way we are currently assessing plan review charges, based on the permit value and not on the total project value.

Randall questioned I heard you say earlier with the change that you are proposing you said that we would be collecting less money. You said that the fee would be less to the homeowner, but now what are you are saying? Mack stated that applies to the case when we are not conducting the plan review itself. That's the change. That was made administratively by our building official.

Conway questioned regarding the plan review, when do we do them and when don't we do them? Mack stated we don't do a plan review when they don't supply us with plans. Randall stated so if one person got a plan from a construction company for a major repair or remodel because they aren't going to do it themselves, that would be a plan review. But if someone else wanted to do that same repair and do it all themselves because they have the ability and knowledge to do that and they didn't have these plans from a contractor, they wouldn't pay for a plan review. Mack stated essentially what we are doing is each time a request comes in and it does involve an addition we ask the building official on this specific permit if we need plans so that a plan review can be conducted. He's giving us a yes or no answer so staff is not making that discretionary decision. It's coming from the building official.

Conway questioned do we know what the criteria is as to whether he needs plans or not? Mack stated there is a little flexibility in that. That's why the building official makes the call. He's certified. One thing I will say in preference to a smaller community like this. If we can be a little more friendly, where some bigger cities may be very ridged and make them spend extra money to get plans for simple additions that the building official says he can handle by a field inspection, then I think that's a good service to our citizens. Randall stated I totally agree.

A motion was made by Randall, seconded by Conway, to refer this First Reading of the Ordinance Amending the City Code of Ordinances of the City of Park Rapids, Chapter 36 Fee Schedule, Regarding Changes to Planning & Zoning and Building Permit Fees, back to staff for a worksession with our building inspector.

Discussion: Randall stated I want a discussion with our building inspector about building permits. There are a lot of questions and it would be helpful to have our inspector here. Conway questioned do you want a workshop or just have the building inspector attend a Council meeting? Randall stated I'm asking for a workshop. I know in speaking with him myself he has lots of thoughts about our building permits and our fees and our process.

Since we're just addressing one little thing that seems to have brought on a lot more questions, I'd like a workshop. Before we change anything I think we should be hearing from him directly about what he thinks we need to be working on and not just changing one little thing. Mack stated I'd be more than happy to set that up.

Leckner questioned were these changes and fees brought on by the building inspector? Mack stated no they weren't. I was trying to make sure that we had fees in the ordinance for the interim use permits. We haven't had one of those permits come forward since we changed the ordinance in January. I think a worksession is an excellent idea.

Randall stated our budget is our primary concern, so if this worksession is scheduled in January, that would be fine.

The vote was called.

The motion carried unanimously.

8.7. Resolution Amending the 2008 Park Rapids Comprehensive Plan to Include a Chapter Regarding Electric Vehicle Readiness: Mack stated this update to the comprehensive plan for electric vehicle readiness in the community is the collimation of the internship project with Adam Herberg. He presented this at the last Planning Commission meeting at a public hearing. His internship has ended otherwise he'd be here tonight to present to you. Since the resolution adopts an update to our comprehensive plan establishing a set of criteria encouraging the community and businesses to become more EV ready and friendly. We've already addressed the separate item of installing electric charging station equipment within the downtown. That is proceeding. This is the final element of that project, to update the plan. You have those updates before you. The Planning Commission was very complimentary of the work that our intern did for us this year. I found him to be excellent to work with. We did collaborate through the updating of this plan. We included some of the actions of the Council for the charging station as a part of the plan.

Mack stated it's helpful information moving forward and evaluating various things. For example, next week I'll be attending training on grants that are being made available statewide to address improved EV readiness throughout Minnesota. This is right in line with that funding source that's quickly being made available from the diesel and Volkswagen lawsuit settlement in the State of Minnesota. That's 75% grant money for a level three fast charging. For our downtown we did level two medium rate charging. This is something that I've begun discussions with the new Simonson development that is underway now. There is some interest there and some funding to go along with it. The update to the plan is recommended to you through a public hearing by the Planning Commission. Staff does recommend it's adoption here tonight.

A motion was made by Wills, seconded by Randall, and unanimously carried to approve Resolution #2020-136 Amending the 2008 Park Rapids Comprehensive Plan to Include a Chapter Regarding Electric Vehicle Readiness.

9. GENERAL BUSINESS:

9.1. 2021 Budget and Property Tax Levy:

A. Resolution Adopting Preliminary General Fund Budget for the Year 2021 for the City of Park Rapids: Mathisrud stated before you is the proposed general fund budget for 2021. As we discussed in the workshop prior to this meeting there's a number of items there with recommended amounts. The total recommended budget is \$3,597,097.00. We're in the process of working through this and would like to see additional cuts in going forward into next year. But at this time this is our recommended preliminary fund budget.

A motion was made by Randall, seconded by Conway, and unanimously carried to approve Resolution #2020-137 Adopting Preliminary General Fund Budget for the Year 2021 for the City of Park Rapids.

B. Resolution Adopting Preliminary Property Tax Levy for Tax Year Payable 2021 for the City of Park Rapids: Mathisrud stated this is to adopt the preliminary property tax levy for 2021. We are recommending a 5.9% increase to the levy as a starting point for setting the budget. This gives us the flexibility to make the final decisions on that by December 8th of this year. In that resolution the actual number for the general fund will be corrected to \$2,239,283.00. The total levy would be corrected to \$\$2,974,742.00, presenting a 5.9% preliminary tax levy increase. As was discussed in the workshop we're targeting a lower increase than that. Those numbers will come to a Council workshop in the near future.

A motion was made by Randall, seconded by Wills, and unanimously carried to approve Resolution #2020-138 Adopting Preliminary Property Tax Levy for Tax Year Payable 2021 for the City of Park Rapids.

C. Set Truth in Taxation Meeting: Leckner stated I'd like to set the Truth in Taxation meeting to be held on Tuesday, December 8th, 2020, at 6:00 p.m. where the public will be allowed to speak. **A motion was made by Randall, seconded by Conway, and unanimously carried to set the Park Rapids City Truth in Taxation Meeting for Tuesday, December 8th, 2020, at 6:00 p.m. to be held in the Park Rapids City Council Chambers, at 212 Second Street West, in the City of Park Rapids.**

9.2. Presentation on Body Worn Camera Program for the Park Rapids Police Department: Police Chief Appel stated I'm here to present a program for Body Worn Cameras for the Park Rapids Police Department. I'll present the program, there will be a public comment period on the policy, then a resolution to adopt the policy, and the approval of the purchase of the cameras.

Appel stated I recognize your familiarity with body worn cameras. This was brought to you in a worksession and was identified as a budget priority. We had two incidents this year that prompted me to have a conversation with Administrator Mathisrud about the urgency of adding this program to the police department for many reasons that we will get to here tonight. He called for a Finance Committee meeting, which was presented to them and they recommended that we bring this forward to the full Council.

Appel stated after the Finance Committee meeting on August 27th, we posted our body worn camera policy and requested public input and comments. We advised the public that we are looking at implementing this program. We did receive twenty-seven

comments on our Police Department Facebook page, and one comment on our city Facebook page. We opened it up for comments by email, telephone, mail, and Facebook.

Appel stated the benefits of the Body Worn Camera Program are it's a crucial piece of any department. We all recognize the state of our nation right now with major law enforcement incidents impacting cities. Having the body worn cameras as part of our police department will enhance officer safety. We all tend to be on our best behavior when we're being recorded. Right now we have the capability of in squad recorders. The incidents I spoke of, you have your camera on the front of the squad so it's going to give you video of the front of the squad. When our officers go on a call not all of the incidents happen in front of the squad. They have a body mic that records audio that has a certain range, and if they are outside of that range, one of those incidents there was a fight and the only thing that the audio grabbed was intermittent screaming, and it didn't document the incident any further than that. In prompting officer safety the public and the officer knows you're recording.

Appel stated we can identify certain training aspects that we can look back on videos for officer safety and specifically train with real life scenarios that we encounter on the street. It enhances public trust through the preservation of factual representations of officer/citizen interactions in the form of audio/video recordings. Transparency is important for every police department. We want to represent an incident to the utmost of our ability to show what truly happened. I feel that these do that. We're in the business of capturing, convincing, and proving criminal activity, body cameras will do that too as we are away from our squads and it's a first person view for every officer.

Appel stated better documentation and the ability to view actions and statements as with any criminal case we arrive on the scene with just audio. Sometimes you don't get a true feel for the situation that a video can bring you. Preservation of audio/video for future investigations. A lot of times in our interactions we will gather information that we don't know what kind of a benefit that will be to a case in the future. That would give us the ability on that front. It's also a tool for self-critic of existing officers and new officers during field training.

Appel stated the Park Rapids Police Department holds all of our officers to an extremely high standard. We expect them to be maintaining that standard, whether they are being recorded or not. This gives us a better ability to document all interactions with the public. It may identify some training issues with new officers, or identify if an officer is not being appropriate. Protection of officers against false claims, this does happen. There was recently an incident in Northern Minnesota. We operate under the assumption that we are being recorded all of the time, but unfortunately videos with police do not show the full story. This allows us to have our side of the story recorded, the full incident. It can protect against false claims. Both sides have the ability to sit down, review the incident and then discuss it. Assist in the civil actions against law enforcement officers and the city. It's a liability to not have that ability, to not have that video, especially in critical incidents where officers involved shootings or major use of force incidents, that video can play a very key role in what the city will face right after an incident of that level.

Appel stated within your packet there is a bid from WatchGuard. WatchGuard was selected because currently we have four in-squad camera systems. These body cameras would fully intergrade with these systems. The first item is body cameras that would intergrade with the four marked patrol cars. There would be two cameras for the chief's

and the investigator's vehicles. Those two vehicles do not have in-car recording systems. This is a shortfall due to the fact that five days a week we have an investigator and myself on duty. We respond to all major incidents, but we do not have an in-car system, therefore we don't have even a body mic recording.

Appel stated in part of these two incidents that I described, at the end of one of these calls, the investigator and myself were on scene and we had further interactions, and there's no recording of that. This would equip both of those vehicles with recording system and body cameras for the investigator and the chief on a daily basis.

Appel stated the four body cameras are for the on duty personnel on the patrol. Then we would have an additional camera for a spare. This would allow us to have every officer that's working at one time to be equipped with a camera, and then we have a spare should one go down. Some of the other stuff is peripheral stuff to allow the cameras to be integrated into our system.

Appel stated I did speak to WatchGuard. There is no annual fee after setting up this program. With the program comes evidence library for software and licensing, which is a key component to allow for synchronization of all videos on an incident, so you'll have all your squad car and body cam videos synced together so it will play. It also includes a wireless download. With our WatchGuard cameras the process is the images and videos are stored on a thumb drive. In a major case in the morning, a supervisor comes to pull a thumb guard, download it to a computer and then clear the thumb guard and put it back in the squad car. But this program has a wireless download system. They pull into the garage, and the data automatically downloads to the WatchGuard system. That allows us to also share any evidentiary items with the county attorney's office through a secure email. Currently we have to buy and burn DVD discs for each incident. One incident can be three or four discs and you have to run them back and forth. We can click on an incident and within seconds send it off to the county attorney securely.

Appel stated I did discuss this with the county attorney's office and they are in support switching over to that process. This also adds a 16 terabyte server for storage of data. This will increase our data storage significantly with body cameras and squad cameras rolling. It also comes with data redaction software so if there is a public request for videos you can blur faces. In this bid it is seven body cameras and two in-car camera systems, which would equip all six patrol vehicles and all officers with body cameras for all on-duty work.

Appel stated this portable audio/video recorder policy is part of our policy manual. We just haven't had the capability for body worn cameras. This is the policy that we posted on the Park Rapids City and Police Department Facebook pages, and on the city's website for the public to comment on. There is a statutory requirement on implementation of a body worn camera program, which we have met with the public comments, posting the policy, and our actions tonight. That is my overview of the camera program. I'd be happy to answer questions. There were no questions from the Council.

A. Comment Period Pursuant to Minnesota Statutes 626.8473 Subdivision 2, for the Adoption of a Policy for the Use of Audio/Video Recorders by the Park Rapids Police Department: Leckner requested comments or questions from the public in attendance. There were none. Mathisrud suggested reading the comments into

the record. Randall stated the comments are now part of the packet and do not need to be read publically.

B. Resolution Adopting Policy No. 422 Portable Audio/Video Recorders for the Park Rapids Police Department Policy Manual in the City of Park Rapids: A motion was made by Conway, seconded by Randall, and unanimously carried to approve Resolution #2020-139 Adopting Policy No. 422 Portable Audio/Video Recorders for the Park Rapids Police Department Policy Manual in the City of Park Rapids

C. Approval of the Purchase of Body Worn Cameras for the Park Rapids Police Department from WatchGuard in the Amount of \$33,610.00: A motion was made by Conway, seconded by Wills, and unanimously carried to approve the purchase of Body Worn Cameras for the Park Rapids Police Department from WatchGuard in the Amount of \$33,610.00.

9.3. Soil Borings for Depot Park Tennis Court: Mack stated one of the things that is a high priority of the Park Board is the reconstruction of the four city tennis courts. This was a part of the city's grant application that was authored by Tom Stursa and the Tennis Association. From that point I worked with the original draft and the DNR to help finalize this grant application. It was submitted by the end of March 2020. Unfortunately, our grant request to the DNR failed. For a total of \$8 million of projects that were submitted to the DNR this year, they had the ability to award \$3 million in grants, which are 50% matching grants with local communities. This community was counting on that grant to help pay for the reconstruction of these courts.

Mack stated last year Council authorized a grant to the Park Rapids Area Community Fund to assist with the soil borings. The \$5,000.00 request to that organization was funded in part, \$2,500.00. The county has also committed \$5,000.00 towards this project. We have received pledges from the Tennis Association in substantial amounts to help pay for the court reconstruction and engineering costs.

Mack stated we have two items for the Council to consider tonight, first is a revisiting of the attempt to go for everything at once on this grant. Given the fact that we are going to be very well set to be able to conduct initial engineering there is already funding in place to pay for the upfront engineering. The US Tennis Association has assured us that once the project is engineered and ready to go out for bid they will provide technical expertise, in addition to our engineering firm, on the design and on the contractor bids. There is an indication of an additional \$50,000.00 from the national association to help meet our local match if we are successful in going for the DNR grant when we apply next year.

Mack stated the main thing is the task order that we are bringing to the Council tonight will set us up in a better position with the next round of state grant funding. Technically, we would be reducing the amount of the grant in the budget by having the engineering phase completed. It puts us in a better position for being competitive with the actual payment for the cost of the reconstruction, which is still an amount yet to be determined through this more definitive engineering study.

Apex Engineer Jon Olson stated I got on board with this over the last several months. There is a lot of energy in the tennis association. From my understanding is where we are at in the project is we're trying to secure funding to not only obtain a grant but also some local donations to fund the project. The thought of advancing the soil borings and the design engineering to provide a more comprehensive, solidified scope of work for the grant application is being proposed with the hopes that it's more competitive. This isn't our normal process here. Typically, once the project is financed, we get on board as far as the engineering. In order to secure this additional outside funding, the group has worked together to finance the initial engineering and soil borings to bolster the application with the intent of us moving forward with that at this point. In addition, it would be a shovel ready project. We would be able to advertise and note that in our grant application that we are to the point that as soon as funding is secured, we can send this out for bids and roll into construction as soon as that agreement is in place. That really does bolster the application in the sense that it shows the evaluation committee that the city is committed to move this project along. It's a little different than our normal process in the sense that we are doing the engineering before the total project funding at the end, but the reason for it is really to secure that outside funding.

Randall stated we are not just being asked to approve \$24,300.00 today, but we're being asked to approve \$43,500.00, which includes phase two, understanding the phase two would only go forward at our discretion. I'm wondering why we are including the \$43,500.00. Olson stated when we prepare a task order we normally prepare it for the total project, full knowing there is a possibility the project may not move forward. There are several instances where we prepare a task order for preliminary construction and the project gets terminated after the preliminary stage. We don't move forward onto those next steps. The reason for completing a task order for the entire project is so we don't have to go back with subsequent task orders moving forward. If you'd like that language we certainly can, but this is how we traditionally prepare these task orders.

Randall questioned does it say somewhere in this task order that phase two is only going to go forward with the city's approval? The resolution only approves task order no. 19 for the whole \$43,500.00. Mathisrud stated typically, administratively, we only authorize each section. If we get to a point in the project where we quit working because we're not ready to move forward with anything, so behind the scenes that's what we're doing to manage the contract with Apex. At this point we'd likely only move through stage one. We may stop long before we get to the full build amount because the first step of that is site survey work, which is only a portion of the \$22,500.00 in step one. We don't anticipate spending all of this in the first get go. Phase One in the first get go would authorize work as we get closer to prepare for that application.

Randall stated I understand that may be going on behind the scenes but I'm just looking at the black and white lettering here that the resolution approves task order 19, does not necessarily say phase one and two, and that they have to have approval for phase two. I'm just pointing that out. You should probably have that language in there so that if the task order is modified to include that language that would be appropriate. Conway stated we could make the task order say on the stipulation that phase two does not proceed without Council's approval. Randall stated I would be more comfortable that the task order we're referring to mentions the same thing that was recommended in the memo for action.

Olson stated if the resolution states basic services and design in the amount of \$20,000.00 I can certainly revise task order 19 to remove the bidding and construction. Randall stated the task order makes mention that there's a phase one and two and each one would have to be approved and then you can leave the whole thing in there. Olson stated I can make that change. Randall stated then the resolution can still say task order 19, as long as task order 19 is amended to reflect phase one and phase two and that approval will be attained at each phase. If anyone looked at this and approved it as is, they would think the \$43,500.00 just got approved. The behind the scenes doesn't matter if you're looking at what is proposed here in writing. Conway stated I think you're right.

A. Resolution Authorizing Proper City Officials to Execute Task Order No. 19 for Depot Park Tennis Court Reconstruction by and between Apex Engineering Group Inc and the City of Park Rapids: A motion was made by Randall, seconded by Conway, and unanimously carried to approve Resolution #2020-140 Authorizing Proper City Officials to Execute Task Order No. 19 for Depot Park Tennis Court Reconstruction by and between Apex Engineering Group Inc and the City of Park Rapids, as long as the task order is modified to reference phase one and phase two, and that both phases need Council approval to move forward.

B. Resolution Authorizing Proper City Officials to Execute the Agreement for Services by and between Terracon Consultants Inc and the City of Park Rapids: Mack stated we have a separate contract bid amount for geotechnical services with Terracon out of West Fargo. They had the lower bid in the amount of \$4,300.00. This bid amount was submitted last year. I asked for it to be updated, which they have done. Our city engineer has worked with this company and they come with high recommendations. We are recommending that Council approve the bid from Terracon for the geotechnical, which would have some oversight on the ground by our city engineer during those soil borings. The public works department will assist with some fence removal, making their equipment able to get into the courts, conduct six borings. They won't damage the courts. They will do the borings and take the excavation material, repack the holes, patch them, and then our public works department worked with the tennis association this year on patching the cracks, and they would do that in house again to seal up those six holes so that the courts are ready for play season in 2021. This would be scheduled tentatively during the week of October 19th upon completion of the regional tennis tournaments that are being held at the city's courts.

A motion was made by Conway, seconded by Wills, and unanimously carried to approve Resolution #2020-141 Authorizing Proper City Officials to Execute the Agreement for Services by and between Terracon Consultants Inc and the City of Park Rapids.

Discussion: Mathisrud stated I met with a Tennis Association representative and we talked about the process for moving the project forward, phase one being getting the information together with the engineer, and soil borings. They are working very hard to secure donations from their association and other members of the community. A significant portion of the project is likely going to be paid for from private donations, which is pretty impressive. They do have a significant portion of that already finished. Once they have this

information, this first phase, they will be able to go back to the donors and really make a strong funding campaign.

9.4. Results of the Performance Evaluation Conducted on August 25th, 2020, of City of Park Rapids Employee City Administrator Ryan Mathisrud under Minn. Stat. 13D.05, subd. 3 (a): Conway stated on August 25th, 2020, the Council held a closed session to facilitate Mr. Mathisrud's performance evaluation. It was determined at that closed session that Mr. Mathisrud meets his expectations that were set forth by Council, and Item 6.8. on the consent agenda tonight, which was already approved, approved his step increase.

9.5. Complete Count Committee Update for the US Census: Conway stated the percentage of households that are claiming to have responded to the census is 48% for Hubbard County. The census has been running since April and we have until September 30th to complete it. If we step back and realize that not only does this census effect how much funding comes out of state and federal government sent to Hubbard County, it also effects how many seats in the house that we have that would represent the State of Minnesota. More than just an update, this is a plea to ask people to fill out their census form because it does have a material effect on our services that the city and county can supply to the constituents and it would also in turn have an effect on what we are going to have to charge for taxes on those services if we are not receiving the funds because we didn't get enough population count. The City of Park Rapids is at 70.5%. The last census in 2010 it was 74.5%. Again, that's 30% of the households missing from the census. If we can get that up, understanding the city asked me to serve on the Complete Count Committee, we are far from being completed and we only have a few weeks left to go. We need any help we can get to try to inspire people to respond to the census. On the map of Minnesota there are only two counties that are at the 40-50% responding. We are way behind.

Mack stated being the staff appointee on this committee, the volunteers of the Complete Count Committee have worked very hard. I want to give credit to Florence Hedeem who has been doing this work on a totally volunteer basis. We've produced commercials, run radio programs, we're trying to get the word out the best that we can, but it's a challenge. The link to the website is my2020census.gov

10. CITY ADMINISTRATOR COMMENTS: Mathisrud stated Heartland Lakes Development Commission met last week to discuss the award of COVID-19 dollars to local businesses for revenue replacement. You put together a program for that. The city released \$120,000.00 for local business revenue replacement. We received six applications from businesses located within city limits and awarded \$117,000.00. The Heartland Lakes Development Commission is in the process of putting together round two allocation period. After we get our next report into the state relating to the use of those funds, we'll bring another request to Council to release additional COVID-19 funds for the round two application period. Countywide there were nineteen businesses that were funded in the amount of \$277,000.00. We're hoping to get additional interest in that. We felt that was a light response for the process to get that application out there. If we could

get the information out to the businesses that these funds are available. The funds have to be expended by November 15th.

11. DEPARTMENT HEAD UPDATES: There were no comments.

12. MINUTES/REPORTS/INFORMATION: There were no comments.

13. COMMENTS FROM COUNCIL: There were no comments.

14. ADJOURNMENT: A motion was made by Conway, seconded by Wills, and unanimously carried to adjourn the meeting at 7:51 p.m.

[seal]

Mayor Ryan Leckner

ATTEST:

Margie M. Vik
City Clerk