

**CITY OF PARK RAPIDS
CITY COUNCIL MEETING
AUGUST 13, 2013, 6:00 PM
Park Rapids Public Library-Lower Level
Park Rapids, Minnesota**

1. CALL TO ORDER: The August 13th, 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 Rod Nordberg, Erika Randall, and Paul Utke. Councilmember Dave Konshok arrived at 6:30 p.m. Absent: None. Staff Present: Administrator John McKinney, Public Works Superintendent Scott Burlingame, Treasurer Angela Brumbaugh, Public Works Employee Chris Fieldsend, and Clerk Margie Vik. Others Present: Dick Rutherford, Dave Wilkins, and Anna Erickson from the Enterprise.

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA: A motion was made by Utke, seconded by Randall, and unanimously carried to approve the agenda with the following change: an amended resolution has been provided for Item #9.2.

4. EMPLOYEE RECOGNITION:

4.1. Tim Little-Twenty Five Years of Employment: Mayor Mikesh presented Tim Little's Twenty-Five Year Employment Certificate to Public Works Supervisor Scott Burlingame.

5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

5.1. City Council Regular Meeting Minutes-July 23, 2013: A motion was made by Nordberg, seconded by Randall, and unanimously carried to approve the July 23rd, 2013 City Council Regular Meeting minutes as presented.

6. FINANCE:

6.1. Payables & Prepays: A motion was made by Utke, seconded by Randall, and unanimously carried to approve the payables in the amount of \$64,984.16, and the prepays in the amount of \$338,354.30, for a total of \$403,338.46.

7. CONSENT AGENDA: Mikesh removed Items #7.11. and #7.22. from the consent agenda. **A motion was made by Utke, seconded by Nordberg, and unanimously carried to approve the following consent agenda items:**

- 7.1. **Resolution #2013-123 Accepting the Resignation of Housing and Redevelopment Authority of Park Rapids Member Clyde Zirkle.**
- 7.2. **Resolution #2013-124 Permitting the Destruction of Aged Documents as Determined by Adopted Minnesota General Records Retention Schedule.**
- 7.3. **Resolution #2013-125 Approving Wage Adjustment and Step Increase for Park Rapids Police Investigator Sabin Rasmus.**
- 7.4. **Resolution #2013-126 Approving Wage Adjustment and Step Increase for Park Rapids Police Officer Jeffrey Hulse.**
- 7.5. **Resolution #2013-127 Declaring Excess Property from the City of Park Rapids.**
- 7.6. **Resolution #2013-128 Approving Application for Minnesota Lawful Gambling Exempt Permit LG220 for Minnesota Deer Hunters-Park Rapids Chapter.**
- 7.7. **Approve the Expense for Repairs, Removal, and Installation of Rain Gutter for the Public Works Building, in the Amount of \$2,640.00 based on lowest bid from ABC Seamless.**
- 7.8. **Approve the Low Bid from Timber Shelters in the Amount of \$5,706.00 for the Installation of Fencing for Pioneer Park, as recommended by the Parks Board.**
- 7.9. **Approve Updated Job Description for the City Planner Position.**
- 7.10. **Approve Updated Job Description for the Public Works Superintendent.**
- 7.11. *Removed from the Consent Agenda.*
- 7.12. **Approve Pay Request in the Amount of \$52,726.68 for HRDC, RKD Construction Service, Andrew Johnston Construction, Mid-Sota Builders, Marchell Electric, and Ackerman Plumbing, for Services Associated with the Small Cities Development Program Grant.**

- 7.13. **Approve Pay Request #1 in the Amount of \$72,012.96 for Di-Mar Construction for Services Pertaining to the Water Treatment Facility.**
- 7.14. **Approve Pay Request in the Amount of \$50,134.05 for MN Public Facilities Authority for the Water Tower Loan Payment.**
- 7.15. **Approve Pay Request in the Amount of \$3,074.00 to Ulteig Engineers for Professional Services Pertaining to the Red Bridge Trailhead Project.**
- 7.16. **Approve Expense in the Amount of \$2,032.93 to Ferguson Waterworks for Repairs to the Hand Held Meter Reader.**
- 7.17. **Resolution #2013-129 Authorizing Proper City Officials to Execute the Authorization for Professional Services by and between TKDA and the City of Park Rapids.**
- 7.18. **Resolution #2013-130 Accepting the Resignation of Volunteer Firefighter Jeremiah Tinker for the City of Park Rapids.**
- 7.19. **Approval to Advertise and Interview for the Vacant Firefighter Position.**
- 7.20. **Resolution #2013-131 Accepting the Resignation of Part Time Rapids Spirits Liquor Store Clerk Fredrick Thompson.**
- 7.21. **Approve the Low Quote in the Amount of \$34,063.00 from Howard's Driveways to Repair City Parking Lots and Alleys.**
- 7.22. *Removed from the Consent Agenda.*
- 7.23. **Approval to Advertise and Interview for the Vacant Public Works Department-Street Maintenance Worker Position.**
- 7.24. **Resolution #2013-132 Accepting the Offer of the Minnesota Public Facilities Authority to Purchase a General Obligation Water Revenue Note, Series 2013, in the Original Aggregate Principal Amount of \$1,174,617; Providing for its Issuance; and Authorizing the Execution of a Project Loan Agreement for the Note and an Additional \$818,133 of Principal Forgiveness.**

END OF CONSENT AGENDA

7.11. Approve the Creation, Job Description, and Salary Schedule for the Facilities Maintenance Superintendent. (and) 7.22. Resolution Reassigning Chris Fieldsend to the Position of Facility Maintenance Superintendent for the City of Park Rapids:

Mikesh stated I have concerns regarding the pay scale. I don't know where that came from. When we talked in the Personnel Committee meetings none of this came up. It was a shock to me. How did you come up with this pay scale?

McKinney stated I don't know where it originated. It's the same scale we're using with other assigned positions within the network of schedules. It's consistent with the same schedule as the public works superintendent. This is a director position which is parallel to that position. I'm sorry if you misunderstood my presentation, but it was my intention that the position and pay schedule be equivalent to the public works superintendent.

Mikesh stated my understanding was that the position was starting out and willing to work with the first wage. McKinney stated that's a question about the particular appointment, not the schedule. If we're going to have the position be parallel to the public works superintendent then the pay schedule is the same. An individual may be anywhere on that schedule, and may fit into any one of the five slots. The question is, if we're going to have that position, what would the pay scale be? My recommendation to the Personnel Committee was that the new position be parallel to the other department, which was public works superintendent.

Mikesh questioned what about the six months? McKinney stated I don't know the history of how this schedule was developed over time, but isn't that consistent with other positions? Brumbaugh stated all the non-union positions have a six month probationary period. That is not any different for any other position. Mikesh stated it all shocked me when I saw it. Is there an evaluation after six months? McKinney stated personnel policy #5 provides for a six month probation. We didn't change the rules. With this particular appointee, because he's been a city employee for eighteen years, with union status, if he accepts the appointment, he'd have to give up the union position and the benefits that go with that. I tried to come up with a parallel compensation package so that he wouldn't lose any money to begin with, even though he's taking on more responsibility and giving up his union status. We did that shy of \$400.00. If he stayed in his same position, he'd make \$400.00 more than in this assignment for the first six months. Then he'd make that up in the next six months.

McKinney stated the two issues should be discussed together, the position and the appointment. We have done considerable evaluation of our conditions here with respect to personnel, and what has to be addressed in the near future. We have been using for our IT department, Chris Fieldsend, who holds a degree in computer science, and has been doing that for us, along with some other things that go under the repair work. The problem that has been created for us is, we only have a part time IT person, and we have a person that has an assignment in public works that isn't available 100% of the time because he's working in the street department. The purpose of this was to get this arrangement on the track it should be by having Fieldsend do the IT, parks, and the other things in the description, which frees him up. The other resolution is to advertise to hire the open slot in public works vacated by Fieldsend. Then that person would have the ability to work full time in public works. We gain a department head with all of the experience we need to do the IT, the parks, the building maintenance, and we gain a full time employee in public works, instead of Fieldsend's part time ability to work in public works. The IT person has to

be non-union. We have an employee that's been with the city for eighteen years. This is not an unknown quantity here. He's doing a lot of the work that we have in the job description on an assignment basis as opposed to taking responsibility and be held accountable basis. I think if we're going to have a first class operation here, we have to have employees that have the authority to do the work and we can hold them accountable if they don't. If we do that we have to give them the title and we have to pay them accordingly.

Mikesh stated I'm on board with the rest of it but the pay scale jumps up in a very short term. With contracts coming up, I think we need to look at that before we can do anything. I think it's pretty tough doing an evaluation on anybody in any position in six months. McKinney stated normally there would be strength in that argument, however we have somebody that's been doing most of this stuff. For example, the lighting system at the airport, it's a very complicated thing. He's been doing that and its part of his assignment. It won't be a surprise if he can do it well, it would be a surprise if he can't. It's the same thing with the IT department, he set up all of our stuff. You also have a website that needs major surgery. We can do that in part with consultants, but we still need somebody here. We've been having some difficulty with the cleaner's contract. Part of the reason we were having those problems is that there was nobody for that contractor to deal with on a regular basis when there was a problem. That's one of the functions of the position that we're creating. He also has been doing the parks and they're in pretty good shape. If we don't create the position, then it's going to continue to fall on Burlingame, and we have a lot of things that he needs to be doing at the airport and water treatment plant. I believe it's a good move. I recommend it and I recommend Chris Fieldsend for the position.

Nordberg questioned is it the six month jump that you are looking at? Mikesh stated it's committing to five years if that's exactly what we're going to give him. Randall stated that's a step for a new position. If you take a new position there's a process that you can anticipate that you'll be moving up. Cost of living increases are city-wide. McKinney stated I'm not sure what actual practices are here, I'm more familiar with the system that step increases are not automatic. They have to be approved by the Council. I don't know if that is actually the case here. Brumbaugh stated non-union employees have to come to the Council for their wage increases. Randall stated they would be based on the employee's evaluation to make sure you are doing your job. It's different than a cost of living adjustment. Utke stated we don't have many employees that fall under this.

McKinney stated it's a key position. It's going to be a team operation that's very important to our strategy. You're going to have to pay some money to get it done on a decent level. Randall stated it's important to know that he's willing to take the job at the starting wage that he's making now rather than stating that I'll do this job for \$5.00 more an hour now, which down the road is only going to cost us more money, because it's going to jump that much more. He's willing to start out where he is now, and to take on more responsibility and have more ownership of the jobs he's doing.

Mikesh stated I was just questioning the steps. To me it seems like it should be more stretched out and not getting that kind of an increase every year. That's what I was looking at. McKinney stated maybe they all should but we haven't done that yet.

Nordberg stated I recall, several years ago, it wasn't automatic and it got postponed until September. Utke stated that wasn't the steps. It was the cost of living increase.

Nordberg stated it seems like there was a compromise reached. Randall stated this ends when you get to a certain point, then you don't move much unless there's a cost of living adjustment, which typically you don't even see that. Mikesh stated this has answered my questions.

Dick Rutherford stated before when you hired supervisors you always advertised. You don't have to advertise for this position? McKinney stated no, because he is already an employee of the city. Rutherford stated he's a union employee. There's a difference. You've always advertised the positions. McKinney stated we checked with legal counsel first to verify that we did not have to advertise. I chose not to advertise because I don't know where I can find anybody that I can put in the slot that can do the job that we need done today. If he did not have that kind of background we would have to advertise.

Rutherford questioned we're trying to cut back to save money in the town, is Scott Burlingame not doing his job? Is that why we're putting another person in, or just leave it the way it is? Mikesh stated we're paying so much in overtime. Rutherford stated that wasn't brought out. That's a different subject. McKinney stated Burlingame is doing his job, but we have more job that needs to be done. Burlingame stated I can't work on computers. Randall stated with Burlingame supervising as many people as he is, he can maybe get the job done but they're not getting their reviews. He doesn't have the time to make sure everyone else is doing their job well. You need that.

Nordberg stated if you've seen the website, it's designed by the school kids. It hasn't been updated for a long time. My name is misspelled on our website. Randall stated I gave up trying to look at our city ordinances. I just look at them on the hard copy.

A motion was made by Randall, seconded by Nordberg, and unanimously carried to approve the Creation, Job Description, and Salary Schedule for the Facilities Maintenance Superintendent (and) to approve Resolution #2013-133 Reassigning Chris Fieldsend to the Position of Facility Maintenance Superintendent for the City of Park Rapids.

8. COMMENTS FROM CITIZENS: Dick Rutherford stated at the last meeting we talked about the Red Bridge. Now it comes out in the paper that they are going to move it and put it over in the park. Was there another meeting that I missed between the last Council meeting? You said you didn't know what you're going to do because you don't know what it's going to come out as. Mikesh stated we still don't know what we're going to do.

Rutherford questioned who's property is from Red Bridge to the Beach House? Mikesh stated it's the city's. Rutherford questioned does this require the same type of footings as anybody else building in the city? The city requires five-foot footings on building anything. Do you realize that two feet below that surface there is a lot of water? I'm wondering who is going to pay for this? The man from the Red Bridge Inn made the comment that he has citizens ready to pay for this. Those citizens are here today, but ten years down the road my grandchildren are still going to have to pay for this to maintain it.

Mikesh stated I think we have to worry about trying to move it before that. It was stated that they would move it one time close to the project area. Nordberg stated if it moves in one piece. McKinney stated we haven't made any decisions beyond what you've heard. Utke stated we won't know until they lift it. At that point we have to have a plan. Is

the DNR doing that whole thing, the footings? McKinney stated they aren't doing the footings.

Dave Wilkins stated I have property at 420 South Main Avenue, across the street from Bearly Used. I sold that property last October to Travis MacArthur. The water was rotted off from the main. It had no water to it at all. With the new project they brought the water up to the curb stop on the south side of the house. Since the city put the assessments on that house, I can't sell it. I finally made a deal with this guy to buy it. I had a contract for deed. He had the water connected in October 2012. He used water last winter, and then in June he told me that he cannot continue purchasing the house because he got a divorce. We got the house back. In the meantime he ran up a bill of \$840.00. When I went to put the water bill in my name after he moved out I found out about the water bill. They told me that I'm going to have to pay for that. That was between him and the city to get that water connected. I had nothing to do with it. Now, in the first part of August, I got another bill for \$945.00, with a large amount of late fees. I still haven't used any water there myself. I do have the place back. Why am I being charged for that water?

Scott Burlingame stated the water bill stays with the house. Wilkins stated he owned the property. McKinney stated on a contract for deed the title is still in your name subject to the contract. Wilkins stated the title was in his name. I changed it at the courthouse. McKinney stated what if he hadn't paid the contract off. Wilkins stated he didn't. McKinney questioned then what happened to the title of the property? Wilkins stated I had to go back and get it put in my name. I can't sell it with \$30,000.00 of assessments against it. I can hardly give it away. McKinney stated you asked how come you got the bill. I'm telling you because the bill goes to the property. You owned the property, you sold it on contract for deed, but the deed doesn't transfer over until the contract is paid for, which it never was. When he abandoned the contract, it isn't like it comes back to you, it always was in your name. I'm not justifying any fees, I'm just explaining how the title thing works. We have a title in a certain name, the water bill was originally set up with you, and then a new arrangement is made.

Wilkins questioned where did they come up with my name because if I would have been getting the bill I would not have let it go that long. I'm surprised the city let it go that long. McKinney stated I am too. Wilkins stated I pay my bills, and now I'm getting late fees. They're hundreds of dollars for the late fees.

Nordberg questioned was the \$840.00 water bill just for water usage or did that include the \$750.00 connection fee? Wilkins stated I don't know. Nordberg stated that's a lot of water. Utke stated it wouldn't have a connection fee because that was already connected. Wilkins stated he had a contractor dig into the curb stop to the house. Nordberg stated so this is all usage. Randall questioned how many years did he have it? Wilkins stated he had it from October 2012 to June 2013. Burlingame stated the Council will have to refer this to staff. Utke stated we'll refer this to staff and they'll work with you and get back to us at a future meeting.

9. GENERAL BUSINESS:

9.1. Sewer/Water Connection Fee: Mikesh stated in 2008 when we started all of this, I saw the way things were going, and how we had planned to go with it. With the times the way they are, I think the hookup fees are way too much for residential. I would like us to take another look at it. To me when you're paying for that line in front, the hookup fees seem ungodly high. In 2008 I don't think it was that bad. It was better. I think we should take the residential fees down to accommodate the times.

Utke stated I would agree. We had this discussion last fall with a few of the citizens that were here. It was probably more of a "buying" a stock into the water/sewer system versus a fee. When they're paying to get the line past their place, plus what it costs to hook up, I would agree that hopefully there's a better way. Looking at the old minutes there was reference to other communities. Maybe referring it to staff to bring us more data about what others do. We could take that and make it useable for our community.

Mikesh stated I'm just looking at residential. Utke stated I would make them all the same. Who pays the commercial but the residents? It all circles back around.

Nordberg questioned do you have something in mind that you want us to think about? Mikesh stated when we started all of this, we had it at \$30.00 a connection. That didn't even pay for the materials. Brumbaugh stated it was \$30.00 for water, \$30.00 for sewer, and \$375.00 for the wastewater fee. There was an additional fee of \$375.00 for wastewater at one time, and that got combined with the sewer, so \$405.00 for the sewer. Mikesh stated I think cutting in half what we have right now. That's what I'd like to see. We know, down the road, that we're going to have to bump up our water fees. The connection fees, if we could pull it down to \$750.00 that would be good.

Nordberg questioned do the collection of these fees go into a separate account that is tractable? Brumbaugh stated they go into the water and sewer funds, \$750.00 for each. Nordberg questioned was it supposed to pay off something or create a reserve for construction or repair? Brumbaugh answered no. I could tell you how much goes in, but it wasn't set aside for paying off any debt. Konshok stated it was to build up the enterprise funds for future expenditures and expansions. Nordberg questioned it's not a repair fund as opposed to a usage fund? McKinney stated that fund is used for repairs. That's where we get the money to run the system. It's in with all the other fees.

Nordberg stated if we don't get some money here we'll have to make it up some other way if that's all right. Mikesh stated I'm saying drop this and we know we're going to have to pick up some more with the water fees. Everybody is going to get hit there, but to keep that high hookup fee is just a hardship. Randall questioned how is that a trade off? Water fees are going to affect everybody. These hookup fees aren't going to affect everybody that are already hooked up. The majority of the city is already hooked up. They don't have this expense up coming, but everybody equally is going to be hit with new, higher water rates. Mikesh stated eventually everybody will be, yes. But when this project is in front of your house you're paying an assessment fee for pipes going in front of your place, then we say you have to hookup in three years. After a project, you have three years before you have to hook up. You have to pay that \$1,500.00, after you get assessed for \$30,000.00. That's a kick, and then another kick.

Randall questioned what projects are incurring those? Mikesh stated we have Riverside and Green Acres. Randall stated everyone in the Riverside Avenue area are

already hooked up to sewer and water. Burlingame stated you only have to pay the \$1,500.00 with new construction or in annexation areas. Konshok stated or any extension of the lines, like Discovery Circle.

McKinney stated if you're going to refer this to staff it would be helpful for us to understand under what criteria do you want us to develop a number, our costs? The problem I have with what's going on in other parts of the world is, that's the other part of the world. They may have a number that is valid for them, but doesn't apply to us. If you're going to refer it to staff lets understand what criteria you want us to use in coming back with a recommendation.

Mikesh stated we already looked at Nevis and Akeley and that's how we came up with these numbers. Is that correct? Brumbaugh stated these numbers came from when Ehlers did the water/sewer study. They did a survey over a broad area, and gave examples of if you charged this you'd see this amount of increased revenue. I have called around the area in the past just to see what they're charging.

Konshok stated the problem with that is there is a lot of science with water rates. Connection fees are like throwing darts at a dart board. It also depends on how much growth is going on in the city. Brumbaugh stated we had someone accusing the city of having high rates compared to the Iron Range. The Iron Range has a lot of utility districts. So they were low, but it wasn't the city that had them. There are a lot of variables.

Utke stated with the Discovery Circle thing it was more of an irritant. They were going to get assessed by us to put in the system, they were going to have to pay a contractor to hook up the services, and then they would have to pay \$1,500.00 on top. Randall stated that's different than the person who is building a new home that hooks up. Nordberg stated no it's the same. Randall stated a new home doesn't necessarily have those assessments against the property. Utke stated depending upon where it's at. It may be built into the price of the property. Randall stated I'm saying that the existing person gets a \$30,000.00 assessment and then you're adding salt to the wound by saying, there's your \$30,000.00 assessment plus \$1,500.00 to hookup. To me that's different than the person that's purchasing property, building a home, and \$1,500.00 is part of your building costs. They are voluntarily taking that on versus a person that's lived in a home for many, many years and then this assessment comes that makes it difficult to sell the property. That's hard to swallow for anybody that owns property that has a \$30,000.00 assessment against it.

Nordberg stated the assessments are mainly designed to pay off the construction bonds. They don't pay for the infrastructure. This is really to amortize the cost of the infrastructure that's already in place. Somebody's been paying for that infrastructure to keep it running up until now. Utke stated it's like buying stock in the system. But we're calling it a fee. Nordberg stated it gets paid for one way or another. Either by the new people or the capacity to run the pipes down there other than hardware, somebody pays for that.

Konshok stated we've been into these rates for a couple of years, and we're seeing that they are having a disincentive for people to connect, whether it's annexation or new properties. When we put those rates up there that was definitely not the intent. Our concern was to make sure we were properly planning for the future as far as having a healthy enterprise fund. It would be interesting to see when we implemented those higher rates, what's been the total increase to the enterprise fund. About the time we

implemented these we went from fifty permits a year to one. I'm not sure it's even having the effect that we wanted.

Brumbaugh distributed a printout to the Council illustrating the water/sewer connection fees collected from 2005 to 2012. From 2005 to 2008 there were a total of one-hundred and fifteen new connections. From 2009 to 2012 there were only thirty-four. Pre-2008 we were getting \$30.00 for a hookup fee. We made \$1,080.00. At the rates we have now we would have made \$27,000.00 in revenue. For the sewer portion we received \$14,580.00 and the fee for each connection was \$405.00. From 2005 to 2008 we received a total of \$3,450.00, if the new rates had applied we would have received a total of \$82,800.00. From 2009 to 2012 we received \$25,500.00 opposed to \$1,020.00. The amount of new connections has really gone down in recent years.

McKinney stated part of the problem is with the water or sewer rate, they know that they got some water or they got rid of some water and they might disagree on whether that's the right price, but they know what they got. When you're charging for a hookup fee, they know they're hooking on but they don't know why they have to pay to do it. It's not as easily understood. Clearly we ought to be able to rationalize in some fashion what we are charging them for. There are some administrative costs. It's possible we could give you a list of those kinds of costs and what they are. Then the criteria becomes, if they're buying stock in the company, that's tough for us to tell you what they ought to pay and what kind of stock certificate we give them.

Utke stated we went to office costs and costs on the job site while the project is going on, and those things are going to add up some, and those numbers would be good. That's hard costs to the city, part of that hookup and that's justifiable. McKinney stated that's what I'm talking about. If we had the criteria around which we'd establish a fee structure. It's a little easier for everyone to understand it. I'm hopeful that you will give me some sense of the criteria you want us to use when we come back with a recommendation. It actually costs more than we're giving the numbers on because it's the time that it takes. I can assure you that it's more than \$30.00. I have no idea if it's \$750.00. Utke stated when it's put together like that it's easier to justify to the person coming in that needs to hookup. We're not just saying \$1,500.00 fee split two ways. It's this is what we have invested. McKinney stated we want it to be what the traffic will bear. We should have a justification for our cost. Mikesha stated that's what I would like to see. Utke stated when you have costs there should be some margin in it like anything else because of the system.

Nordberg questioned are there any pending permit fees right now that this would affect? McKinney stated maybe the apartment house project. Nordberg questioned can they be postponed until we make a decision? McKinney stated if they don't need the permit right away. It sounds like they're going to get a deduct, not an add-on. I'm sure they'll be happy to do that. Dan Walker told me that the developer of the apartment building, when asking about the fee, was assuming that \$1,500.00 was per unit, based on his experience in other cities. He couldn't write the check fast enough. That's another thing we might take a look at, whether we're talking units.

Nordberg questioned did we ever have a distinction between residential and commercial? Konshok stated we've never been that sophisticated. Utke stated for commercial, the hookup might be easy for them but they'll consume a lot of water and contribute a lot to the sewer system, so their bills are going to be proportionate to what

they will be paying. McKinney stated usually the hookup fee is not to pay the cost of operation, but it's to pay the cost of getting there in the first place. Staff will be happy to take a look at this and come back with some thoughts and recommendations.

9.2. Resolution Appointing a Part Time Rapids Spirits Liquor Store

Clerk: Scott Olson stated I interviewed Kristy Haag, and she would be my first choice for the position. **A motion was made by Konshok, seconded by Nordberg, and unanimously carried to approve Resolution #2013-134 Appointing Kristy Haag as Part Time Rapids Spirits Liquor Store Clerk.**

10. CITY ADMINISTRATOR UPDATE: McKinney stated Chris Fieldsend is present and he is now your newest supervisor. Next week I will be out of town, and should be back by Friday or Saturday. We're going to receive bids for the cleaning contract. On September 5th, the Personnel Committee will meet with the Teamsters Union on two contracts. We have not set a date for the union employees at the liquor store. We have sent information to the department heads regarding the budget and the CIP. We're attempting to be very aggressive to get this thing put together in a timely fashion.

Utke questioned do we get the preliminary budget at the next meeting? Our preliminary has to be voted on by September 15th. We're going to have to approve it by the first meeting in September. Brumbaugh stated I will get the information from the department heads by the end of this week, and the preliminary levy has to be voted on by September 15th. We don't get our levy limits until September 1st. Whatever we approve the levy at, we just can't go higher. I tried to get it early and I was informed that the figures will be released on September 1st.

11. DEPARTMENT HEAD UPDATES: Scott Burlingame stated Di-Mar Construction is progressing with the water treatment plant. On Monday the 19th we start the Beach Road Project. We have to sit down and make some decisions regarding the airport. McKinney stated we are working with a consultant on the development of the commercial part of the airport. Burlingame stated the crosswind runway project is on hold. Konshok stated the feds haven't released the funding yet. It still has to go through the certification process.

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

13. COMMENTS FROM COUNCIL: Konshok stated I suggested, for the budget process, to look at the operational budget at the first meeting in September, and at the second meeting, on the 24th, look at the draft CIP, so that we're looking at both of those simultaneously. We got those separated last year. They are not the same but they go hand in hand often touching the same funds. Looking at both at the same times often gets confusing. McKinney questioned you'd like operational first? Konshok answered yes. Because we have to certify the levy.

Konshok stated the Park Board is going to try to have a special meeting later this month to look at their CIP recommendations, especially for 2014. A review of it is to revolve around companion projects, like benches, in Red Bridge Park to go along with the other projects going on there. They have been working hard on the CIP for all of the parks, but they're putting a priority on Red Bridge because this is the time go ahead with that. The big cottonwood was cut down in Red Bridge Park. It's been there a long time. It's sad to have to cut down a tree like that since it was still in good shape, but it's for a good cause. Burlingame stated it took ten hours to take that tree down.

Nordberg stated the report about boat inspections was interesting. Although the percentage of contamination is small when you get 1000's of boat entries, a few hundred boats can make a difference. There is still a state-wide discussion about who is responsible for dealing with it. I think our small contribution to COLA was well spent to catch these few violations. I think the evasive species do affect us as a city. McKinney stated it also helped them make presentations to other governmental bodies because we were a player. That was appreciated very much. It helped.

Nordberg stated Vik asked me to attend a meeting this afternoon of the Hubbard County Senior Council, to which Sue Tomte had been the city's representative. I went this afternoon and they were very pleasant. Their next meeting is in April of 2014.

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

[seal]

Mayor Pat Mikesh

ATTEST:

Margie M. Vik
City Clerk