

**CITY OF PARK RAPIDS  
CITY COUNCIL MEETING  
NOVEMBER 12, 2013, 6:00 PM  
Park Rapids Public Library-Lower Level  
Park Rapids, Minnesota**

**1. CALL TO ORDER:** The November 12<sup>th</sup>, 2013 Regular Meeting of the Park Rapids City Council was called to order at 6:00 p.m. by Acting Mayor Paul Utke, and everyone present recited the Pledge of Allegiance.

**2. ROLL CALL:** Present: Acting Mayor Paul Utke, Councilmembers Dave Konshok, Rod Nordberg, and Erika Randall. Absent: Mayor Pat Mikesch. Staff Present: Administrator John McKinney, Treasurer Angela Brumbaugh, Police Officer Justin Frette, Liquor Store Manager Scott Olson, Planner Dan Walker, and Clerk Margie Vik. Others Present: Ulteig Engineer Brian Hiles, Hubbard County Attorney Don Dearstyne, Cynthia Jones, Dick Rutherford, and Anna Erickson from the Enterprise.

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

An amended resolution was presented for Item #7.23.

Item 7.25. was added to the agenda: Resolution Authorizing Proper City Officials to Execute the 2013 Forestry Assistance Matching Grant by and between the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources and the City of Park Rapids.

Additional Information was presented for Item #10.1.

**4. EMPLOYEE RECOGNITION:**

**4.1. Justin Frette-Five Years of Employment:** Acting Mayor Utke presented Justin Frette with a certificate honoring his five years of employment with the city.

**5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

**5.1. City Council Workshop Minutes-October 22, 2013:** A motion was made by Nordberg, seconded by Konshok, and unanimously carried to approve the October 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2013 City Council Workshop minutes as presented.

**5.2. City Council Regular Meeting Minutes-October 22, 2013:** A motion was made by Randall, seconded by Nordberg, and unanimously carried to approve the October 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2013 City Council Regular Meeting minutes as presented.

**6. FINANCE:**

**6.1. Payables & Prepays:** A motion was made by Konshok, seconded by Randall, and unanimously carried to approve the payables in the amount of \$80,694.78, and the prepaids in the amount of \$157,967.97, for a total of \$238,662.75.

**7. CONSENT AGENDA:** Nordberg requested Brumbaugh report to the Council if there is anything unusual about the bond payments. Brumbaugh stated there's nothing unusual. They follow the amortization schedule that we have. These particular payments have the principle and interest included. We make bond payments twice a year. The other payment has only interest. **A motion was made by Nordberg, seconded by Randall, and unanimously carried to approve the following consent agenda items:**

- 7.1. **Resolution #2013-160 Accepting the Resignation of Urban Forestry Committee Member Eric Bervig.**
- 7.2. **Resolution #2013-161 Approve Wage Adjustment for Part Time Rapids Spirits Liquor Store Clerk Mark Peterson.**
- 7.3. **Resolution #2013-162 Accepting the Resignation of Rapids Spirits Part Time Liquor Store Clerk Kristy Haag.**
- 7.4. **Approve Advertisement and Interviewing to Fill Vacant Part Time Rapids Spirits Liquor Store Clerk Position.**
- 7.5. **Resolution #2013-163 Permitting the Destruction of Aged Documents as Determined by Adopted Minnesota General Records Retention Schedule.**
- 7.6. **Approve Plumber's Permit to Work in the City of Park Rapids in 2013 for Park Rapids Plumbing & Heating.**
- 7.7. **Resolution #2013-164 Accepting the Resignation of Park Rapids Library Board Member Carol Nelson.**
- 7.8. **Approve Pay Request #1 in the Amount of \$370,241.41 to Tri-City Paving for Services Pertaining to the Runway 18-36 Paving & Lighting Project.**

- 7.9. Approve Pay Request #4 in the Amount of \$186,802.33 to Di-Mar Construction for Services Pertaining to the Water Treatment Facility Project.**
- 7.10. Approve Pay Request in the Amount of \$106,395.00 to Northland Trust Services for the 2005a General Obligation Crossover Refunding Bond.**
- 7.11. Approve Pay Request in the Amount of \$233,088.75 to Northland Trust Services for the 2007 General Obligation Bond.**
- 7.12. Approve Pay Request in the Amount of \$89,723.75 to Northland Trust Services for the 2008 General Obligation Bond.**
- 7.13. Approve Pay Request in the Amount of \$291,982.50 to Northland Trust Services for the 2009a General Obligation Crossover Refunding Bond.**
- 7.14. Approve Pay Request in the Amount of \$68,821.25 to Northland Trust Services for the 2009b General Obligation Bond.**
- 7.15. Approve Pay Request in the Amount of \$46,187.50 to Northland Trust Services for the 2009c General Obligation Sewer Refunding Bond.**
- 7.16. Approve Pay Request in the Amount of \$100,493.76 to Northland Trust Services for the 2010a General Obligation Bond.**
- 7.17. Approve Pay Request in the Amount of \$260,046.88 to Northland Trust Services for the 2010b General Obligation Bond.**
- 7.18. Approve Pay Request in the Amount of \$694,178.75 to Northland Trust Services for the 2010c General Obligation Refunding Bond.**
- 7.19. Approve Pay Request in the Amount of \$3,698.00 to the League of Minnesota Cities for the September 1<sup>st</sup>, 2013 to August 31<sup>st</sup>, 2014 Membership Dues.**
- 7.20. Approve the Replacement of Equipment (One Printer) at the Park Rapids Library, as per the Repair and Replacement Policy.**
- 7.21. Authorize Staff to Enter into a Contract for Services with Headwaters Regional Development Commission, for Small Cities Development Grant Subordination Requests, with the Understanding that there will be no Additional Costs to the City.**

- 7.22. **Resolution #2013-165 Authorizing Execution of Tax Increment Revenue Note for Phase I By and Between SDG Properties II LLC and the City of Park Rapids.**
- 7.23. **Resolution #2013-166 Certifying Delinquent Utility Bills to the Hubbard County Auditor Payable in the Year 2014.**
- 7.24. **Resolution #2013-167 Authorization to Execute Minnesota Department of Transportation Grant Agreement for Airport Improvement Excluding Land Acquisition.**
- 7.25. **Resolution #2013-168 Authorizing Proper City Officials to Execute the 2013 Forestry Assistance Matching Grant by and between the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources and 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 Installation of an Additional Microwave Antenna with Ice Shield and Necessary Mounting Equipment and Cables, in the B-2 Zoning District, at 212 Second Street West, PID #32.37.06208:**

Walker stated the applicant, SMJ International on behalf of AT&T, is requesting a conditional use permit to allow installation of an additional microwave antenna with ice shields and necessary mounting equipment and cables at a height of 125 feet on the existing cell tower owned by the City of Park Rapids. That will be seven feet below the top of the tower. The request also includes the addition of a new equipment cabinet on the existing platform within the AT&T leased area. Staff is requesting that the applicant provide a new screening fence to conceal and secure the new and existing facilities located at ground level. The screening fence must meet all city requirements and the location and design must be approved by city staff prior to construction.

Walker stated we're waiting on a complete structural analysis from AT&T to determine if the tower can accommodate any additional antennas. They said that would be available before this meeting, but it isn't. We want to approve that prior to any construction to see the condition of the tower. After reviewing that analysis we may require additional analysis if there are any discrepancies. We're also in the process of working on a new lease agreement between the applicant and the city that must also be approved prior to construction.

Walker stated staff and the Planning Commission recommend approval of the conditional use permit with the following conditions: a complete structural analysis will need to be conducted and reviewed and approved by staff prior to any construction. Staff

may require additional analysis to be performed prior to construction, and a new lease agreement between the applicant and the City of Park Rapids must be approved prior to any construction.

Utke stated at the Planning Commission meeting it sounded like whoever is analyzing the tower is going to be doing that fairly soon. Did they run into a snag because it hasn't gotten done? Walker stated she said that the analysis has already gotten done. We're waiting on the report. I've seen AT&T trucks and people working around the tower over that last few weeks. Utke questioned they had to hire someone from outside to come in? Walker stated they hired a consultant or contractor to do the analysis for them. Utke questioned at this point we would be approving everything but they're going to have to supply that information to you to move it forward? Walker stated at the Planning Commission meeting we told them we would be requiring the analysis before we'd allow any construction. They wanted to proceed with the conditional use permit regardless of that analysis. If it comes back negative we'll have to discuss other options with them. Utke stated they must be pretty comfortable with it. Antennas are part of their business.

Nordberg questioned is there any chance there's interference with the other antennas that are already up there? What other companies are up there other than AT&T? McKinney stated we're in the process of evaluating all the leases on that tower. Nordberg stated at one point there was a request from Sprint for that tower. McKinney stated there's more than one on there. Nordberg questioned we don't have to get an approval from the other tenants? McKinney stated all of the license agreements are conditioned on them not interfering with other users. I don't know that there will be, but that would be a violation of their lease.

Konshok questioned is there a time deadline here for us to approve this, or can we table this until we get the structural analysis done? Walker stated one requires the other anyway. If you want to table it you're welcome to do that. Konshok stated I understand that it cleared the Planning Commission, but we're the final stop to have all the paperwork completed unless there's a time deadline. Walker stated they're not allowed to do the construction until we review the analysis anyway. If you want to table it we can certainly bring it back. Nordberg stated all we're doing here is approving it in principle, with a lot of conditions.

**A motion was made by Nordberg, seconded by Randall, to approve Resolution #2013-169 Approving a Conditional Use Permit to Allow Installation of an Additional Microwave Antenna with Ice Shield and Necessary Mounting Equipment and Cables, in the B-2 Zoning District, at 212 Second Street West, PID #32.37.06208.**

**The vote was called.**

**The following Councilmembers voted in favor: Nordberg, Randall, Utke.**

**The following Councilmember voted nay: Konshok.**

**The motion carried 3-1.**

## **10. GENERAL BUSINESS:**

**10.1. Check Diversion Program Contract:** Hubbard County Attorney Don Dearstyne stated the check diversion contract is with the Humane Achievement &

Performance Academy (HAPA). It used to be run by Tina Peterson. She is no longer in it because of health reasons. HAPA is still active and wanting to do this check diversion program. We divert the prosecution of checks that are less than \$500.00, which are misdemeanors, to HAPA and the check diversion program. Anything over \$500.00 is a felony and would be prosecuted by our office. If the person is successful with the educational component, then they avoid a conviction. HAPA is responsible for the education. HAPA receives the \$30.00 recovery fee from the businesses in Park Rapids that participate in the program. They have agreed to waive that fee that they would normally collect. HAPA also charges \$100.00 for the educational component to the offender. There's no cost to the city or to the county. I presented this to the county board last week. They signed off on it. The city's contract is for a two year period, starting this November.

Utke questioned how is the success of the program? Are there statistics? Dearstyne stated I didn't go through the Downtown Business Association for the renewal of this. I think they have been very happy with it. The lady that took over from Tina hasn't had the opportunity to compile statistics yet. She's a little overwhelmed since she took over. I hope to have the statistics in the future. I can tell you that our check prosecutions are down because of it. It is used by the local businesses. J&B was one of the largest users of the check diversion program. Hugo's has their own program out of Grand Forks. With the major players we've seen a little reduction in the program because J&B was a huge player. They received a large number of checks that went through the check diversion program. It's primarily developed for the smaller businesses not the big box retailers.

Utke questioned when a business gets a bad check do they come through your office first? Dearstyne stated no, they go right to HAPA. HAPA contacts us with a name. We see if we've referred the person before. There's a great deal of communication between us and HAPA regarding that. If HAPA is unsuccessful in getting the individual in, then they refer the check to us for prosecution. The end result is that we are trying to get the dollars for the business owners, and get restitution for them to make them whole again.

McKinney questioned in paragraph 7 it says Hubbard County has no financial obligation. Dearstyne stated your final contract will say the City of Park Rapids will have no financial obligation. McKinney questioned what is the obligation of the city? Dearstyne stated there is none. Utke stated we're just endorsing the program. Nordberg stated its reducing prosecutions. Dearstyne stated ultimately it's to get these people education and not only reduce prosecutions, but to reduce the incidents. The educational portion is the most important. HAPA teaches them life skills and how to balance checkbooks. Most of these people that get into this problem of writing bad checks don't know how to balance a checkbook.

Cynthia Jones questioned I'm assuming this is just a renewal? Dearstyne answered yes. Utke questioned what's the overall success among the downtown businesses? Jones stated the big boxes aren't involved with this. This is basically for the small businesses. We like this. We worked with Dearstyne to develop this policy initially. We weren't getting anywhere with the out of town company that we hired before. We wanted a local contact. We appreciate the Council for supporting this.

McKinney questioned in paragraph 9.C. what would give rise to us having to implement that? Dearstyne stated really nothing that I can see. I can remove it from the final contract.

Nordberg questioned what are the numbers for on the chart on page 127? Dearstyne stated that is not about the check diversion program. I wanted to give the city an update. We're completing the first year of our two year contract for city prosecutions through the county attorney's office. My support staff are now able to use the excel programs to get statistics. In 2011 there were 749 prosecuted cases that were referred to us from the city. In 2012 it was 699. The 2013 stats are through late August, and it's 442. That will be higher once we get to the end of the year. The city contract, from a prosecution standpoint, took over the misdemeanor and gross misdemeanor prosecutions. We were already prosecuting the felonies. In 2011, out of the 749 cases, 606 were misdemeanors. The rest were felonies. In 2012, out of the 699 cases, 578 were misdemeanors. For 2013 of the 442 cases, 290 were misdemeanors. That gives you an idea of what we are doing, and shows that you are getting a pretty good bang for your buck on the city contract. The bulk of our activity from those numbers is the misdemeanors.

Dearstyne stated we still have a significant number of felonies that are referred to us from the city. Those felonies are anything from thief to burglaries in town, to some of the drug cases. We sent someone to prison for one hundred months. He had been out of prison for ten days, and then committed another burglary.

Utke questioned are the misdemeanors the traffic violations? Dearstyne stated those would be for traffic violations, misdemeanor thief, DUIs. Anything that is punishable by either a ninety day jail sentence or up to a year in the county jail. McKinney stated we are very happy with the service provided by the county attorney's office. Dearstyne stated I'm glad to be busy. The one thing that I do miss is the courtroom. I enjoy the courtroom work. McKinney stated we're very pleased with your services. Dearstyne stated we're happy to provide it to the city.

Nordberg questioned how many cases go through the check diversion program? Dearstyne stated we probably have one hundred cases a year. The dollar amounts are less than \$500.00. Sometimes there's an aggregate. There is the occasion when we're working with someone and they wrote two bad checks for a total of \$400.00. Then another bad check pops in and that puts them over the \$500.00. Technically, that is a felony, but I say if we're working with them and they are paying the restitution, then we'll keep them in the program as long as they continue to work and get the educational component.

Nordberg questioned businesses got some money back? Dearstyne answered yes. Randall stated the only way to be successful in the program is to pay the restitution back to the merchant. Dearstyne stated if they don't pay the restitution back to the merchants, then they go to court. Through court we'll still order restitution. In today's world, we don't have debtor's prisons anymore. If they don't pay their fines, we can't revoke them on probation, but if they don't pay their restitution we can revoke them on probation, and we do. If there's someone who is either a shoplifter or a bad check writer and we have prosecuted them and they're not paying, after six months they'll be brought in on a probation violation, so they still have that jail sentence hanging over their heads. That's usually when they'll come up with the money, when they're looking at that iron clad door.

Jones stated we've been working with Dearstyne on a shoplifting policy. That is a problem for us right now. Shoplifting has a lot of legal ramifications to it. We have a network now, we just have to decide how we can legally put the word out.

**A motion was made by Konshok, seconded by Randall, and unanimously carried to approve Resolution #2013-170 Approving Check Diversion Program with HAPA on Behalf of the County Attorney and the Police Chief.**

**10.2. Water/Sewer Rate Adjustment:** McKinney stated ultimately this discussion will lead to the adoption of an ordinance. We have prepared the form for you with blanks. At such time you'll tell us what to put in the blanks and then we'll bring it back to you at the next meeting for the ordinance's first reading. If you wish to stay with the original scheduling for the rates to go into effect the first of the year, two readings are required, and then the clerk will publish that before the end of the year. You've had some previous discussions, and Brian Hiles is here to answer any questions.

Utke stated on page 136, the blank ordinance shows sewer rates, which we did not talk about changing. We've been discussing water rates, and also the water/sewer connection fees. We have been provided with increases based on the base fee, and also based on gallons billed, along with some different options. Does the Council have any preferences?

Nordberg stated we talked about the connection fees, which are presently \$750.00 each. Utke stated it's \$1,500.00 to hookup to water and sewer. Nordberg stated we talked about cutting that in half. One of the factors that considers usage and the balance between usage and base fees is the connect/disconnect fees for snowbirds. It's presently \$25.00 to connect and to disconnect. That seems to me to be low. I don't see it here as available to change. I'd like to have us consider increasing that fee somewhere in this fee schedule. McKinney stated there is a distinction between connecting the meter and connecting the lines to the system. These fees are the to-the-system thing. Utke stated these are if you're hooking up new to the system, but that did come up at a workshop for turning the water off while they were out of town. Nordberg stated I'd like to discuss increasing those because that affects whether people keep their water on all winter, keeping their account active. Vik stated the utility connect/discontinue fee is listed in the current fee schedule on page 139 of your packet. Utke stated the thing you'd be balancing there for the people that are considering that fee versus the minimum billing charges for leaving it hooked up, which is what we talked about at our last meeting.

Randall stated the connection fee, whether it's the initial hookup or the connect/reconnect fee, only effects a very small amount of people compared to the rate increases. I noted that the most uniform increase across the board is the 25% base increase rate. The percentage of increase is the most even for all users at 26%, 26.3%, 25.8%, 25.4%, 24.8%, and 24.2%, all within about 2%. The other suggested increases fluctuate quite a bit and are disproportionate among all size users. Utke stated I thought the same thing while looking at the numbers. It's what I consider the most fair to everybody. I also took the numbers and broke it down to the per person per month. If it was one person it was \$3.08, if it was four people it was \$2.40. Even with the larger households it's still a slight decrease per person in cost. If we went to the higher rates it would be more in their favor. I like the 25%.

Dick Rutherford questioned is that on the sewer and water? Utke stated just water. Rutherford stated in the summertime, if you're rate is going up, people aren't going to water their lawns. They won't keep everything nice looking if they have to pay a higher

rate. That water is not going into the sewer, it's going on their lawn. McKinney stated there are provisions for them to have an irrigation meter and they don't pay sewer fees on that.

Utke stated we have a sizable amount of gallons that go through the irrigation portion of that. If you watered your lawn a lot you'd have a separate meter so you don't pay the sewer part for that. Those that do it in a limited fashion are essentially paying more. Rutherford stated in the summer my bill went quite high. Utke stated the base fee is \$14.00 a quarter now. The 25% increase would make it go to \$17.50. Also, that same percentage in the gallons used. As an example, with the base and the water quarterly billed was \$35.50 versus \$44.73.

Konshok questioned we have the information on the residential rates, what about the commercial? Are they proportional to the residential rate? Nordberg stated they're the same, only the residential has a fifth tier.

Nordberg stated I've been billed at other jurisdictions for water use in the summer that takes into account for watering by basing it on winter usage. But here, with snowbirds, that's not relative either, because there would be no use. It's possible to come up with a formula that doesn't penalize people for watering their lawn. But it's complicated for us. I'm not against the 25%. That was my original preference.

Nordberg stated Hiles was recommending a 50% increase. Hiles stated that was my original reaction when we had the workshop. When I sent out this information I saw there was such a small variance between a one person and a six person with the 25%. There's only that 2% difference between how it affected them. When you start getting into the bigger base increases that gap got a lot bigger. Looking at that, and then looking at the 25%, it got more equitable by distributing it over everybody. Utke stated everybody is basically paying the same for what you use. It's equal between all households. If you use more water you write out a bigger check. Nordberg stated but it's more per gallon if you have more people. Utke stated if it goes up, and that's the thing we're forced to do because of things that are out of our control. It gets more expensive as you consume more.

Nordberg questioned did the city receive comments from the school? Brumbaugh stated they did call. They were looking at what it would do to their bills. They had questions on how to calculate it for budget purposes. McKinney questioned if staff received any other calls. Vik answered no.

Nordberg questioned our information goes up to a six person home, do you have any thoughts on the big industrial users, which I presume to be the school, jail, and hospital? Hiles stated not without having specific knowledge of what their usage is. You could easily run the numbers to see if you know what their usage is. Konshok stated those aren't truly industrial users. They are heavy commercial users. Hiles stated you don't have anything that is classified as high water usage in town. Maybe the dialysis center, but since they are just getting started we don't know how much they'll use.

Nordberg questioned the 45,000 gallons at \$4.78, do we have many of those users? Brumbaugh stated not a lot. Not that I can recall. Nordberg stated those are the people that are going up the most. Utke stated everybody goes up equally the same, but with higher consumption their bill will be higher. Nordberg stated with the choice of between 25% or 50%, at 45,000 gallons, that could be a difference. Randall stated right, but we shouldn't base it on 1% of our population. The majority of the people are residential

homeowners which is what we should be most concerned about. Utke stated I looked at what's fair across the board from everybody to a single person household on up.

**A motion was made by Konshok, seconded by Nordberg, to approve an amendment to the city code of ordinances, regarding the fee schedule, to include the specific changes as follows:**

<b>Water connection fee</b>	<b>\$375.00</b>
<b>Residential water base rate</b>	<b>\$17.50 per quarter</b>
<b>Residential water rates</b>	<b>\$3.99 per 1,000, 0 to 15,000 gallons</b>
	<b>\$4.31 per 1,000, 15,001 to 30,000 gallons</b>
	<b>\$4.78 per 1,000, 30,001 to 45,000 gallons</b>
	<b>\$5.25 per 1,000, 45,001 gallons and above</b>
<b>Commercial water base rate</b>	<b>\$17.50 per quarter</b>
<b>Commercial water rates</b>	<b>\$3.99 per 1,000, 0 to 15,000 gallons</b>
	<b>\$4.31 per 1,000, 15,001 to 30,000 gallons</b>
	<b>\$4.78 per 1,000, 30,001 gallons and above</b>
<b>Sewer connection fee</b>	<b>\$375.00</b>
<b>Irrigation water base rate</b>	<b>\$17.50 per quarter</b>
<b>Irrigation water rates</b>	<b>\$3.99 per 1,000, 0 to 15,000 gallons</b>
	<b>\$4.31 per 1,000, 15,001 to 30,000 gallons</b>
	<b>\$4.78 per 1,000, 30,001 gallons and above</b>

**Discussion:** Nordberg clarified that there will be no changes in the sewer rates, with the exception of the sewer connection fee. I would like us to consider a change to the utility connect/disconnect fee. Is this the time when we should change that? Utke stated it could be an amendment to the original motion. Nordberg stated I think \$25.00 is too little. I believe \$35.00 could be a starting point to possibly \$50.00. Between making the appointment, sending our employee out to the curb stop, reporting back to the office, changing the billing, it's worth more than \$25.00. Utke stated we don't enter the house, but we have to go out to the site and locate the curb stop.

**Nordberg amended the motion to include the following fee schedule changes:**

<b>Utility connect/disconnect</b>	<b>\$40.00 each during regular hours</b>
	<b>\$60.00 after hours and weekends</b>

**Konshok accepted the amendment. Nordberg seconded the amended motion. The vote was called. The motion carried unanimously.**

**Further Discussion:** McKinney stated this will produce the numbers that we need to give you a formal ordinance for a first reading at the next Council meeting. If the Council

decides to radically change those numbers, we would have a timing problem to get the new rates implemented by January 1<sup>st</sup>. The first billing with the new rates will go out in April of 2014.

**10.3. Resolution to Authorize Proper City Officials to Execute the Labor Agreement by and between the City of Park Rapids and the Minnesota Teamsters Public and Law Enforcement Employees' Union, Local No. 320 Representing the Public Works Employees:**

McKinney stated this is consistent with the law enforcement contract. The Personnel Committee has recommended this. The only loose end is that we have to enter into a new contract with the health insurance. We have unofficially been told that it has been approved. But officially they need to be given some time to vote. The proposal was unanimously approved by the union members. This is consistent with the approach that we took with the police union as well.

Konshok questioned is there any change regarding uniforms? It's interesting that it's up in the air. Being from the military I felt we should just say you're going to wear uniforms. Randall stated it was an interesting conversation. This is their clothing allowance. That is a better title for it. They wanted more money each year for the clothing allowance. It was discussed that their current attire was not justifying giving them more money, and that if they wanted to start dressing more appropriately, and we did direct their supervisors to have that discussion that there is a dress code, and that there should be a dress code, and they should be wearing clothing without holes in them. They should not be wearing t-shirts that are free from a local watering hole. That would be preferable.

McKinney stated in essence we told them that we would not agree to any increase this year, and if they wanted us to talk about it next year they better change their performance. Konshok stated I find it interesting that we haven't required it up to this point. McKinney stated we do have a clothing allowance. We haven't enforced it. Konshok stated I mean a uniform. Randall stated like specific t-shirts. Konshok stated these people are going on private property. Randall stated we discussed that. The other issue becomes that the clothing allowance still needs to be there in some respect for winter gear, rain gear. McKinney stated some of the specific equipment they don't buy every year. This is ongoing.

Nordberg questioned is there a city vest with a logo or some identification that they could have if they wanted? Randall stated that was my concern. I think they should be in something that says City of Park Rapids. Utke stated if they knock on a door to do a water call it should identify them as being a city employee. McKinney stated we're thinking some discussions will be held about ID. Whether that's a nametag as opposed to a logo that's sewn on or what form it will take. We have not come to any decisions yet. Konshok stated I think there should be both. Particularly if you're entering private property. Every utility has identification. I run a restaurant. My employees wear t-shirts, as does management. We provide them. I register that as a concern. In a lot of cases we're a utility and we're interacting with folks in a public role. In the future we should probably consider that. McKinney stated we have it on our list of things to consider.

Rutherford questioned does everybody get a clothing allowance as far as the city employees are concerned? McKinney stated no. Rutherford stated if you went ahead with this then Scott would get an allowance to have a uniform or some type of identification. The people that work at the liquor store all should be dressed the same. Scott Olson stated

we provide shirts. Randall stated if we went to a uniform, then in the budget you'd have to accommodate that and provide those. Rutherford questioned do you provide for his employees? Randall stated for Olson's, yes. McKinney stated that union contract has not been negotiated yet. Olson stated their shirts are purchased by me and ordered by me. Utke stated the public works is the one that we are looking at here. Police have their uniforms. The liquor store employees do. It's public works. Randall stated it is odd. In the union negotiations one of the employees looked like he worked for another local company and not the City of Park Rapids when he came in that day. In my opinion, that was the biggest reason they didn't get an increase. It looks like you work for this establishment that's on the shirt and you haven't bought a new pair of jeans all year. McKinney stated it made it very easy to explain why we made that request.

**A motion was made by Randall, seconded by Nordberg, and unanimously carried to approve Resolution #2013-171 Authorizing Proper City Officials to Execute the Labor Agreement by and between the City of Park Rapids and the Minnesota Teamsters Public and Law Enforcement Employees' Union, Local No. 320 Representing the Public Works Employees.**

**11. CITY ADMINISTRATOR UPDATE:** McKinney stated Burlingame is presently down in St. Paul providing information about the effects of nitrates on our water supply and how that had a direct effect on the project that we are undergoing right now. We're grateful that the legislature is at least listening to those situations. The airport construction is going well. They are going to start the graveling on the north end at the end of this week. That contractor is working late into the night and on some weekends.

**12. DEPARTMENT HEAD UPDATES:** Olson stated in October the liquor store saw an increase of 2.3% over 2012 the numbers.

**13. MINUTES/REPORTS/INFORMATION:** Konshok questioned the building permit report shows we have two new houses going up? Walker answered that is correct.

**14. COMMENTS FROM COUNCIL:** Konshok stated there has been excellent progress on the airport project, as well as good progress being made on the Red Bridge Project. They seem to be taking care of the property. They did have to take out one tree which was right up against the bridge abutment.

Nordberg stated the new carpet here in the library looks good.

Randall stated we discussed at our last meeting about several firemen going to Indiana. The airplane itself was donated. The city didn't have to pay a rental fee. The plane is owned by a person that has a cabin here. The city should be very thankful for that. I don't know whether the pilot donated his time or not. The plane itself would have been a nice chunk of money on top of the \$2,000.00 for fuel costs. It would be nice if the fire chief would send a thank you to that individual.

Utke questioned how did the trip turn out? McKinney stated they were outbid. They hoped it would sell for \$70,000.00 to \$80,000.00. It past \$100,000.00.

Konshok stated the Parks Board is looking for volunteer help on the skating rink at Depot Park. We're in desperate need of some volunteers. It is in partnership with the city. We do the flooding of it, but we need manual labor for brooming and shoveling off the snow. We do hope to open it this year.

Nordberg stated we had a resignation from the Library Board. We're open to nominations for the board.

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

[seal]

---

Acting Mayor Paul Utke

ATTEST:

---

Margie M. Vik  
City Clerk