

**CITY OF PARK RAPIDS  
CITY COUNCIL MEETING  
MAY 8, 2012, 7:00 PM  
Park Rapids Public Library-Lower Level  
Park Rapids, Minnesota**

**1. CALL TO ORDER:** The May 8<sup>th</sup>, 2012 Regular Meeting of the Park Rapids City Council was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Mayor Nancy Carroll, and everyone present recited the Pledge of Allegiance.

**2. ROLL CALL:** Present: Mayor Nancy Carroll, Councilmembers Dave Konshok, Patrick Mikesch, Sue Tomte, and Paul Utke. Absent: None. Staff Present: Treasurer Angela Brumbaugh, Public Works Employee Dean Christofferson, Planner Dan Walker, Liquor Store Manager Scott Olson, and Clerk Margie Vik. Others Present: Ulteig Engineer Jon Olson, Bob White, Connie Harsha, Terry Forbes, Kenneth Mrnak, Leanne Mrnak, Art Wood, Beth Waller, Mark Waller, Kenny Miller, Ryan Leckner, Eric Hillesland, Alicia Hillesland, Tim Heinecke, Lisa Heinecke, Nate Sitz, Dori Mueske, Amy Yerkes, Betty Fuller, Hilda Benjamin, Jim Theisen, Ken Mackley, Glenn Pryor, Mary Lou Pryor, Meg Morris, Debi Malm, Gregg Malm, Nate Pike, Peter Meyers, Lou Ann Rech, and Anna Erickson from the Enterprise.

**3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA:** A motion was made by Utke, seconded by Tomte, and unanimously carried to approve the agenda as presented.

**4. PUBLIC HEARING FOR THE GREEN ACRES ADDITION STORM SEWER PROJECT:**

**4.1. Presentation of the Green Acres Addition Storm Sewer Project:** A motion was made by Konshok, seconded by Mikesch, and unanimously carried to open the public hearing at 7:02 p.m.

Mayor Carroll stated we will have a presentation from Jon Olson, from Ulteig Engineering in Detroit Lakes. Following the presentation, there will be an opportunity for people to speak. We want everybody to sign in, so you can have the opportunity to speak, and it's a record of who is attending tonight. The order of speaking will follow the order of the names on the signup sheet. Please refrain from repeating comments that have been made previously. Feel free to indicate if you support something that someone else has said. Limit your comments to approximately two minutes so we have time to get to everybody. Address your comments to the Council. The purpose of the hearing is for the Council to hear your comments on the project. Do not respond to each other's comments. If you have a need for a side conversation, please take it out in the hallway. We'd appreciate that. Keep your comments to the storm water project. That's all we're talking about tonight.

Jon Olson thanked everyone for coming to the second public hearing for the Green Acres Project. The public hearing is a requirement of Minnesota Statute 429. When we met in February, we did not include or propose any storm sewer improvements in the project. Therefore, if we were to implement any, that would be above and beyond what was previously discussed, which is the reason why we are meeting again today.

Olson stated storm sewer is any facilities that collect, convey, and dispose of runoff. That includes mainlines, culverts, manholes, catch basins, ditches, and holding areas, which we commonly call basins. According to the assessment policy those storm sewer improvements are 90% assessable, 10% being city share.

Olson stated the project was originally initiated for the purpose of the extension of watermain and sanitary sewer. It was at that hearing that we received a lot of comments indicating that we should review and look at the drainage and incorporate that discussion in the project. Since that time we collected some data on the Green Acres Addition, and developed some options for discussion and review. Generally speaking, the west half drains westerly, and the east half drains somewhat easterly. The primary source of discharge is infiltration. What collects on the site, typically, doesn't go very far. It collects in depressions around the development and it's able to infiltrate. There's an exception on the far west end where some discharge does get into the Timbers system. The far east side does discharge under County Road 6 into the Timbers Addition. I wanted to note that what the system does in the spring, that we experience issues in Green Acres, that it does frequently get overwhelmed. During the review we did determine this is primarily an issue during the spring thaw. The reason is for lack of conveyance the water is designed in that development to sit, and not go very far and infiltrate. We have a lack of designed storage here. We have storage, but it's within the majority of the properties, in front of their houses. The reason we have ponding during that time is due to that. We're not conveying the storm water to a specific location. We're allowing it to basically stay on site. Our issues are primarily spring thaw, when the ground is frozen, that water is not able to soak in and primarily a nuisance-type issue. We received very few comments on any property type damage. It's more standing water in yards, across driveways, for that period of time throughout the years.

Olson stated we developed four options to look at. Option one is do nothing. That would have no increase to the project cost. It would be the same project that we presented last time. Option two is constructing a storm water basin on the west half. The city owns an existing lot. That would significantly improve conditions for those properties on the west side. That does have an increased estimated project cost of \$42,000.00. Option three encompassing the whole development. We'd be constructing two basins to convey the water to designed areas. That's more expensive. It's estimated at \$121,000.00. Option four would be the same as three, but with the addition of curb and gutter and a full storm sewer system, with an estimated cost of \$440,000.00.

Olson stated the do nothing option drawing is very conceptual. It's based off survey data, it's the low points that shows where existing issues may be present. It's not perfect because this area experiences more issues than other areas. It's very conceptual, but it does give you a general idea of where we do have ponding water. With the proposed improvements, the water and sewer, we'd be reconstructing the street, and we don't anticipate any adverse impacts on the drainage. We'd be slightly widening the street one to two feet, however we wouldn't be impacting or taking away any of the existing ditch

sections. In those areas where there is a deep ditch, we'd be slightly lowering the street so that we're cutting out the very steep portion. When we lower it we're cutting out the steep portion, and that portion isn't very conducive to infiltrating water. We're keeping the infiltration areas. The deep potholes, shown in blue on the map, would be relatively untouched and they would be the same. Two things that we would do under this option, to try to assist with the two most problematic areas, first in the northwest corner, our existing street hugs the south property line of the south parcels quite closely. We're going to re-center it. That's standard anytime we build a new street. We try to get the new street centered in the right of way. When we do that in this location it gives us a little more room to work with to try to gain some storage. We have that option up here that would be part of this do nothing option, as well as incorporating some French drains. We'd put some rock pits down. They're by no means foolproof drainage systems. A lot of times the voids in the rocks will break quicker than a granular material and that water will break through the frost quicker. With the do nothing option we are still trying to improve the conditions. However, not by traditional storm sewer.

Olson stated option two generally improves the conditions of the west side of the development. We're proposing a basin in the city owned lot. The benefits of this alternative, dramatically improves the ponding that we typically experience in this area. The land is available. The disadvantage is the cost. If it is assessed according to policy, it would significantly impact the assessment that we discussed at the last hearing. Another disadvantage is that it would not provide benefits to the properties to the east.

Olson stated option three takes that into consideration. In addition to the basin on the city owned lot, we would be looking at an additional basin on one of the two vacant lots on the southeast side of the addition. This is very conceptual. These basins, once designed, likely wouldn't be that size. It's being shown for illustration purposes. The major disadvantage is the cost associated with it. It would likely impact the assessment by about \$2,500.00.

Olson stated option four is the Cadillac of options. That is what you see in a lot of urban settings, reconstructing the road to a full blown urban section with storm sewer throughout. This would dramatically improve drainage throughout the development. It would have an aesthetic impact on the development as well. We'd be lowering the street grade. The street right now is currently up. That's very common in a rural-type street. Lowering the street, we'd be eliminating the ditches, and collecting the water in the street and then convey that to the same two basins that we discussed in the first two options. Another advantage is the curb does provide some protection for the edges of the asphalt. It does have a function beyond runoff. It does provide longevity to the edges of our driving surface. The major disadvantage is the cost. This is the most expensive option. If it were assessed according to policy, we would be looking at adding an estimated \$7,500.00 to each parcel. It's a very expensive option. As with option three, some land would be necessary for a basin on the east side.

A citizen questioned is that included in the price? Olson stated the estimated land acquisition costs are included in the costs.

Olson stated the options include storm water basins, instead of just ditching it. We're not able to simply discharge runoff from a project that hasn't discharged. We have to match the existing, or slower than existing rates. So our post-construction rates cannot exceed that of the existing. Basins do a very good job of slowing that runoff rate. They

happen to be the most economical solution that's been the case for several years. We're seeing a lot of below ground solutions. Rain gardens are starting to become more common. Those features do look great, however there is an added cost to those solutions. Basins within the City of Park Rapids are typically dry. We have great soils here. When it's not frozen, water typically drains out, and they're typically a dry basin.

Olson stated our project schedule is unchanged from last time, with the exception to the bidding. We pushed the bidding back. We're hoping to start bidding at the end of May, and looking at opening bids at the end of June. The construction could start sometime in July.

**4.2. Questions/Comments Regarding the Project:** Carroll questioned if there were any general comments on what Olson has just presented.

Terry Forbes: You're talking of putting rock through the ditches in option two to make a little bit of drainage.

Olson: They would be a below ground feature. You wouldn't see them. They're called a French drain and they've been utilized through the community on several occasions. They do provide some assistance.

Kenny Miller: I don't understand, when you said for option two \$2,500.00 for fourteen parcels, so only fourteen parcels will be charged that extra \$2,500.00?

Olson: That is correct.

Miller: Because, when we did that survey that I sent back, I didn't understand that. In fact I think that maybe would change people's minds on how they maybe would have voted through things.

Carroll: You'll have another opportunity to express that. There were some shaded areas on the slides that showed who would be assessed by that.

Miller: I wanted to make sure I was understanding correctly now, because I didn't understand correctly before.

Bob White: You mentioned construction starting in July or August. Is it a go for the water and sewer?

Carroll: Well, yes as far as I know.

Utke: It hasn't been put out for bids or anything.

Carroll: We have one more meeting.

White: I thought it was supposed to be up for discussion. He mentioned for July or August construction will be starting so let's get that clarified.

Konshok: That's the tentative project schedule.

Carroll: The next....we ordered plans and specifications.

Olson: The next time that I'd be back to the Council after this meeting would be to present the plans and specifications and request a bid opening date. At that time we'd advertise the project and put those out for sealed bids and open those bids.

White: Will the citizens, before you start, be able to vote on the project? Go or no go?

Carroll: The Council will vote. But it will be at a public meeting.

White: Are we not in the United States?

Carroll: We are recording the meeting. It's very good for picking up around the room. I'll remind you to address your statement or comments to the Council.

*Mayor Carroll began reading names from the sign in sheet.*

Bob White: Relating to the storm sewer system in Green Acres, I've been there for forty-two years. I don't know, maybe one time your house got water in it in forty-two years. That's the only time I've known of any house getting water in it. And that was five years ago, in 2009. Also, when Jon and Bill came around and we had a little survey, and I showed what happened when they run the water and sewer to the bank, that is when that road got shifted over to the south side, and the manhole and the water line is way off of the street lines. So who's cost would this be to correct that part of the problem to put it where it belongs?

Carroll: I can't answer that. You looked at the whole lot?

White: That was an engineering flaw I think, or whatever.

Olson: The road was constructed to match the existing alignment. The existing alignment was offset. The existing infrastructure that's in place will not require relocation. It's within the right of way and there's no issues with current existing infrastructure.

White: Okay. Number two is remember I showed you Bade's culvert? That thing is open on the northwest side. It's been plugged ever since construction on the southeast side so the water can't run through there. Who is supposed to take care of the culverts on County Road 6? Is the city agenda or county agenda?

Carroll: Well if it's a county road, it's probably the county.

White: I've noticed that when we have a good rain, the water that was on Lee Davis' side behind this building, that water was coming into Discovery Circle from the other culvert. We do have a problem there. Those culverts are getting plugged bad.

Connie Harsha: I was wondering if the city applied for the Total Maximum Daily Load Grant Program? There's \$3 million available. Up to \$3 million. They cover 50%. I was wondering if the city applied for that?

Carroll: I don't know. Our city administrator is not here this evening.

Harsha: Since we talked last has there been any grants applied for?

Carroll: There's been contact with DEED I believe.

Harsha: I went to HRCDC, and I'm the one that contacted them to help these people out. Not you guys, like the letter stated. That pissed me off really bad. I did that work, not you guys. Anyway, up to \$3 million, 50% of it would be covered, and there are funds available. I have a contact person. You guys could apply for that. It not only helps you out but it helps everybody else out so we don't have to pay this much money. So if you need that information, I'll get it to you, but if you're looking at funding-wise and what people...it's been brought up that people are going to have a hardship. Obviously, it would benefit the city and people for you guys to apply for this.

Carroll: We'd really appreciate it if you would bring that to city hall and share it with Bill Smith. I think he's coming back really soon, on Thursday.

Harsha: When I got the letter that said how the city was working so hard, credit should have been given where it's due. I contacted the HRCDC to find money for these people, not the city.

White: Are we supposed to say which one of the three options that we want as we stand?

Carroll: If you want to make a comment, why not.

Utke: Give your opinion on what you think.

White: I would do number one, do nothing.

Carroll: We'll keep a tally.

Harsha: I'd take number one. It don't affect me. But I'm not really sure on it yet.

Terry Forbes: I got it down that you're doing this for better water for us. Where's the better water at? I know what you're going to say, to stay to this, but I want to know where the better water is? This is all to benefit us, and it's not going to benefit us at this time when you have to put all of that chlorine and crap in there.

Carroll: We're going to stick to the storm water issues tonight. That's all.

Forbes: I know that's what you're going to say, but are we going to get better water?

Kenneth Mrnak: I've not much to say. I say number one, do nothing. When you talk about these French drains, I for one would like to see that. I know that will help us out in my area.

Terry Forbes: I agree on that as well. That makes good sense.

Leanne Mrnak: Option one.

Art Wood: Option one.

Beth Waller: We did not know that option two was assessed only to those affected until we walked in here tonight. So I was going to say option two, and I'm considering that because it's a higher cost to us.

Mark Waller: Obviously, we're the place with the problem. Go back to the second slide, you said something about 90% is what, assessable? Is that a law that 90% has to be assessable? Or is that just up to 90% is assessable?

Carroll: This is referring to our assessment policy.

Utke: That's a city policy.

Carroll: The other 10% of the money for the storm water project would come from our storm water fee.

Waller: This is not a storm sewer we're talking about.

Carroll: Well it's various storm drainage issues and approaches to solving drainage issues.

Konshok: Storm sewer covers all those different categories. Everything from ditches to full up lines.

Waller: My thought is, make it a story a little bit. If you were to come and said my window needs to get fixed, and as you were fixing my window even if I didn't want it fixed, you broke my door. Who's responsible to pay for the door? Am I responsible to pay for the door or the one who broke it? Make the connection here. You're coming in fixing a water/sewer system some of us aren't interested in having it done. In the process, the potential is there of causing more problems with the drainage. Now you're asking us to fix the problems you're causing by your city project. This is a city project, you're doing it and if by your doing it you cause greater problems with drainage, we shouldn't be the ones to fix it. It should be the city who fixes it and makes it so that it's not a problem. I know there's been a number of projects around the city where they've done similar types of things and there's standing water around in those particular settings. It's not like they've completely fixed those. So how can we make sure it's going to be better or at least as good. Why should we pay for it if it's a city project?

Carroll: Which of the four choices?

Waller: Two.

Konshok: For a clarification, for the drainage issues, we were looking at the historical drainage issues, these are existing, not caused by the project.

Waller: It remains the same. I'm concerned about it being worse after it's done at my place. If you move the road, and start messing with levels of stuff, it could be any houses around in that area that could have a problem instead of just mine.

Konshok: The point behind why we're looking at the storm drainage is because it was raised by some of the residents as a pre-existing, current condition. It wasn't part of the original project. The original project was to put the structures, the street, and the ditches as they are today. That was the plan.

Carroll: Which is still the plan if we go with number one.

Waller: So when it gets all done, if we do number one, we do it all and the drainage is worst, who's..... it shouldn't be, of course it shouldn't be....but....if you're going to do it that way, then it shouldn't be, then guarantee it, that if there's a problem that you'll fix it, and at your cost. It shouldn't be our problem because it's your problem.

Utke: It really couldn't get worse. I mean if it goes back in the same spot and height, and the yards are the same the water has to pond basically the same as what it is.

Waller: The roads aren't going back in the same spot. He's moving it.

Utke: It's proposed to move a little bit.

Waller: Let's say the height...the houses across the street have a problem instead of me.

Utke: When the heights all remain the same.....

Waller: The heights aren't staying the same.

Utke: That's a whole different subject.

Waller: That's a different subject?

Utke: I don't see the problem, but I'm listening. I don't see where that change would make a different.

Olson: I'll make a comment. Before we put a final plan out, we're going to be very diligent. We know there's an existing issue at hand. We're going to be very diligent that that issue is not worsened by this project. That's an absolute priority from our desk. If it does become worse, it's likely environmental issues, an extreme spring thaw that is a worse case situation.

Kenny Miller: I have a question on two. Tonight is specific towards storm sewers, correct? Because we talked the last time right away there was a greater percentage. I assume that the ditches could be in the right of way, the thirty-three feet or whatever, so that's a separate 90%, see what I'm saying. You can assess 90%, then you talked earlier at the other meeting that anything in the right of way was more so a bigger percentage for the city, less for the homeowners.

Olson: Every improvement is assessed at a different percentage. Water and sewer are assessed 100%, streets are 60%, and storm sewer is assessed 90%.

Miller: Then that answers my question.

Konshok: It's not based on right of way, no.

Miller: I wanted to make sure to clarify that. Then, I contacted a lawyer to talk about the assessments and whether this was a singular project or as a whole. I think a lot of these people should know the fact that the lawyer called it a special benefit rule. Basically what the state says is once the project is completed and they come with a total assessment price, at that final meeting when they have a public hearing and they tell us the exact cost, we have the right to informally, in writing, to state that we're objecting to the assessment. We have thirty days to appeal. Based on the economy, I think we talked about this, whether it's just a sewer project or a project as a whole, the assessment price should increase our home value based on the assessed price. For simplicity's sake, if it's a \$150,000.00 assessed home, the assessment should increase it by \$20,000.00. My lawyer assures me that's not going to happen in this economy. If we appeal that, whatever is

beyond, let's say your home is assessed, and everyone would have to hire and if we went in as a group, we could hire an assessor and it would cut costs a lot as a homeowner, but basically we would have it assessed and let's say it comes back at \$10,000.00 on the improvement. The city would have to pay for the other \$10,000.00. It would come out of their general fund. We wouldn't save any money on the hook up, but we'd save a lot of money on the assessment itself. And then maybe the city would see the little bit of the pinch we're in, and it would lower our taxes obviously based off of the lower assessment total cost. A lot of these people should know that and it can only be completed once the total assessment price comes out, so it's not a rush. If they decide that they want to go through with the project, we should let them know that we're ready to spend our money. If we spend \$1,000.00 and save \$10,000.00, I think it's a good trade off. They asked if we'd be interested in making improvements on our home if low interest loans are available. That was a peculiar question that had nothing to do with whether we're talking about sewer or water. I don't know why that would be asked.

Tomte: That was on the survey.

Miller: That's a very good question. Where did that come from?

White: They also asked for income.

Carroll: I think that had to do with the potential of getting a grant.

Miller: By the way, I would suggest that you personally say don't make any home improvements. Because if you think about it, if you make improvements to your home, and then you want to appeal that assessment, you just increased the value of your home, the city will be thanking you because your assessed value will be making that \$20,000.00 a breeze. I would encourage you not to make improvements to your home, and skip that low interest loan, if you want to appeal anyway.

Carroll: Do you have a particular comment on the issue of the evening?

Miller: Yeah, are we not assessing that is a part of the assessments for this project.

Carroll: Do you prefer one of.....

Miller: Are we not assessing is part of the assessments for this project, an extra \$2,500.00 is part of this discussion. Okay, so whether it's \$2,500.00 to \$7,500.00.

Carroll: Do you have a preference for one of the four proposals?

Miller: Okay, so you shut me down, okay. I have a preference for number one, just because I think, I do truly believe that they will be able to improve the roadway and improve the drainage issue, but I would say number one because I'm on the other side of the circle.

Konshok: Just a clarification on that, we did look at a number of different programs that are available as to help out with the funding, and we'll check on the one you mentioned as well, the problem is of late over the past few years, the funding has either dried up a bit or they put a lot of restrictions and constraints in them. The loan program you were referencing to, why we ask that question is because there is a potential program out there that if enough folks express interest we can put in an application, but as you mentioned it is a zero interest loan. But one of the quirks of that grant, that loan program, is that we have to have more or less a commitment from the folks up front that x number of folks want to participate.

Miller: Why do they have to know our income?

Konshok: Because it's a State of Minnesota based, most of those programs are, they have pretty strict income.....

Carroll: Income eligibility. That's why.

Konshok: I don't know if the one you were looking at mentioned that as well, but most of them are, a lot of them are income based.

Harsha: The one for the total maximum daily load grant program? That one is not income based. The city applies for it. In other words, the city applies for it, the city saves money and passes the savings on to the residents. There is money available.

Konshok: I was asking Jon, we typically go through.....

Harsha: That came from the attorney general, there is money available and it needs to be applied for as soon as possible. It saves you and us.

Konshok: We go through the available programs and see which ones apply. If it's available to us, then we apply for them. They may have pretty tight constraints on them. We'll check in on it.

White: Does the city have anybody hired to look at grants?

Konshok: The engineers, as part of that, do it on a cost basis. They are pretty dialed in to what programs are available.

White: Jon, were you involved already when we ran the water/sewer from Henning all the way to Ottertail?

Olson: Our company may have, I was not.

White: We ran water all the way from Henning to Ottertail, from the water tower, and ran water throughout the City of Ottertail. This guy had a plush home on Ottertail Lake, a couple billion. I asked him what it cost for city water, and he said the hookup fee was \$1,500.00.

Carroll: Let's get back to our public hearing.

Terry Forbes: How can just a citizen can find them grants and everything else, and everything can go through so much?

Carroll: We're going to address the grant issue with the city staff will be doing that. Let's not go back to that again where we are repeating ourselves.

Ryan Leckner: I would go with option one.

Eric Hillesland: Our vote would be number one.

Alicia Hillesland: I vote for number one also. We already can't afford the first project, so any more money would make us even more behind.

Tim Heinecke: I would vote for option number one. Especially in that map two of those big blue areas are on my property. And I would still go with option number one.

Lisa Heinecke: I would vote option one too.

Nate Sitz: I have a small concern with the drainage pond going on the existing city lot. I'm directly to the east of that. How deep would the pond be? Would there be any type of drainage problem getting into my basement? I'm assuming the picture's not exactly where one's going to go but it looks like it's right on the line. So trees would come out?

Olson: The pond was conceptual. No we wouldn't impact any trees. Certainly the design would take into consideration your property to insure there isn't any impacts to it.

Sitz: I was standing in my driveway and I looked at the far side, the far west side of the city lot. It looks like it's about at eye level, so 5 ½ feet higher, so it's already got to come down. I've only been in the house since December, so we didn't get any snow this year so I have no idea what type of drainage problems there are. As far as I know it's supposed to be blue area and all I see is grass growing. There aren't any wet soil type plants growing up

on the side of the road. I'm not sure what it's like in the past. I guess if I had to pick one, I'd pick option one.

Dori Mueske: I'm going with option one because if you put ponds in out there we're going to have mosquito problems. We have no mosquito problems. We don't need anymore. We have children out there. We don't need the ponds. They're going to fall in. And you all are talking how this is going to go on our taxes and how it's supposed to improve our property. I got my assessed value for next year. It's gone down \$4,000.00 for this year. It's gone down \$4,000.00 for next year, and it's supposed to increase my value? It's not. I want to see it in writing that it's going to improve my home value for my son.

Amy Yerkes: I just moved to Discovery Circle in August into Bev Torkelson's old house. Her property value actually went down from \$119,500.00 to \$85,600.00. For which we purchased it. The reason we purchased it was because it was all I could afford. I could have afforded another home out in Nevis for just a little more. It was already hooked up to sewer and water, and all these other options. Now when we were looking with relators, with my parents, around the surrounding areas, I was told a \$12,000.00 with probably three to ten years to pay that off. After moving in here and hearing people's frustration with the project, is it going to happen, is it not going to happen, how much is it going to cost, how's it going to affect people, how is it going to affect properties, I've learned other relators have given the same amount, oh it will be \$12,000.00. That's reasonable and it will again, improve your property value. I think part of the problem is, the communication. I know that you guys are strapped in an economy that there used to be someone that did look at the grants, and all that stuff. And I know that Connie has found some. I've found some online, federal grants for water conservatory act stuff, under Obama's law. I used to work for DEED. I worked for the state for almost nine years. And there is this stuff, the problem is you need the people, the power, and the time. But I think if there, the options are presented in a way that make it a little more sense. One of them was a brochure offered by the city league of cities or something that explained if it causes a hardship, it was something like, if it exceeds the benefits to the assessed property in terms of the increased value it was Minnesota Statute 429.051 and it's not reasonably proportional to the benefit of your property, we, this group of people that live there can present an objection to your Council, this is going to then drag this out to another hearing and all this other stuff. But we can do that and use it as reference. And then there is deferment for the collection of special assessments, whether they are senior citizens, whether they're retired, whether disabled. My parents own this home. I was without a job for two years. Lost my home, lost my car. I'm trying to start over, and I'm working a part time job back in my hometown where there isn't a whole lot. So, my dad said vote for number one. I personally am not going to get involved in all this, but I think if they, the City Council, can show some different options, when you were talking about programs, when I lived in St. Paul for example, they used to have city improvement loans. So you had to make less than \$35,000.00 a year, where the salary requirement came in. But they had zero percent interest loans for \$1,000.00 to \$10,000.00. It was to get rid of lead, and stuff like that, if you 3%, 4%, 5% interest loans, it would be up to thirty years so you could afford home improvements for people who normally couldn't afford them. Things like that. The one question that my mom had, she said when we lived in town here, the house would eventually get hooked up to city water and sewer. Instead of the three year, we had ten years. And they wanted to know why that isn't a possibly option. So that, something like

this large amount wouldn't be stretched out. I guess really basically, three things that I'm trying to address, one would be to increase communication between the city, City Council, and the residents, not just throw out a survey. And I'm not saying it was good, bad, or other. If you have people saying why are you asking us this question, or why are you asking about possible other low cost grants, we're all kind of confused. This isn't going to improve my home, and this is what's happening in this economy, it could have been simply clarified with a little, hey we're considering this, we're looking into this, we're researching this, and like that. The other thing is are there other alternative options, ten year, or fifteen years? And what about categorizing, people who are retired, people who are disabled, people who for whatever other reason can't afford this, this is a definite economic hardship. And again when we were looking for homes, we're within a budget just like everybody else in this world, and if somebody would have told me \$12,000.00 over the next three to five years, that's breathing room. But then when you find out four months later after you've moved into a home, you've set the rent, and you think everything's going to be okay, and I'm not going to be homeless, and then go \$46,000.00. What? My parents are retired. They're on a set income. They're not earning money off of me. The area is safe for me and my daughter. I understand everybody's taxed for time, programs have dried up, but there has to be something out there.

Carroll: Amy, I'm going to interrupt you. I want to remind everyone again that we are going to stick with just the storm sewer issues for tonight. We appreciate your comments. We definitely heard you. Thank you. I've got you down as number one.

Yerkes: My dad and mom. I don't know if I have a right to vote as a renter. I don't even know.

Carroll: That's okay. We're taking a head count more or less. I think you could say that.

Konshok: Just a couple of clarification responses. There was a Q&A sheet put out right, that would answer some of the questions? There was a question and answers put out that tried to explain some of the issues. You folks have seen that? A show of hands anybody?  
*No one responded.*

Carroll: Did that go to the homes?

Konshok: I don't know if it did or not.

Carroll: Without Bill here we don't know what happened.

Konshok: We'll check on that. The other clarification is, we've said from the get go, and it's standard on any of our assessments. You always have two options. One is pay it up front, the other is pay it over a set term which is typically the bond for the project, which on most of these runs a fifteen year payback.

Tomte: Then you have three years to hook up.

Yerkes: Then it is possible to look at fifteen years on the time period?

Konshok: For the city portion. I think what's probably getting confused is the three year, when you do your part, inside your property lines to hook up to it. The assessment can either be paid off all at once, up front, or it will automatically be added to your taxes out over, typically, a fifteen year period.

Kenny Miller: Is the hook up, the three year, being discussed? Is that the city, is that set in stone?

Carroll: The city has been doing that for some time.

Konshok: It's a city policy.

Betty Fuller: Option one, please.

Hilda Benjamin: I'd go with option one.

Jim Theisen: I've been out there fifty-one wonderful years. I think it's high time I sold. Because the wonderful years have kind of disappeared. No fault to anybody, other than I'm getting old. I don't like the city coming in and pestering me. Okay? I know you're going to do this. But, as far as voting here, if I understand right, I don't hear very well, number two, voting effects that one little area, why should we be voting what the people on number two should be voting on only? Doesn't make any difference to me. And it doesn't make any difference to most of the people, other than the ones on number two because they're going to have to pay for it, right?

Carroll: Right.

Theisen: So why are you asking me? I'll go with number one, but ask those people in number two. Are they going to be willing to pay for it? Because they have a problem. I feel sorry for them. They got water. But I don't see why I should be voting for or against them when it doesn't affect me, monetarily or water-wise.

Carroll: The primary purpose of our meeting is to explain that there are some options as to how to address this issue. And the second issue is to vote.

Theisen: I feel guilty voting against number two. I've lived there all my life. And I see them drive through water and so forth. And I feel we can't do anything for you, and if it's going to cost me anything we're not doing anything with the water, but if they want to do something with the water and pay for it, I think now's the time to do it. Not five years from now. One or two, whatever. If I was twenty-five, buying a home out there, I'd vote for four. It would be beautiful. I'd love to see Green Acres with curb, gutter, sidewalk. I like it out there.

Utke: I got one thing. Jim brought up a question. How many people do we have here that live in area two?

*Two people held up their hands. Mark and Beth Waller.*

Carroll: I think we could do a head count on that. Contact the individual property owners of two. Maybe that would be a follow up to the meeting tonight, to contact each individual property owner in two, just to make sure, see what the consensus is for that.

Ken Mackley: Option one would be just fine.

Glenn Pryor: Option one.

Mary Lou Pryor: Option one for me also.

Meg Morris: Option one.

Citizen: He's talking about French drains, there's going to be no culvert into them, right? So what's existing is staying. If you culvert in all the way down to us, we're going to be in trouble. So you're not going to put anymore culverts in?

Olson: No.

Ken Mrnak: Where they're not existing now, they'll be non-existing later. So it would be like a culvert type dam coming down.

Olson: Except for you guys. Yes. Thank you for the clarification. Absolutely. We're going to try to get things on County Road 6 moving a little more freely in their area.

Konshok: Everybody understands what French drains are right? We use them on agricultural fields all the time. It's buried rocks. It's covered up rocks. That's what it is. It's essentially rip-rap underneath turf. There will be turf on top of it. It will drain faster.

Forbes: That's why I wanted to ask. We'll have 1,200 kids coming trick or treating and those rocks look great.

Konshok: That's why we're going to go with turf. And the water doesn't flow anywhere, it just flows down faster.

Carroll: They had one near the hospital where the old clinic was before they did that street reconstruction. It really helped a lot.

Konshok: It's the same thing farmers use to speed the drainage on their fields.

Kenny Miller: I have a question. You talked about the drainage and surveying for the drainage. You said you sent surveys out to other people too on other things obviously also. But I'm just worried about contact times. I've never been contacted. We got another piece of paper just in the door. We found it yesterday in the door. Some people got it personally handed to them. Just with discussions here, you've talked to people, obviously they're home during the day. I work during the day. I'm just wondering if you are going to go around and survey verbally. It would be nice if you try to contact everybody. Because there's sometimes there're questions they don't think about or a survey doesn't cover. I know that you stopped off at Jessica Leckner's and went through a lot of discussion with her and then we got a sheet of paper. Similar questions, but there might have been questions, I wish I would have been given an opportunity.

Olson: My number is 100% available. That's why I left the sheet out there.

Miller: Any time of the day?

Olson: Any time of the day, day or night, weekends. Give me a call. It's important to me. It's very important that I do talk with you. True statement.

Miller: The survey, I got it today because I've been gone, is dated April 12<sup>th</sup>. Is that something that we were supposed to have, did I miss something horribly bad?

Olson: I apologize for the date on those. Bill Smith was able to walk around with me on the first go around. We were able to get the northern half and that was April 12<sup>th</sup>. By the time I got back out it was yesterday. So it was incorrectly dated. I just didn't update that so I apologize.

Carroll: We've been through the list. I need a motion to close the public hearing.

**A motion was made by Utke, seconded by Tomte, and unanimously carried to close the public hearing at 7:58 p.m.**

**4.3. Resolution Ordering the Improvement and Preparation of Plans for the Green Acres Addition Storm Sewer Improvement Project in the City of Park Rapids:**

Carroll stated the Council needs to consider this resolution now that we've had the public input. **A motion was made by Utke, seconded by Tomte, to approve Resolution #2012-86 Ordering the Improvement and Preparation of Plans for the Green Acres Addition Storm Sewer Improvement Project in the City of Park Rapids.**

**Discussion:** Konshok stated as a note of explanation and clarification, what we're doing here is an addition to the original project, for the storm drainage, if we choose to do it or not, or if we choose to do the entire project or not, that's not for discussion. We're just talking about the plans at this point. The project is not officially being ordered yet. We are just trying to fully scope it out at this point and get a complete handle on what, from an engineering standpoint, what needs to be done out there.

Tomte stated the discussion is we've definitely gotten feedback from everybody, I'm hearing that most people that are affected don't want any changes with respect to the

storm sewer improvement. That is very valid input. We have only two of the fourteen parcel owners that are affected here. Utke stated to go and visit with them we need plans to talk intelligently to them. It completes that process.

**The vote was called. The motion carried unanimously.**

**Further Discussion:** Bob White questioned are you planning on fixing so the water goes to County Road 6 from the east property this year, or not? It would only take a backhoe and a half a day. Konshok questioned are you talking about the blocked culverts on County 6? White answered no. I'm referring about when they ran the water and sewer to the bank, they filled that ditch up. That's why they got the water problems. It was not existing before. Carroll questioned you're talking about inside Discovery Circle? White stated inside where these folks live. When they ran the water and sewer to the bank they shifted the road over to the south, took their ditch away, the water can't go to County Road 6, plus Bade's culvert is open facing to the northeast and it's completely plugged on the southwest corner. You can't get water through that culvert, even if you open up the ditch. If I had a backhoe I could get it done in two hours. Carroll stated we're aware of that now, thank you.

## **5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

**5.1. Local Board of Appeal & Equalization Minutes-April 17, 2012:** A motion was made by Mikesh, seconded by Utke, and unanimously carried to approve the April 17<sup>th</sup>, 2012 Local Board of Appeal & Equalization Meeting minutes as presented.

**5.2. Local Board of Appeal & Equalization Minutes-April 24, 2012:** A motion was made by Utke, seconded by Mikesh, and unanimously carried to approve the April 24<sup>th</sup>, 2012 Local Board of Appeal & Equalization Meeting minutes as presented.

**5.3. City Council Regular Meeting Minutes-April 24, 2012:** Utke questioned on page 27, didn't Konshok make the motion and I seconded it so that we could have discussion. Konshok stated I don't remember. Brumbaugh stated Utke made the motion, because later on Carroll tried to change to motion and had to defer to Utke. **A motion was made by Utke, seconded by Konshok, and unanimously carried to approve the April 24<sup>th</sup>, 2012 City Council Regular Meeting minutes as presented.**

**5.4. City Council Special Meeting Minutes-April 27, 2012:** A motion was made by Utke, seconded by Konshok, and unanimously carried to approve the April 27<sup>th</sup>, 2012 City Council Special Meeting minutes as presented.

**6. FINANCE:**

**6.1. Payables & Prepaids:** A motion was made by Konshok, seconded by Mikesh, and unanimously carried to approve the payables in the amount of \$61,723.94, and the prepaids in the amount of \$183,702.66, for a total of \$245,426.60.

**7. CONSENT AGENDA:** A motion was made by Tomte, seconded by Konshok, and unanimously carried to approve the following consent agenda items:

- 7.1. Resolution #2012-87 Approve Minnesota Lawful Gambling LG220 Application for Exempt Permit for Headwaters Animal Shelter.
- 7.2. Resolution #2012-88 Approve Wage Adjustment for Part Time Rapids Spirits Liquor Store Clerk Ellen Albee.
- 7.3. Accept the Proposed Terms and Conditions of Accepting Airport Improvement Program Grants from the US Department of Transportation and Authorize Appropriate City Staff to Execute the Same.
- 7.4. Resolution #2012-89 Permitting the Destruction of Aged Documents as Determined by Adopted Minnesota General Records Retention Schedule.
- 7.5. Resolution #2012-90 Joint Resolution by and between Todd Township and the City of Park Rapids Amending in Part the 2012 Fire Service Agreement.
- 7.6. Approve Payment of GO Improvement Bond Series 2008a to Northland Securities in the Amount of \$20,731.25.
- 7.7. Approve Payment of GO Refunding Improvement Bond Series 2010c to Northland Trust in the Amount of \$540,428.75.
- 7.8. Approve Payment of GO Refunding Crossover Improvement Bond Series 2005a to Northland Securities in the Amount of \$7,800.00.
- 7.9. Approve Payment of GO Improvement Bond Series 2007a to Northland Securities in the Amount of \$76,227.50.
- 7.10. Approve Payment of GO Crossover Refunding Improvement Bond Series 2009a to Northland Trust in the Amount of \$19,800.00.

- 7.11. **Approve Payment of GO Improvement Bond Series 2010b to Northland Trust in the Amount of \$71,896.88.**
- 7.12. **Approve Payment of the GO Refunding Improvement Bond Series 2009a to Northland Securities in the Amount of \$4,896.25.**
- 7.13. **Approve Payment of GO Improvement Bond Series 2010a to Northland Securities in the Amount of \$21,293.76.**
- 7.14. **Approve Payment of GO Refunding Improvement Bond Series 2009b to Northland Securities in the Amount of \$2,062.50.**
- 7.15. **Approve Payment to Ulteig Engineers for Water Treatment System in the Amount of \$\$6,308.69 and for Main Avenue Project in the amount of \$1,996.86.**
- 7.16. **Approve Pay Request to Park Rapids Chamber of Commerce for Wayside Rest Agreement for 1<sup>st</sup> Quarter 2012 to in the Amount of \$1,352.31.**

**END OF CONSENT AGENDA**

**8. COMMENTS FROM CITIZENS:** There were no comments.

**9. PLANNING:**

**9.1. First Reading of Ordinance Rezoning Land to R-B in the City of Park Rapids, PID #32.40.02500, and PID #32.44.90300:** Walker stated we have two items that pertain to the same issue, so I'll read through both issues and then we can have a discussion and vote on them. The two issues are tied together.

Walker stated the first issue is a zoning amendment. The applicants are Scott Rech and Lou Ann Rech who are the owners of the properties and are requesting to rezone two parcels, which are approximately 1.45 acres, from B-2, General Business District, and R-2, Single, Two Family, and Townhouse District, both to R-B, Residential Business Transitional District. The properties are located at 117 Third Street East and 200 Washington Avenue South and the parcels are currently the location of a vacant portion of the old middle school and an existing vacant single family home across Washington Avenue.

Walker stated they'd like to zone both the properties to R-B. The city's Comprehensive Land Use Plan designates this area for commercial and multi-family residential use. The properties are serviced by city water, sanitary sewer, and storm sewer. The properties are also located in an area that is scheduled in the Capital Improvement Plan for street, sewer, water and storm water reconstruction in 2013 with the proposed Riverside Redevelopment Project.

Walker stated they are requesting the zoning amendment in order to construct twelve new one bedroom, two bedroom, and efficiency apartment units in the existing middle school building. They are also looking at using the portion of the vacant property for parking for that as well as having the single family home remain.

Walker stated based on the existing land use and location of the parcels, multi-family and commercial use will continue to be the best and highest use for these parcels in the future. The surrounding neighborhood is in transition as commercial development continues to develop around the remaining single family homes. The comprehensive plan also encourages in-fill development. The rezoning of the parcels would not drastically change the characteristic of the neighborhood. The area surrounding is already zoned for commercial or multi-family residential use or is identified for those uses in the future.

The Planning Commission and staff recommends approval of the rezoning request to rezone two parcels with the three conditions outlined. The applicant must obtain a building permit and comply with all applicable codes, the applicant must register the new units with the rental inspection program, and all graffiti must be removed before a Certificate of Occupancy is issued.

**The City Council acknowledged the first reading of the Ordinance Rezoning Land to R-B in the City of Park Rapids, PID #32.40.02500, and PID #32.44.90300.**

**9.2. Resolution Approving Variances to Allow a 72 Foot Lot Width, to Allow 75% Impervious Surface, and to Allow a Duplex on a 10,285 Square Foot Lot in the R-B District at 200 Washington Avenue South, PID #32.40.02500:** Walker stated the applicants are Scott Rech and Lou Ann Rech. They are requesting three variances in order to split an existing parcel into two parcels in order to construct a sixteen stall parking lot on the newly created parcel for the middle school apartments, and to convert an existing structure into a duplex on the remainder of the existing parcel. They have since decided that they are not going to pursue a duplex at this time. The three variances requested are to allow a 72 foot lot width where 100 feet is required, a variance to allow 75% impervious lot coverage where a maximum of 40% is permitted in order to construct the parking lot, and a request to allow a 10,285 square foot lot where 10,500 square feet is required.

Walker stated the property is located at 200 Washington Avenue South across from the old Middle School. As noted they are requesting a zoning change with the application to R-B, Residential Business Transitional District. The comprehensive plan designates this property for multiple family residential use and it is serviced by city water, sanitary sewer, and storm sewer.

Walker stated the applicant is requesting the variances in order to construct the parking stalls to accommodate the new apartment units, and to create a lot that does not meet the required minimum lot size for the proposed north parcel. It is necessary to keep the existing house lot as conforming as possible and also to accommodate the parking lot. The applicant has had the property surveyed and has split the parcel in order to maintain a five foot side yard setback for the existing house as required in the proposed R-B District and it would also allow for an eight foot grass buffer setback around the parking area, as required by ordinance.

Walker stated the applicant has provided a parking site plan that shows nineteen parking stalls, which is three more than is required by ordinance. A utility box and power pole along the west side of the property make it impractical for another egress on the property from Washington Avenue South to allow for two way traffic. Washington Avenue South is also a one-way street along this section. The proposed site plan shows that the parking lot would be accessed off of the alley, located along the south of the property. Staff and the Planning Commission would support reducing the eight foot buffer along the west property line to five feet in order to widen the drive aisle to twenty-six feet, which would allow for ninety degree parking stalls and more space to maneuver within the parking lot. The applicant has also suggested removing the three stalls to the east, which are not required, in order to have a place to store snow in the winter, and this would also be a good location for a storm water ponding facility. Since the applicant is asking for a variance to increase the impervious surface allowed on the site from 40% to 75%, staff and the Planning Commission feels that it is reasonable to require the applicant to retain storm water on site, as required in similar projects in the past.

Walker stated staff is recommending that the applicant be required to provide a new parking site plan showing the new configuration of the required sixteen parking stalls, which includes a storm water mitigation and drainage plan. The parking lot must be paved with an approved impervious surface and striped to city standards. The new parking plan must also be approved by the city engineer before construction. Security lighting will also need to be placed on the property with the new parking lot along Washington Avenue South for safety. As they will be accessing a dark alleyway to get over to the new proposed apartments. There is also a 728 square foot garage on the parcel, which they intend to keep for storage. A parking lot needs to be buffered and screened by perimeter landscaping consisting of an area of an eight foot grass buffer. They also need to have it landscaped. I visited the site. They had significant trees that have been credited towards landscaping per the policy. They have also shown two ornamental trees that will be planted in order to meet the landscape requirement. There is also questions about screening to residents to the east. They will be required to provide screening that would be enough for twelve months. There's currently a lilac bush but that's only there for half of the year. So they would be required to complete that screening.

Walker stated the third variance request is to allow a 10,285 square foot lot where 10,500 square feet is required. The applicant had originally proposed to convert the existing single family home into a duplex, which would be a permitted use. They have since said that they are not going to be converting the structure at this time. The lot size variance is still required, as the minimum lot size requirement is still 10,500 for a single family home. If they'd like to convert to a duplex in the future, they would need to secure a building permit and would be required to meet all other site requirements including, parking and landscaping requirements. A lot split would need to be approved by the city staff and recorded with Hubbard County within sixty days of City Council approval.

Walker stated the Planning Commission found affirmative on all five of the requirements on the finding of facts as required for approval of a variance. With that, staff and the Planning Commission recommend approval of the variance with the seven conditions outlined in the staff report. It was also mentioned by the public works staff that there's clay tile in the alley. So we would recommend that they do not pave over the top of that at this time. You can condition that if you choose to.

Carroll questioned if they're not going to pave it are you suggesting that they gravel it? Walker stated there is already a paved section there. They suggested re-grading and paving that. I think at this time we suggested they wouldn't do anything. Carroll questioned it would be part of the 2013 project? Walker answered right.

Carroll stated this is redevelopment of the old Middle School site and another lot. Tomte questioned is the house staying or going? Walker answered staying.

**A motion was made by Utke, seconded by Mikesh, and unanimously carried to approve Resolution #2012-91 Approving Variances to Allow a 72 Foot Lot Width, to Allow 75% Impervious Surface, and to Allow a Duplex on a 10,285 Square Foot Lot in the R-B District, at 200 Washington Avenue South, PID #32.40.02500.**

**9.3. Resolution Authorizing Proper City Officials to Execute a Lot Exchange by and between Peter W. Meyers and the City of Park Rapids:** Walker stated this was brought to both the Planning Commission and the Finance Committee. Pete Meyers, who lives at 905 South Street, approached city staff a few months ago about the prospect of a lot exchange for property owned by Mr. Meyers and city owned property.

Walker stated the lots are similar in size and value, but Mr. Meyers' lot is lower in elevation than the city owned lot. The city engineer and public works director have both agreed that Mr. Meyer's lot would be more conducive for storm water purposes than the city owned lot. Mr. Meyers has also offered the city the option to buy lot six, block three, which has frontage along Pine Street. The Finance Committee did not recommend that purchase at this time, but may consider it in the future for storm water purposes.

Walker stated a public hearing is not required for the city to enter into a land exchange agreement, but the Planning Commission is required to review the proposed transaction and make findings as to the compliance with the comprehensive plan, or require the City Council to dispense of this requirement if it finds that the proposed transaction has no relationship with the comprehensive plan. The Planning Commission did not make any findings that stated that. With that, the Planning Commission has recommended approval for the request from Pete Meyers to exchange with us, with the one condition that Mr. Meyers will be responsible for drafting the legal agreements and bearing all costs to prepare the documents, as well as recording and any other additional fees.

**A motion was made by Konshok, seconded by Tomte, and unanimously carried to approve Resolution #2012-92 Authorizing Proper City Officials to Execute a Lot Exchange by and between Peter W. Meyers and the City of Park Rapids.**

## **10. GENERAL BUSINESS:**

**10.1. Resolution Authorizing Proper City Officials to Execute the Paperwork Associated with the Farm Leases for the City of Park Rapids-tabled April 10, 2012:** Carroll stated we have a letter from Becker Farms. We have the bid proposal from Gregg Malm, which was the highest bidder. We did not approve it at the time because we had some concerns and now Beckers have removed their offer from the bid package. Utke stated Luke Stuewe wanted to address us, and he hasn't followed through with that either because of that happening. Carroll stated I think we can go ahead and vote on it

tonight. **A motion was made by Utke, seconded by Mikesh, and unanimously carried to approve Resolution #2012-93 Authorizing Proper City Officials to Execute the Paperwork Associated with the Farm Leases for the City of Park Rapids.**

**10.2. Resolutions Appointing Two Part Time Rapids Spirits Liquor Store Clerks for the City of Park Rapids:** Scott Olson stated I'm filling one position that we advertised for, and then we have another resignation that we need to fill. Keith Bunnell would be starting on May 10<sup>th</sup>, 2012, and Cynthia McGrath would start on May 11<sup>th</sup>, 2012.

**A motion was made by Mikesh, seconded by Konshok, and unanimously carried to approve Resolution #2012-94 Appointing Keith Bunnell as Part Time Rapids Spirits Liquor Store Clerk for the City of Park Rapids (and),**

**A motion was made by Tomte, seconded by Mikesh, and unanimously carried to approve Resolution #2012-95 Appointing Cynthia McGrath as Part Time Rapids Spirits Liquor Store Clerk for the City of Park Rapids.**

**11. CITY ADMINISTRATOR UPDATE:** The administrator was not present.

**12. DEPARTMENT HEAD UPDATES:** Scott Olson stated on Thursday morning the beer coolers will be reset, which is the last of our spring cleaning projects.

Walker stated I'm heading to the governor's opener this weekend. Hopefully I can come back with some good news. The DNR has given us back the Red Bridge design. We'll need to set a date to have an open house to inform the public so they can ask questions on the project. We gave away a lot of trees on Friday. There are still a few remaining, but we got rid of most of them. We appreciated all of the cooperation from the Rotary Club. It was a good project.

Dean Christofferson stated we are sealing Main Avenue. They got the first block done in one day. They should have the 300 block sealed tomorrow. It's going faster than we expected. We're working on getting the irrigators up and running. Burlingame should be back on Thursday.

Jon Olson questioned if he could get clarification on getting plans and specifications ready for all four options for the Green Acres Storm Sewer Project. Carroll stated doing all four would be overkill. Utke questioned what about two and three. Olson stated the challenge with three is we do have land acquisition with that. If we pursue that we'd have to begin discussions with the property owner. I have talked to him a few times, and he's open. However, if we do go into design, we have to have an idea what he's thinking. From my prospective option two would be in the city's best interest. It would take the pressure off of Timbers. That's the option I would be most in favor of. Carroll questioned would you be able to poll those fourteen property owners and get an up or down? Olson answered yes. I can work with them. Another thing we can discuss is opportunities to vary from the assessment policy. It's something to consider.

**13. MINUTES/REPORTS/INFORMATION:** There were no comments.

**14. COMMENTS FROM COUNCIL:** Konshok stated I'll be coming back from Canada so I hope I'll be here for the next Council meeting.

Tomte stated I will not be here for the next meeting, and either of the meetings in June and July.

Carroll stated I attended the Black Swan ribbon cutting ceremony. That is a great business for our community. I was asked to attend the eighth grade social class. They have been working on our website. The seventh graders have done a 3D castle project, which I visited.

Utke questioned what was up with that sink hole on Highway 71? Christofferson stated it was storm sewer collapsing in the middle. It was the state's responsibility, and they patched it from the top. They cut a hole and put in a concrete patch, and then re-patched the tar.

**15. ADJOURNMENT:** A motion was made by Utke, seconded by Mikesh, and unanimously carried to adjourn the meeting at 8:35 p.m.

[seal]

---

Mayor Nancy J. Carroll

ATTEST:

---

Margie M. Vik  
City Clerk