

**CITY OF PARK RAPIDS
CITY COUNCIL MEETING
JULY 23, 2013, 6:00 PM
Park Rapids Public Library-Lower Level
Park Rapids, Minnesota**

1. CALL TO ORDER: The July 23rd, 2013 Regular Meeting of the Park Rapids City Council was called to order at 6:00 p.m. by Mayor Pat Mikesh, and everyone present recited the Pledge of Allegiance.

2. ROLL CALL: Present: Mayor Pat Mikesh, Councilmembers Dave Konshok, Rod Nordberg, Erika Randall, and Paul Utke. Absent: None. Staff Present: Administrator John McKinney, Planner Dan Walker, Liquor Store Manager Scott Olson, Public Works Superintendent Scott Burlingame, Police Chief Terry Eilers, and Clerk Margie Vik. Others Present: Ulteig Engineer Brian Hiles, Building Inspector Ron Dick, Roger Walker, Dick Rutherford, and Anna Erickson from the Enterprise.

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA: A motion was made by Nordberg, seconded by Randall, and unanimously carried to approve the agenda with the following addition:

Consent Agenda: #7.15. Resolution Authorizing Advertisement for Bids, Interviews, and Selection for Cleaning Services for the City of Park Rapids.

4. EMPLOYEE RECOGNITION:

4.1. Thomas Haag-Fifteen Years of Employment: Mayor Mikesh presented Thomas Haag's employment certificate to Police Chief Terry Eilers.

5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

5.1. City Council Regular Meeting Minutes-July 9, 2013: A motion was made by Utke, seconded by Randall, and unanimously carried to approve the July 9th, 2013 Regular Meeting minutes as presented.

6. FINANCE:

6.1. Payables & Prepaids: A motion was made by Konshok, seconded by Nordberg, and unanimously carried to approve the payables in the amount of \$28,387.52, and the prepaids in the amount of \$82,578.33, for a total of \$110,965.85.

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

- 7.1. Approve Outdoor Dance Permit for the American Legion, at 900 First Street East, on Friday, August 9th, 2013 from 8:00 p.m. to 12:30 a.m.
- 7.2. Resolution #2013-115 Approve Minnesota Lawful Gambling LG220 Application for Exempt Permit for Antique Tractor & Engine Club Inc. (for October 25, 2013).
- 7.3. Approve Advertising and Interviewing for a Part Time Liquor Store Clerk.
- 7.4. Approve Pay Request in the Amount of \$4,663.42 for Ulteig Engineers for Professional Services Pertaining to the Well and Water Treatment Facility Project.
- 7.5. Approve Pay Request in the Amount of \$21,771.69 for TKDA for Professional Services Pertaining to the Runway Design Part II.
- 7.6. Authorize Staff to Obtain Two (2) or More Bids/Quotes for the Repairs of City Parking Lots and Alleys.
- 7.7. Approve the Purchase of Lights in the Amount of \$1,751.89 from Genesis Lamps for the Airport Runway Project.
- 7.8. Approve Hiring Walsh Logging Company, for the Bid of \$4,134.00, to Cut Down Trees on Airport Land, in Preparation of the Airport Runway Project.
- 7.9. Approve the Purchase of Hoses in the Amount of \$2,625.12, plus any applicable tax, from Heiman Fire Equipment, for the Park Rapids Fire Department.
- 7.10. Resolution #2013-116 Approve Minnesota Lawful Gambling LG220 Application for Exempt Permit for Antique Tractor & Engine Club Inc. (for August 3, 2014).
- 7.11. Resolution #2013-117 Accepting Donations for the City of Park Rapids.
- 7.12. Resolution #2013-118 Authorization to Execute State of Minnesota Department of Commerce Amendment No. 5 Contract 26402/CFMS B47248 for the City of Park Rapids.

- 7.13. **Approve Backhoe Operator's License to Work in the City of Park Rapids in 2013 for Eric's Excavating Inc.**
- 7.14. **Approve Johnson Jet-line Televising the Utilities on Riverside in Preparation of the Riverside I Project scheduled for 2014, per the CIP.**
- 7.15. **Resolution #2013-119 Authorizing Advertisement for Bids, Interviews, and Selection for Cleaning Services for the City of Park Rapids.**

END OF CONSENT AGENDA

8. COMMENTS FROM CITIZENS: There were no comments.

9. PLANNING:

9.1. Resolution for a Conditional Use Permit to Allow Outdoor Sales and Renewal of Conditional Use Permit for an Existing Twenty Unit Storage Facility in the B-1 Zoning District at 807 First Street West, PID #32.23.00500, and PID #32.23.01000:

Walker stated this request for a conditional use permit (CUP) is to allow outdoors sales of combines, ATV's, boats, trailers, RV's, etc. and a renewal of a CUP for an existing twenty unit storage facility, at 807 First Street West. The applicant is Jeremy Jennen of Hodge Podge LLC. There are two parcels consisting of 6.27 acres. The property is currently the location of the Hodge Podge Thrift Store, and the previous location of the John Deere dealership, which was an existing non-conforming use. The property is currently zoned B-1, Highway Business District and the city's Comprehensive Land Use Plan designates this property for commercial use. This type of request is listed as a conditional use in the B-1 District.

Walker stated the applicant would like to add outdoor display and sales to the existing retail business. The applicant has stated there will be sales of combines, ATV's, boats, trailers, and RV's during the summer months and they intend to shrink wrap and store boats and pontoons in the winter months. There are also twenty storage units on the site, which were approved by CUP in 2004 that the applicant would like to continue to use.

Walker stated there were two conditions added to the application at the Planning Commission meeting. The first was the applicant must keep all outdoor storage in a neat and attractive manner, per the site plan. The second was that the display and storage of boats, etc., would be permitted on bituminous, gravel, class V, or on grassy area, which was included in the site plan. They also added a stipulation to that that any display or storage on grass must be moved to allow mowing for upkeep of the site, and the site must be kept free of all long grass, noxious and virulent weeds, as outlined in the ordinance. All automobiles and vehicles for sale must be parked on either asphalt or concrete or within

the storage garage, per ordinance. Any expansion of the display area in the future will be required to meet all applicable standards.

Walker stated staff has visited the site and determined that there is adequate vehicle parking on the site to accommodate the outdoor display area and parking for the retail business, so no additional parking is required. There are also enough trees on the site to satisfy the requirements of the landscape ordinance knowing that if they want to remove any of the trees on the site they would need to work with the city on approval so that they have the required amount of screening on the site.

Walker stated the Planning Commission and staff are recommending approval with the two conditions as outlined in the staff report.

A motion was made by Utke, seconded by Konshok, to approve Resolution #2013-120 Approve a Conditional Use Permit to Allow Outdoor Sales, and Renewal of Conditional Use Permit for an Existing Twenty Unit Storage Facility, in the B-1 Zoning District, at 807 First Street West, PID #32.23.00500, and PID #32.23.01000.

Discussion: Nordberg questioned is the business open in the winter, or is it just the storage? Roger Walker stated I also do custom interior upholstery. We want to see how it goes up to December. If we can't afford to heat the place, then we'll just lock it up. But we do want to try to go through winter. Nordberg questioned you do your upholstery business in the winter? Walker stated right, and then shrink wrapping and storage facilities.

Mikesh questioned is the building hooked up to utilities out there? Walker stated everything is hooked up.

The vote was called. The motion carried unanimously.

9.2. Resolution Approving the Parks Donation Program, a Policy for the City of Park Rapids: Walker stated staff has been working with the Parks and Beautification Board over the past few months on a Parks Donation Program Policy, which will create a guideline and standard for park amenity donations, and also a level of recognition for park donors. The policy will set a standard style for donated benches and picnic tables and a standard donation amount that will cover the complete cost of the purchase, installation, memorial plaque, and future maintenance costs. That was done intentionally because if we're getting a donated item, we're accepting the full amount of the donated item, including the feature, and also the cost to install it by our staff and the maintenance costs. The styles will be chosen by the Parks and Beautification Board and updated on a regular basis depending on specific park needs and included as an appendix in the policy. It's not included at this time. The Parks Board is still working on the details of those amenities. Those will be added at a later date and will be specific to each park. The policy also sets a standard amount required for other amenities, which is based on the same dollar amount of the bench and picnic table donations. The policy will help guide the Park Board on decision making for future park improvements and also be used as a tool to solicit donations in the future. The policy ensures that any donated feature meets a true need of the park system, is consistent with the Parks Plan, and does not create any future maintenance or financial burden on the city.

Walker stated the policy is meant to be a fluid document and the Parks and Beautification Board will recommend any updates or changes as needed. The policy also

allows any final decisions to be made by the Parks Board and City Council. The policy was reviewed by city staff and no additional comments were made. The Parks Board recommended approval of this at their July meeting.

A motion was made by Konshok, seconded by Nordberg, to approve Resolution #2013-121 Approving the Parks Donation Program, a Policy for the City of Park Rapids.

Discussion: Konshok stated kudos to Dan Walker. He spent a lot of time working on this by researching it thoroughly. The Park Board put a lot of thought into this. I think it's a good document. The idea is when we improve our parks, rather than doing it on an adhoc basis we have a plan and an approach now. We particularly focused on smaller items that tend to be good for donations but also if we can get folks to donate benches then we can save city dollars for larger projects. It's a win-win for everybody.

Nordberg stated I appreciate the work that was done. It's an opportunity to solicit things. It's built right in. Also, you considered life cycle, because that's a concern of how long do you have to keep a plaque on it or maintain it.

Walker stated on behalf of the Park Board, they really worked hard to come up with something. I appreciate their work too.

The vote was called. The motion carried unanimously.

9.3. Red Bridge Relocation Ideas: Walker stated staff held a public open house at the Red Bridge Inn on Tuesday, July 16th, 2013, to discuss possible relocation ideas for the old Red Bridge, which is scheduled for replacement in the Fall of 2013. We had approximately twenty-five to thirty people attend the event and comments were heard both for and against the relocation of the bridge. The public was encouraged to write down comments for Council consideration, but only three individual's comments are included in this report. Many of the written comments received did not address suggestions for the possibility of the bridge relocation. Many of the people that were there were in support of the relocation of the bridge into the Red Bridge Park. A location was staked out and agreed upon by those in attendance. The location would be parallel to the new trail, and would be visible from Highway 34. If the Council wishes to proceed with the relocation, I will work on the details for it. The cost of the relocation will be covered as part of the DNR project, but the city will be responsible for any site work that may be necessary to secure the bridge. There is no recommendation.

Mikesh questioned as far as securing the bridge, are they looking for forms and everything? Brian Hiles stated it depends on if and how the bridge comes out and how the ends look. I'm thinking a concrete pad at both ends and a tie-in to that pad to hold it in place and to stabilize it. We have to see what shape it's in to know if we should leave it open to traffic walking over the top of it or if we have to close off the ends so it's a fixture instead of a useable fixture. A lot of it is up in the air until the bridge is actually pulled off and set down so we can take a look at it and see.

Utke stated it almost needs to be useable so people can walk over it or not put it in. You can block off the ends but they're still going to crawl on it. If it's not safe to walk over, it's not safe to sit there. Hiles stated if it's not safe to walk over, it probably won't even

make it over there. Burlingame stated that's why this new bridge came about, because the old bridge needs some significant work to be saved. We have to wait and see.

Dick Rutherford stated I think you should think about the burden that you are going to be putting on the people later on. Somebody is going to have to pay the insurance, maintenance and upkeep on this. This is not just a two year deal. This is a long term thing. If it's not good enough now, why waste our money. We don't need to spend our money on that. This is foolish. What's going to make it safer when they move it? Randall stated you won't be falling into the river for one thing.

Mikesh stated I do agree a little with Rutherford. But we have to see what happens when they lift it. If it's maybe just a little piece going in there somewhere. Walker stated staff doesn't have a recommendation on what to do with it. Obviously there is going to be some long term maintenance, but there is a sentimental value to the community to try to preserve it in some state.

McKinney questioned how long do we have to do something to prepare for it if we decide to keep it when they lift it up? Would you do a temporary location and then move it again? Hiles stated we'll have the DNR set it close to where it's going to be so once you have the footings then they'll lift one end with a backhoe, set it down, then lift the other end and set it down. McKinney stated so the strategy at the moment is to do nothing until it's pulled out. Hiles stated once it's out we can really take a look at it. If it ends up that we really can't do anything with the ends, then maybe we have to cut a twelve foot section out of it and it just sits on the ground. The DNR will be responsible for pulling it out. Walker stated that expectation was made clear to everyone that if it doesn't make it, it doesn't make it.

McKinney stated unless the Council doesn't want any part of it under any circumstances it will be left as to be determined. Is that status fine with the Council? If you know that you're not going to spend any money and you don't care if it stays, then we'll move on. But we can wait for all of the other scenarios and then we'll see. Utke stated if it's sitting there then we have to move it out, haul it away, and dispose of it. But at the time it's pulled out, then it would be part of the project. Hiles stated that would be part of the DNR's project. Utke stated as nice as the drawings are of the new one, I think the attachment to the old one will probably go away for a lot of people once they see the new bridge. Then we'll have an old wooden bridge sitting in the middle of the grass and be wondering what to do with it. Randall stated I think it's very sentimental. I like the idea that if it comes out nice and you can still see it from the road, that's a good idea. If it comes out and it can't be used then there's a little cost incurred to haul it away.

Burlingame questioned you'll be able to see it through the willow trees? Nordberg stated the trees are old and decaying. They're almost falling down now. They did a really good presentation to the public. I appreciate that. I was surprised at the number of people that did show up. For not keeping all of it, the footprint that they marked out of sixty feet, is a big footprint. It takes up a lot of that park. It would be nice not to have that much used up. I'd like whatever's salvageable, maybe twelve feet, but not sixty feet.

Rutherford stated if you just took the railing and put it in Pioneer Park, on the wall there, or on top of the rocks, so that people could see it, what would be wrong with that? Konshok stated it loses all of the context if you do that. Rutherford stated ask Nordberg where the original Red Bridge is. Konshok stated we went through all of that.

Konshok stated the safety issues regarding the bridge, it has nothing to do with the Red Bridge. It has to do with the train bridge according to the state. They want that out because of the safety concerns. The pilings are rotted through. This bridge for what it does, it's actually in pretty good shape. It's being taken out to make room for a larger bridge to replace the trail bridge. When we talk about whether or not it's going to move, the concern is that it was built in place, a compression bridge. We're going to yank it opposite to the design of it. Nobody knows when you lift it, if it's going to come out in one piece or not. Setting it off to the side in the park, one of my concerns is that I do want to clean up our parks. We still have a couple of outhouses in Deane Park that we need to get rid of. We've done a very good job over the twenty years of getting rid of stuff in our parks and our town.

Konshok stated this is a chance to preserve a highly iconic, important structure in town. I think it's worth it to try this. If it doesn't work, by all means, frankly it's an old wooden bridge, it's not going to take that much work to take it out of there. I think it's going to be a great photograph location. It provides a good feature. The liability is a concern, but we've got liabilities all over the city. This one is definitely worth a shot. It's going to be a good feature for the park. The comments that we heard were pretty positive on it. The Park Board has done a good job of going out and garnering public comment. Through this process the number one comment is what are you going to do with the Red Bridge. To say it's just an old piece of wood that we may as well get rid of is a big understatement. It would be a mistake on our part to just cast it off at this point without at least trying this. I think it's a good idea.

Mikesh questioned do we need the whole thing? Konshok stated in my mind you either take the whole thing or you don't. We have to recognize that there's going to be a lot of try and see with this. There's no sense ordering engineer plans because we have to see how it goes. Walker stated the DNR has a line item in their project, move it or scrap it.

McKinney stated we're not requesting action. We just want you to understand that there isn't going to be any action until we find out more. Konshok stated two reasons why we're keeping it at Red Bridge Park, the first one, that's where it makes sense. Two, the DNR has agreed that as long as it's placed anywhere in the park they are picking up the tab for moving it. That's a strong incentive. If we start moving it across town, even in parts, we'll be incurring more costs and losing that attachment to the park.

Nordberg questioned I wonder how many of us still knew that the old foot bridge is still in existence. That was informational and surprising. I discussed that with a few people who have seen it, and they said it looks pretty strange.

9.4. Building Official's Mid-Year Report for 2013: Ron Dick, the building inspector, stated my report was included in your packet. It's been a good year compared to the last two years. The number of permits is down a little, yet the value is going up, so it's making the report look pretty good. There are a couple of projects that will start this year that are of good size. We have the normal re-roofs and re-siding.

Konshok questioned a lot of the re-roofing was from last year's storm damage. Dick stated I believe that's true. It's normal to have some re-roofing permits in any city.

Dick stated there's been some talk about people in the extraterritorial areas with mobile homes. We've had a few people come in and want to do additions onto their mobile homes. There's an issue with that generally. Mobile and manufactured homes come with a

certification that is attached to them when they're built in the factory. As a building official we can't go in there and do an inspection on it because it's already been inspected. We can inspect footings, foundation, and a deck. When somebody wants to add onto a mobile home there may be a certain amount of responsibility for the building official and the city if we do allow them to do that. We really need to have some standards set with the people that want to add on that they can review and sign prior to even considering issuing a building permit. Because adding onto a mobile home, they could be damaged so far as any weight bearing. We've been talking about that and we look forward to coming up with some suggestions for the Council at some point in the future. There are other things in the extraterritorial areas from time to time that we come across. When it happens we address it at that time.

Konshok stated the comment we heard was you can't even replace a window. What are they referring to? Dick stated that's not true. I talked to the building officials in Fargo. They won't even issue a permit on remodeling a mobile home in North Dakota. It's personal property. They say do what you want. We couldn't inspect it to start with, we're not going to inspect it now. In Minnesota it's considered personal property if you are renting the ground that you have your mobile home on, or if you're renting a mobile home. If you own the mobile home and you own the ground it's on then it's considered real estate. So there's a little different slant to take into account there. This is why we have to tread carefully. If someone wants to replace windows, let them replace windows. That's what I would say. But if they're going to do an addition, that's where it would make sense to get involved simply for the safety aspect of it. But being a little concerned that we don't take on responsibility that we don't want to without covering ourselves, making sure the owners understand that this could be an issue for your mobile home and that a mobile home could lose its warranty, especially for a newer one. I don't know how long those warranties last. If someone had a ten year old mobile home with a twenty year warranty and they added on to it, the warranty might be void if anything happens to it. That's my concern.

Randall questioned are you saying if they want to replace windows, just let them go ahead and do it, or go through the permit process? Dick stated at this point in time, I'd say if somebody has some bad windows let them go ahead and do it until we come up with some standards. McKinney stated the argument that was made a few weeks ago was that the mobile home owner is stymied from doing anything, even maintenance. That's not your view? Dick answered I don't think so. If it was in town, and it was a mobile home, it really wouldn't make any difference, unless you have a standard for that. You shouldn't be looking at it any different than if there are some in town, which there are a few, versus in extraterritorial areas. McKinney stated let's talk about the extraterritorial areas. Dick stated I don't see personally why they couldn't go ahead and do that. At this point in time we don't have a standard by which to address those things. So it's only fair that they can go ahead and do something like that unless we have standards, in my opinion. McKinney questioned and we're going to talk about that? Dick answered yes.

Walker stated it should be clear that the city does not ban mobile homes. We have a minimum size standard for single family dwellings, which mobile homes don't meet. Double-wides do meet that standard. An eight-hundred square foot minimum floor area and a twenty foot width minimum is required.

Utke questioned so when we had the people here complaining that they couldn't do maintenance and couldn't get a permit it was because they weren't meeting this minimum

size requirement? Walker stated I didn't receive any requests to do any maintenance or window repairs. The requests that we received were to do the additions.

Utke stated they sat in the audience and said we aren't allowed to do that, yet we don't have anything to back that up with. Dick stated unless there was something in the county or township for an extraterritorial area. McKinney stated the whole thing was presented on the basis of the reason that they didn't want to continue the annexation agreement, because they would be giving up the ability to do that and already in fact been prohibited because they were in this extraterritorial area. That was their argument, the validity of it is a little different.

Walker stated even from a zoning perspective if you have a non-conformity, maintenance is allowed. You're just not allowed to expand it. McKinney questioned so we treat them as a non-conformity? Walker answered correct. Mikesch questioned that would stop them from pulling an old one out and putting a new one in there? Walker answered correct. Nordberg questioned even with a variance? Can you go through a variance process for the annexation areas? Walker stated obviously we could grant a variance to allow that. We're not disallowing the use, it just doesn't meet the size requirement.

McKinney stated one of the arguments was that someone wanted to upgrade their unit. It was a whole new unit. Utke stated when it gets ratty enough they're not allowed to upgrade. McKinney stated it was probably more than windows. Randall stated there were some people that were implying that they couldn't make repairs, and that they were prevented from doing that. Dick stated I haven't received any calls on that particular issue. The only issue I had was where they wanted to add on one or two bedrooms. I contacted the party and then I contacted the local contractor. I asked him what he knew about adding on regarding septic systems. He said he actually put the septic system in on that home and that if they added two new bedrooms they'd have to put in a whole new septic system. I wrote an internal report on it.

McKinney stated we are in discussions with the township people about a lot of things and we'll look into this a little further. It sounds like there's some misinformation and misunderstanding. Nordberg questioned is there any normal communication between you and the township which claims it has zoning rules or the county which has some inspection requirements? Dick stated I have not addressed that up until this time. I could do that. The township would be the one to find out what they have had in the past and if that's causing part of this problem. We could discuss it with them and address it so that when a homeowner comes in we could have a handout at least.

Nordberg stated their claim was they could have zoning overlays that replaced our annexation policies and do without us. The question is what would be required and what would be inspected? Dick stated if the township took over, my understanding is that they would not have to do any inspections. They don't have enough population, but that anything that's done there, small towns that haven't adopted the building code, really have adopted it by being in the state, it's just that if there's no building official, there's no one to check it and a lot of stuff goes by the wayside.

Walker stated the township does have permits and the only reason they do the permit is to file it with the county for tax purposes. They don't do any inspections. Nordberg questioned the county has some authority over plumbing, sewers, and septic systems? Dick stated they would have that. There are probably no inspections for in the house plumbing. We do that here in town. The state inspectors only do state buildings. For

electrical, if there's an electrician involved, they will typically contact the state electrical inspector for the area. So if that doesn't get done it's because the electrician is skirting the issue or a homeowner that does his own electrical, which he's not supposed to do. We'll get a report and study done in a couple months or so.

Konshok stated it sounds like its just miscommunication. Also, the thing is understanding the difference, a permit is a permit, except the permit in the township is just registering that you've done work on it. A permit inside the city limits includes inspection and it has to meet code. That's the big aha moment for everyone what the difference is between those two. Dick stated we need to make it plain to the people in the township, including the board, the fact that they don't have inspections doesn't mean that it shouldn't be done according to state code. Konshok stated all of the codes we're following are state codes. We're not applying any city codes on top of that. Dick stated that's correct.

10. GENERAL BUSINESS:

10.1. Resolution Awarding Bid for the 2013 Beach Road and Washington Avenue Utility Improvement Project in the City of Park Rapids: Brian Hiles stated earlier today we had the bid opening for the Beach Road and Washington Avenue Utility Improvement Project. There were three bidders on the project. We talked about this project being \$80,000.00. I went back and looked at what that included. That was just for the sewer and water. It did not include removals, restoration, surfacing. The \$80,000.00 was just for the pipe. I created a revised estimate at about \$121,000.00. The low bidder was Feldt Plumbing from Detroit Lakes at \$115,187.91. The bid was about \$6,000.00 under the estimate. The other two, Sellin Brothers and Quam, were considerably higher at \$171,206.50 and \$196,989.30. Feldt is a smaller company. This type of project is in their wheel-house. The other two are larger contractors and are pretty busy right now. You can tell that by the higher numbers. They just threw a number in and if they got it they would have made a lot of money on it. Feldt's number is good. They do quality work. They're a good company to work with. There will be some de-watering on the project. They do all their own de-watering and they're ready to come in as soon as it's available to go, as soon as we get the tree cut down. Based on that I would recommend that the Council award the bid to Feldt Plumbing from Detroit Lakes, Minnesota.

Konshok questioned do you think they missed anything? Hiles stated no I don't think so. I think the reason for the big difference is availability. I know that Sellin has a couple of big jobs starting in August. It's the same for Quam. I am hearing that Feldt needed some work.

Nordberg questioned what's the traffic control item? Hiles stated that would be street signs, road work ahead signs, and barricades. We did include some business signs for the Red Bridge Inn to help people navigate there. It also sets up the phasing on the project. Anything the contractor will use regarding signs for the project.

Nordberg stated there's such a big difference between unit prices on pipe. Mikesh questioned you have worked with this company before? Hiles answered yes. Burlingame stated I know them.

A motion was made by Nordberg, seconded by Konshok, and unanimously carried to approve Resolution #2013-122 Awarding Bid for the 2013 Beach Road and Washington Avenue Utility Improvement Project in the City of Park Rapids.

Discussion: Hiles presented three copies of the Notice of Award for signatures. He stated we can get the contract process going to get them in here as soon as possible.

Konshok questioned are we coming to an end of our competitive bids? Hiles stated part of it is that it's a small project. This time of year everyone is busy. Fargo did a bid opening last week. Their engineer's estimate was \$4.2 million. The bid came in at \$5.1 million. You're seeing high prices because companies are busy. The thinking is that come this fall and early spring, the prices will get competitive again. Pipe prices are going up. The no-lead brass rule is coming into effect January 1st, 2014. That's going to drive up the price for all the fittings. Right now a typical brass fitting has 5% lead in them. It helps make them more manageable to form them. The lead actually seals up any cracks that may form in the brass. The nation has decided to get the lead out of the fittings because it may leech into the pipes. We're seeing a 30-50% increase in price on all fittings. Anything companies may have in stock can't be used after January 1st because you can't install them anymore. There's more and more costs all the time.

11. CITY ADMINISTRATOR UPDATE: McKinney stated the airport project has started, the Trillion Contract is starting to move, and we took bids for the Beach Road Project this morning. The six inch test well was done today. We have a lot of things going. Staff is to be complimented on the things that they are putting out. The Parks Board is really starting to get a sense of some of the work that hasn't been done for a while. Walker is to be complimented for leading them in that regard. We're doing good.

12. DEPARTMENT HEAD UPDATES: Eilers stated the department will be selling cars within the next couple of weeks. There are twenty of them and they will be sold as is, no warranty.

Scott Olson stated this month might be the busiest July in recent years.

Scott Burlingame stated the well project is underway. MN DOT came through with some funding for the airport project so we're working on the paperwork. McKinney stated the effect of that is the things that were possibly not going to get done, will be funded by the state. We're going to get the full scope of the project that we had initially hoped for. Our contribution is lower than what it was projected at to begin with.

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

14. COMMENTS FROM COUNCIL: Nordberg stated on August 5th the Region 2 Arts Council is promoting a meeting to be held at the armory starting at 10:30 a.m. for arts groups and primarily as a chance to talk about the armory and who would use it if it were a public place.

Mikesh stated the Personnel Committee has been working on the union contracts. There will be more news later. McKinney stated we've agreed to the date of September 5th to start discussions.

15. ADJOURNMENT: A motion was made by Utke, seconded by Konshok, and unanimously carried to adjourn the meeting at 7:00 p.m.

[seal]

Mayor Pat Mikesh

ATTEST:

Margie M. Vik
City Clerk