

**CITY OF PARK RAPIDS  
CITY COUNCIL MEETING  
MAY 13, 2014, 6:00 PM  
Park Rapids Public Library-Lower Level  
Park Rapids, Minnesota**

**1. CALL TO ORDER:** The May 13<sup>th</sup>, 2014 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 Mikesh. Staff Present: Administrator John McKinney, Public Works Superintendent Scott Burlingame, Liquor Store Manager Scott Olson, Planner Dan Walker, Public Facilities Superintendent Chris Fieldsend, Treasurer Angela Brumbaugh, and Clerk Margie Vik. Others Present: Jon Olson from Apex Engineering Group, Cynthia Jones from the Downtown Business Association, 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: to the Consent Agenda: #6.34. Resolution Appointing Councilmember Rod Nordberg as the City of Park Rapids Representative to the Board of Directors of the Park Rapids Community Development Corporation.

**4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

**4.1. City Council Regular Meeting Minutes-April 22, 2014:** A motion was made by Nordberg, seconded by Randall, and unanimously carried to approve the April 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2014 City Council Regular Meeting minutes as presented.

**5. FINANCE:**

**5.1. Payables & Prepaids:** A motion was made by Konshok, seconded by Nordberg, and unanimously carried to approve the payables in the amount of \$75,801.66, and the prepaids in the amount of \$309,903.28, for a total of \$385,704.94.

**6. CONSENT AGENDA:** Nordberg removed Item #6.18. from the consent agenda. A motion was made by Nordberg, seconded by Randall, and unanimously carried to approve the following consent agenda items:

- 6.1. Resolution #2014-68 Approving Ordinance No. 549 Amending the City Code of Ordinances of the City of Park Rapids, Chapter 96: Public Property/Facilities Regulations, Section 96.011 Postings and Circulations Prohibited.**
- 6.2. Ordinance No. 549 Amending the City Code of Ordinances of the City of Park Rapids, Chapter 96: Public Property/Facilities Regulations, Section 96.011 Postings and Circulations Prohibited.**
- 6.3. Approve Lowest Quote for Landscaping Red Bridge Park from Flying W Gardens in the Amount of \$14,016.14.**
- 6.4. Approve Backhoe Operator's License to Work in the City of Park Rapids in 2014 for Cooperative Development LLC and Ralph Sanquist Construction.**
- 6.5. Approve Multi-Vendor Transient Merchant License for Brenda Mason d.b.a. Brigid's House for Outdoor Sale at 500 Park Avenue, on Saturday, June 21<sup>st</sup>, 2014.**
- 6.6. Approve Fireworks Permit for Zambelli Fireworks Internationale for the Fourth of July Fireworks Presentation at Heartland Park.**
- 6.7. Approve Pay Request in the Amount of \$84,000.00 to Northland Trust Services for the 2005a General Obligation Crossover Refunding Bond.**
- 6.8. Approve Pay Request in the Amount of \$69,788.75 to Northland Trust Services for the 2007 General Obligation Bond.**
- 6.9. Approve Pay Request in the Amount of \$18,446.25 to Northland Trust Services for the 2008 General Obligation Bond.**
- 6.10. Approve Pay Request in the Amount of \$13,050.00 to Northland Trust Services for the 2009a General Obligation Crossover Refunding Bond.**
- 6.11. Approve Pay Request in the Amount of \$3,487.50 to Northland Trust Services for the 2009b General Obligation Bond.**
- 6.12. Approve Pay Request in the Amount of \$875.00 to Northland Trust Services for the 2009c General Obligation Sewer Refunding Bond.**

- 6.13. Approve Pay Request in the Amount of \$19,693.76 to Northland Trust Services for the 2010a General Obligation Bond.**
- 6.14. Approve Pay Request in the Amount of \$68,146.88 to Northland Trust Services for the 2010b General Obligation Refunding Bond.**
- 6.15. Approve Pay Request in the Amount of \$532,628.75 to Northland Trust Services for the 2010c General Obligation Refunding Bond.**
- 6.16. Resolution #2014-69 Approve Extension for Leave of Absence for Full Time Receptionist/Utility Billing Clerk Brenda Stuemke.**
- 6.17. Approve the Purchase of a 2015 One-Ton Chevrolet Pick-up Truck, with the ABM Service Body, in the Amount of \$50,914.00 from Thielen Motors (truck) and ABM Equipment & Supply (service body).**
- 6.18. *Removed from the consent agenda.***
- 6.19. Approving Recommendation to Move Front End Loader/Blower Purchase, with the Updated Cost of \$240,000.00, to the 2016 Airport Capital Improvement Plan, and Accepting MN DOT Aeronautics Grant to Proceed this Summer (2014) with the Hanger Site Preparation/Drainage Improvement Project, Total Estimated Cost of \$167,000.00, with \$83,500.00 being City Share.**
- 6.20. Resolution #2014-70 Approve Easement for Ingress and Egress from the City of Park Rapids for PID #25.04.04010.**
- 6.21. Approve Public Facilities Use Permit for Randy Leritz and Candace Kimball to Use Deane Park at 19382 Eagle Pointe Trail on Saturday, July 19<sup>th</sup>, 2014 for a Wedding Ceremony.**
- 6.22. Approve Purchase Order in the Amount of \$5,622.00 from Swanson's Repair for Repairs to Pump Manifold and Replacement of Flow Sensor for Foam System for the 5774 Tanker for the Park Rapids Fire Department.**
- 6.23. Resolution #2014-71 Appointing Curt Eischens as Full Time Public Works Street Maintenance Worker for the City of Park Rapids.**
- 6.24. Approve the Pay Scale for the Rapids Spirits Lead Liquor Store Clerk Position for 2014-2016.**

- 6.25. Resolution #2014-72 Appointing Robyn Capistrant as Full Time Rapids Spirits Lead Liquor Store Clerk for the City of Park Rapids.
- 6.26. Approve Pay Request in the Amount of \$24,616.50 to Kitchigami Library for the First Half Payment of the Levy and the Repair and Replacement Fund.
- 6.27. Approve Pay Request #10 in the Amount of \$88,495.86 to Di-Mar Construction for Services Pertaining to the Water Treatment Facility.
- 6.28. Approve the Quote in the Amount of \$2,075.00 from Legends Technical Service for the Air Quality Testing at the Public Safety Building.
- 6.29. Approve Public Facilities Use Permit for Sara J. Thorson Family to use Depot Park Picnic Shelter on May 24<sup>th</sup>, 2014, 9:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m. for a Birthday Party.
- 6.30. Approve Tracy Ryan from David Drown Associates to Complete the Annual TIF Reports for Year Ending 2013.
- 6.31. Authorize Staff to Enter into Agreement with Trillion Aviation to Complete Negotiations Pertaining to Airport Agreements.
- 6.32. Resolution #2014-73 Authorizing Proper City Officials to Execute a Letter of Understanding for the Riverside Area – Phase One Project by and between Braun Intertec and the City of Park Rapids.
- 6.33. Approve Pawnbroker's Permit for Royce Holland d.b.a. Fuller's Gun and Pawn Shop for May 1<sup>st</sup>, 2014 to April 30<sup>th</sup>, 2015.
- 6.34. Resolution #2014-74 Appointing Councilmember Rod Nordberg as the City of Park Rapids Representative to the Board of Directors of the Park Rapids Community Development Corporation.

**END OF CONSENT AGENDA**

**6.18. Resolution Approving the Part Time Employment Status and Acknowledging the Declaration of Park Rapids Police Officer Matthew James Stein:**  
Nordberg stated this is requesting approval for part time police officer status. It should give us an indication of what's expected, like how many hours, how long this lasts. Brumbaugh

stated Eilers is not looking for a certain amount of hours. He wants to have him in case he needed an extra officer. Matthew Stein was a part time officer for the city before. He took a full time position in Brainerd. He's no longer working there. Eilers liked him when he was a part time officer here. He wanted him so if we need someone to fill in. Utke stated this is someone to call in when needed. Brumbaugh stated right, but we have to have a resolution so the officer has the authority to do the job. This has to be approved before the officer works a shift. McKinney stated it's more to put him on the roster as opposed to giving him specific assignments at this point, and he might be doing some work for the county as well. Randall stated it's also beneficial because we're not calling in an officer to fill in a shift that you're going to be paying overtime for.

**A motion was made by Nordberg, seconded by Randall, and unanimously carried to approve Resolution #2014-75 Approving the Part Time Employment Status and Acknowledging the Declaration of Park Rapids Police Officer Matthew James Stein.**

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

**8. PLANNING:**

**8.1. Resolution Approving a Conditional Use Permit to Allow a Home Occupation in the R-2 Zoning District at 410 Washington Avenue South, PID #32.40.02400:** Walker stated the applicant is James Nelson, who is the owner of the property. He is requesting a conditional use permit to allow a home occupation for an accounting and tax preparation office, at 410 Washington Avenue South. The property is currently being used as a single family home and the location of the applicant's accounting and tax service. The property is zoned R-2, Single, Two Family and Townhouse District, and it's designated for single family use. The property does have city services.

Walker stated the applicant has stated that he is a certified income tax preparer and does most of the work out of his home during the period of January 15<sup>th</sup> to April 15<sup>th</sup>. He also stated that he does have other clients who stop by during the remainder of the year, but not on a regular basis. He has an office within the house where he meets with clients and does not plan any building alterations. The business operates during normal business hours. There is adequate parking on the site and adjacent streets to accommodate his clients.

Walker stated the conditional use permit request for a home occupation meets all of the provisions listed in Chapter 151.146, Home Occupations. Staff and the Planning Commission recommend approval of the conditional use permit to allow a home occupation for an accounting and tax preparation office with the following conditions. The home occupation must comply with all of the provisions listed in Chapter 151.146, Home Occupations, and a conditional use permit issued by the City Council for a home occupation shall not transfer with the change of ownership of the dwelling.

Nordberg questioned has there been any signage proposed? Walker stated the applicant did not propose any signage. He said he has a name plate on the house, but it's not the business name, and he doesn't propose any other signage. Utke stated he told us

at the Planning Commission meeting that same thing. He has his current customer base. They have followed him for years and that's who he works with. He doesn't need to put a sign up and do the extra stuff.

**A motion was made by Randall, seconded by Nordberg, and unanimously carried to approve Resolution #2014-76 Approving a Conditional Use Permit to Allow a Home Occupation in the R-2 Zoning District, at 410 Washington Avenue South, PID #32.40.02400.**

**8.2. First Reading of Ordinance Rezoning Land to B-1 in the City of Park Rapids, PID #32.38.90200 and PID #32.38.90300:** Walker stated the applicant is Roger Hocking, the owner of the parcels. He is requesting a zoning map amendment to rezone two parcels from R-1, Single Family Residential, to B-1, Highway Business District and a future Land Use Map Amendment, from Single Family Residential to Commercial. The rezoning is being requested concurrently with a conditional use permit request to allow an outdoor sales lot. The parcels are serviced by water and sanitary sewer. They are located on the west side of Henrietta Avenue South and are north of his existing residential parcel. The parcels to the north are zoned B-1, Highway Business District, the parcels to the west and south are zoned R-1, Single Family Residential, and the property to the east is zoned AG-1, Agricultural District. The applicant would like to rezone the parcels to B-1, Highway Business District, in order to operate an open sales and display lot for golf carts and trailers along Henrietta Avenue South. The applicant currently has a Home Occupation Conditional Use Permit to allow display and sales of golf carts at his residence to the south and would like to expand that business.

Walker stated the applicant has also applied for a new conditional use permit to allow outdoor display and sales on Lot Two, Block One, Hocking Acres, which is being done concurrently with this request. That application will be contingent on the approval of the rezoning request. It's not included in this packet. A rezoning takes two readings. Procedurally I'll be bringing that to you at your next meeting.

Walker stated both parcels meet all minimum lot requirements for a sewer B-1 parcel, so the lots would conform to the zoning requirements. There has been an expansion of the B-1 Zoning and commercial activity along Henrietta Avenue South in the recent past and expansion of commercial zoning along Henrietta Avenue is listed as a Land Use Goal in the City's Comprehensive Plan.

Walker stated staff and the Planning Commission recommend approval to rezone two parcels and the comprehensive land use amendment, as noted in the staff report.

Nordberg stated I'm not clear on the changes that you're planning to bring later. What would that do to this decision, the block one part that you are talking about? Walker stated there's a conditional use permit request for one of the parcels that are being rezoned. Procedurally a rezoning takes two readings. The second reading will be at the next Council meeting in May. Then I will bring that conditional use permit request at that time. Utke stated we have to rezone before we can approve a conditional use. Nordberg questioned so the rezoning doesn't permit him to do the business that he is hoping to do? Walker stated not at this point. You still have to approve a conditional use permit.

**A motion was made by Konshok, seconded by Nordberg, and unanimously carried to approve the first reading of the Ordinance Rezoning Land to B-1 in the City of Park Rapids, PID #32.38.90200 and PID #32.38.90300.**

## **9. GENERAL BUSINESS:**

### **9.1. Update on Riverside Area – Phase One Improvement Project:**

McKinney stated staff was asked to look into the possibilities of reconfiguring some of the design of Second and Third Streets to accommodate additional angled parking, which was not included in the current plan. We have a presentation by Engineer Jon Olson on that. Walker also sent a memo to the Council regarding this.

Jon Olson stated per your last meeting, there was some discussion on how we want to proceed on design for Second and Third Streets as it relates to parking. We'll touch on what was proposed in the preliminary engineering report back in February. That report was based on the RDG Study that the city had done. I learned recently there was some additional planning work done in 2008 that was what triggered this discussion. We'll talk about the configuration and what the costs may look like in an effort to maximize the parking.

Olson stated there is currently striped diagonal parking on Second Street on the north portion between Highway 71 and Washington Avenue. The remaining stalls are for parallel parking. At busy times at the church we do see some people utilize the southern portion as diagonal in an effort to maximize the space in that area. The street width as it stands right now is not necessarily designed to accommodate that, but during those special events it appears to be working. With the configuration that I have striped we have approximately fifty-two existing stalls with the two block corridor of Second Street.

Olson stated when we put the preliminary engineering report (PER) together we started looking at the RDG Study to get a basis of the outline of that planning document. Our interpretation of it was that they recommended that the first block of Second Street would be diagonal on both sides. It appears, based on the document, the second block would be left as parallel. Under this configuration there would be a net increase of fourteen stalls from the existing, for a total of sixty-six stalls.

Olson stated the next option maximizes the parking configuration. This is in accordance with some of the newer planning documents that you may have seen. It converts both the first and second block of Second Street to diagonal parking. With this there is an increase of thirty-six stalls from the existing. There would be a substantial increase in parking for this area. This increases the stalls from twenty-two as listed in the PER. This would maximize the allowable parking within that area.

Olson stated Third Street East, from Highway 71 to Riverside Avenue, is basically parallel parking on the north. The majority of the south is set up for diagonal parking, with the remaining balance toward Riverside Avenue is parallel. Its eighty-nine stalls, but it could be as low as seventy-eight depending on how you look at it. There are several diagonal stalls that are not striped, but the street is sufficient to accommodate that. The existing ranges from seventy-eight to eighty-nine. For the purposes of comparison I did use the eighty-nine because it could be easily striped to accommodate that.

Olson stated the major revision to the parking was adding diagonal parking on the north side from Highway 71 and Washington Avenue. It did also extend diagonal parking on the south side. Under this configuration it did increase the parking stalls by twenty-three, for a total of one-hundred and ten.

Olson stated if you look at maximizing parking in this corridor we were able to increase that even more and by doing this we'd be widening out that street the entire width to allow diagonal all the way through the corridor. I did extend the diagonal all the way to Riverside Avenue. Under this configuration a total of one-hundred and thirty-eight stalls are obtained. This is an increase from the existing of approximately forty-nine stalls.

Olson stated, for both Second and Third Streets, currently there are one-hundred and forty-one stalls. As per the PER there would be one-hundred and seventy-eight stalls, an increase of thirty-seven. Under the maximized plan, there would be two-hundred and twenty-six stalls. That is an increase of eighty-five stalls over the existing.

Olson stated the costs associated with the widening are city share. The assessment policy allows us to assess for a standard size street. When we widen it out beyond that standard size it would be city share. That is in accordance with how the Main Avenue improvements were assessed. The widening of the parking was city share. The current estimate with the Second Street watermain replacement that we discussed last week is \$2.8 million, of that approximately 50% assessable. City's share is \$1.4 million. If we were to widen out both Second and Third Streets to allow diagonal parking on both sides we'd be increasing project costs by roughly \$160,000.00. The total would be \$2.9 million, with \$1.5 million being city share.

Olson stated to proceed from this point, there are four possible options to consider. One is to proceed as presented in the PER. Two would be to increase the width of Second Street to allow diagonal parking the entire stretch and leave Third Street as is. Number three, increase Third Street, and leave Second as is. Number four, increase the parking for both streets. The other option, for the future, if the Council chooses, these streets could be widened in the future. We had that discussion at the staff level last week. It's hard to predict future costs. There would be a lot of unknowns. You could assume that the costs today are pretty reasonable for today's dollars. Certainly construction costs go up as time goes on.

Utke questioned if Walker had anything to add. Walker stated I made my points last Friday, and have nothing more to add.

McKinney stated we were asked also to invite the downtown business people to comment if they had anything to say about additional parking. Dave Collins called me. His position is it's always nice to have more parking. There are no particular issues that he has to bring forth. Nicole at the Chamber was aware of it, but I didn't talk to her to see if she had an issue or not.

Cynthia Jones stated we had a Chamber Board meeting this morning. I'm pretty sure there are a lot of people in Park Rapids that feel I do nothing but spend my time trying to figure out how the city can spend more money. That really isn't true. I think more parking would be great, but with the cost at this point in time, with everything that is going on right now, and the fact that this could be done in the future, and also we haven't looked at other options. Highway 71 seems to be a barrier for people. They don't seem to go east to park. They will either park along Highway 71 or up toward Main Avenue. I think for now, in my opinion, the Chamber seemed to feel the same way that we should look at it for a different time.

Konshok stated I brought this up. Thanks to Olson, Walker, and everybody that did the staffing on it. It gives us a clear synopsis on it. I brought it up because I was in on the RDG Plan from the beginning. We expanded it to a larger area than just Main Avenue,

from Court Avenue, from Highway 34 South down to Eighth Street, and all the way over to Riverside Avenue. The RDG Plan encompasses more than just the Main Avenue corridor.

Konshok stated I do agree that Highway 71 represents a significant barrier, as does Highway 34. Those are major trunk highways. People are reluctant to cross multi-lanes with truck traffic. I can understand that it would be a potential marginal assistance to downtown as defined by Main Avenue. But as I recall from the RDG Plan, this had more to do with the redevelopment of this block, Highway 71 east over to Riverside, and Highway 34 south to Fourth Street, to include Depot Park. All of this area isn't transforming as quickly as either the Main Avenue or Pleasant or Court Avenue corridors. It has transformed over time.

Konshok stated the biggest development that I would point to is where the old Ford building used to be. Now we have Hugo Foods, which was formerly J&B Foods. That was a major development. I recall that parking was a significant issue with that facility. They ended up expanding to the south by taking out some houses. They had to get creative. That points out to me the fact that one of the chronic problems with this area, redeveloping, is the parking issue. Once upon a time we had Gilbert's Restaurant that unfortunately burned to the ground. We've seen no redevelopment on that lot. We had a house on the corner of Washington and Third Street also burn to the ground. No signs of redevelopment there as well. My take is, if you build it they will come scenario, or wait until they come with a proposal, and then build accordingly for a large parking issue.

Konshok stated from an economic development standpoint I take the view of a lean forward progressive position. If we are going to tear up all of the streets, now would be the time to put in more parking if we anticipate that this area is going to transform from half-commercial to half-residential, to all commercial in the future. Or, I shouldn't limit it to just commercial. We talked about high density residential. On the RDG Plan it calls for, between Third and Second Street, Washington and Gilbert Avenues, high density condo-style housing. Whether it's commercial or high density housing would be challenged by the lack of parking as it exists today.

Konshok stated I was hoping for higher numbers. Olson has convinced me that eighty-five is the number that you can get. Per parking stall the price seems steep at eighty-five parking stalls divided by \$160,000.00. Unfortunately, that is a lot of money. I would point out that every stall counts now that we've changed our parking ordinance. We do count on-street parking. We do allow businesses to include that in their total when they present a plan to redevelop property. The on-street parking now does officially matter. That was not the case when J&B Foods/Hugo Foods went in. I think that's a good thing.

Konshok stated now that we include on-street parking, I think that we as a city have an obligation, especially when we are looking at areas that we have targeted ourselves for redevelopment to do our part, and when possible, when the timing is right and a project comes up, we increase the parking in that area. The engineer in me is not in favor of waiting and then coming back in and adding parking when the developers come in. I'm not in favor of it from an economic standpoint because I don't think a lot of people, especially small developers, insurance agents, planners, medical professionals, it's a big stretch to ask them to look at a vacant lot with either no curbing, or curbing with parallel parking, to say envision if you will that this has angled parking here.

Konshok stated from an engineering standpoint I hate it when we redo a street, get everything laid out perfectly, and within five years we come back through, tear it up, put a

patch, and it never looks the same as opposed to if you do it right the first time. For those two reasons that's why I would advocate considering increasing the parking. I asked Olson to step increase it. We don't have to go for the full meal deal of all the way on Third Street and two blocks on Second Street. I think we should seriously consider an increase of some size for certain, even above what is listed in the PER.

Konshok stated from the Park Board's point this is important. We see Depot Park as becoming the primary park for events in Park Rapids. We already see a lot of tennis tournaments. When there is a tennis tournament going on down there the parking is haphazard at best. We have buses parking parallel right in front of the tennis courts along with people parking at angles, some perpendicular, and some however they feel. It's a mess. It's an inconvenience at best. It's a safety hazard at worst. That would be my other reasons for increasing parking on Third Street in particular.

Nordberg questioned are we talking about in the basic plan tearing up Second and Third Streets? Are they both going to have water, sewer, curb, and gutter normally? Olson stated what we discussed at the last meeting was, the additional block that we discussed on Second Street, from Washington to Gilbert, we were recommending just a watermain rehab. The watermain runs on the north side of the block. We were thinking this is an opportune time to come in and replace the watermain. The existing sidewalk there is predominately in pretty good shape. The area to the east that is in poor condition, replacing that. But the curb and gutter on both sides and the street surface itself are in pretty fair condition and do have service life left. We are recommending for this segment, simply watermain replacement. No surface improvements. We didn't take into consideration the need for parking improvements.

Nordberg questioned it would be torn up for the watermain? Olson stated as minimally as possible. We'd try to save what we could. Burlingame stated we would patch it. Olson stated that was our recommendation, but certainly we could look at other options for that. Third Street is a full reconstruction from start to finish, which was the original recommendation, the underground and the surfaces too.

Konshok questioned we formally added that Second Street stretch? Olson stated we will re-discuss that at your next meeting. Konshok questioned that's the section where we had a freeze up on the corner of Gilbert and Second? Burlingame stated that is right. It's old cast iron pipe there.

Utke stated I like the original PER that Olson presented with the expansion of parking on the first block east of Highway 71 on both Second and Third Streets. Driving around, it looks nice with more, but I don't know if it's justifiable at this point. I like the original plan, which upgrades that first block between Highway 71 and Washington Avenue on both Second and Third Streets. Third Street just gains us the north side diagonally. Olson stated we are able to expand the diagonal on the south side as well. We could go even further. We stopped it short of the housing on the corner. Utke stated just by realigning it at its current width. The buses could go over into the vacant lot where the restaurant burned down a few years ago. But they want to pull up in front, drop the kids off, and sit there.

Nordberg questioned if the street is already being torn up what's the extra cost going for, just paint? Olson stated added width. It would need to be wider. Utke stated if we go with the maximum parking stalls, it widens the street and probably in the case of Second Street you're taking away some of the sidewalk on the south side. Olson stated we

would maintain a six foot sidewalk. Utke stated the diagonal on that block was already in the plan. Konshok stated you'll lose sidewalk on both the north and south side of the school. Those are extra wide sidewalks for loading kids. Those would be cut back to six feet.

McKinney stated the replacement of the watermain didn't include widening of the street. That's the differential that he's talking about. Olson stated that is correct.

Nordberg questioned how does this relate to the RDG Plan you mentioned? Utke stated the first block east of Highway 71 would be part of the plan. When the streets narrow it doesn't follow the plan anymore. Olson stated I don't have a good image of the original RDG study. I did include a version of the newer plan. We have Highway 71 running north and south. This is the block of Second Street that we are discussing and one block of Third Street show diagonal parking.

Konshok stated one of the aspects that are important that was clear on the RDG plan was to re-establish Third Street as a primary east-west corridor. That was the first Main Street of Park Rapids from the river going all the way down to courthouse. After a certain point in time the access shifted ninety degrees to a north-south up and down Main Avenue. You see how that opens up Third Street, widens it, brings it all the way down so you have the ability to come off Highway 34, turn down Riverside, which is a feeder road for the truck highways, now you also have Third Street acting in that same regard. Part of it is also including traffic flow. Right now you have a jumble of different widths. Block by block there is a lot of variation.

McKinney stated you might comment on the timing in order to keep on the schedule that we have in mind. We need to make a decision on this. Olson stated we set a goal to open bids at the end of July, with the hopes of starting construction in August. In order to maintain that schedule I would like to see some directive in the next few days if at all possible to keep us on the design schedule. If we wait until the next Council meeting it's going to be more challenging for us to pull off that schedule. We will still work for it, but it would be challenging.

Konshok questioned do we have a read from any of the property owners in the area? McKinney stated I've heard nothing from anyone. Nordberg questioned I thought it was mentioned for property owners to agree in regards to a hearing. Olson stated Burlingame did have an opportunity to touch base with one of the residential properties on Second Street. Their opinion was that they'd rather not see diagonal parking in front of their property. I did talk to State Bank but in the discussion the topic of parking did not come up. Utke stated unfortunately there's not a lot going on in that area that would benefit from it. It's strictly something for the future. That's the part I'd rather not do.

Randall questioned how much is going to go on in the future given the main occupant of the first block of Third Street, I don't see a lot of condo-like development going on down further on Third Street with the current occupant of the first block of Third Street. Konshok stated I would argue that part of that issue is parking. It's looked like this for the last twenty years. I hope it doesn't look like this for the next twenty years. Randall stated you can change the appearance but you can't change the occupants inside that building and the problems that it presents and the reputation that it has. Konshok stated I take an alternative view of that. I recognize you have a lot of problems with regards to law enforcement issues, but from an economic and engineering standpoint, we need to give some kudos to the landowner. He has taken the school property that was vacant and at

least turned half of it into a useful area, regardless of whether or not you like the activity going on in there, it is occupied, it is active, it is back on the tax rolls, and that is a significant achievement. As someone who has rehabbed an old building I have to give him a tip of the hat just from that aspect. But I definitely think it's stalled out. Randall stated I'm not saying that he didn't supply some housing. I'm saying that for other potential people to come out to that block they would be concerned about that. Konshok stated we have already seen with both State Bank and with the old Middle School, they've had problems with the parking, which has caused them to convert building lots, into a parking lot. Right around one house we have a parking lot that was required for them to develop, and same with State Bank. There is a strong indication that parking is needed, plus an extremely poor use of property that we demolish houses for commercial that have value and are paying taxes on to put up a parking lot that doesn't have much tax value.

Nordberg stated also looking into attracting the development that we might hope would be coming. Who pays for that, assuming that it's coming later? Is it all city cost, or is it assessable? McKinney questioned are you asking about widening the street later? It would be a wider street and in would be city cost unless it would be part of a development agreement, which we discussed at the staff meeting. The impact of the new changes to the zoning requirements make it negotiable that they can use the parking on the street and they wouldn't need so much, but it would be our cost, which it is now so it doesn't change. Konshok stated it wouldn't be future assessable. McKinney stated we might get some developer participation, but that would not be the same thing, and not likely either. Nordberg stated essentially that is the bargaining chip. We would say if you bring a development, we, the city, will pay to widen the street and provide parking. McKinney stated and at that point we have the flexibility of saying, we'll address your parking problem, maybe by widening the street, or maybe by something else. That's the only advantage to wait for later.

Utke requested a recommendation from the Council and reviewed the possible options presented by Jon Olson.

**A motion was made by Konshok, seconded by Nordberg, to pursue Option Three (3) to maximize Third Street parking and leave Second Street as presented in the Preliminary Engineering Report, for a total of two-hundred and four (204) parking stalls, an increase of sixty-three (63) stalls, with an estimated increase of \$92,000.00 to the project.**

**Discussion:** Konshok stated I understand that the overall increase is probably too steep at this point, but I am concerned that with the RDG we wanted to re-establish Third Street as a primary corridor for that area, plus for Depot Park. Utke stated it looks nice but I don't know what use we are going to get out of those stalls. Nordberg questioned you don't think they'll have events in Depot Park? Utke questioned do they park there for Depot Park, or do they come in on the south side of Hugos on Fourth Street? Nordberg stated right now they do. Konshok questioned how many stalls are there in the Depot Park parking lot? Walker stated approximately fifty.

**The vote was called.**

**The following Councilmembers voted yes: Konshok, Nordberg.**

**The following Councilmembers voted no: Randall, Utke.**

**The vote tied 2-2, therefore the motion failed.**

**Further discussion:** Utke stated we could entertain a motion for another option at this point. Option One is already in the plans so we don't need any further action on it. McKinney stated you already approved Option One, you have the addition of the watermain on Second Street, which you directed staff to come back with a design. If you do nothing it will be Option One, with the watermain issue coming at your next meeting. Utke stated at this point we will fall back to Option One.

**9.2. Appeals for Run Water Credit 2014:** McKinney stated we have gotten pretty much everybody's appeals back, but there are a couple that aren't back yet. The Council directed staff to notify those who had signed up to run water that we would bill them for their last year's usage, if that wasn't agreeable to them, we provided them with an appeal application to come to the Council for a different remedy. Because we still have some people that are in the mix we decided that we would bring this to you at your next meeting instead of now because we still have a few that haven't been returned. I think there are six people who want to talk to the Council about something other than what you have authorized. We talked to those people today, they all know we were going to recommend this be dealt with in two weeks. They seemed to be okay with that. That should be the extent of it. We had our own problems on one of our mains, but that should be all of it.

**10. CITY ADMINISTRATOR UPDATE:** McKinney stated we've been talking about the Henrietta Township Orderly Annexation Agreement modifications, which are now in the hands of drafting and review. We did get a letter just before the last Council meeting from Mr. and Mrs. Dix asking that they be excluded from the deal as well. Planning sent them rationalization of why we included it. Mr. Utke and I ran into that couple at a meeting and explained the situation and they seemed to be okay with that. They were concerned about the immediate impact if they were left in the deal. They had not received Walker's letter yet. I haven't heard from them since. I think, right now, we're okay with that situation.

McKinney stated as far as I know the water thing is under control. The financial impact of that is not clear yet, but I think we are okay.

**11. DEPARTMENT HEAD UPDATES:** Burlingame stated the water plant is moving along good. If the weather would straighten out, we could finish the landscaping. The airport project is moving along also. They are working on the wiring now. We had a watermain that blew out. Twenty-two feet of cast iron, six-inch main froze and broke. We got that fixed. As far as I know that was the only main that froze up and broke. It was in the area of the old Petro Petes.

Fieldsend stated he has been working on the parks, in particular Red Bridge Park. We're trying to get everything to come together for that. Hopefully it will be ready by the Fourth of July. My crew has been helping Burlingame's with crack sealing.

Konshok questioned do we have any news on where we are going to put the old red bridge and getting quotes for the slabs? Burlingame stated we have gotten one quote back and are waiting for another.

Scott Olson stated we had our best sales for the Fishing Opener in four years. We beat last year by 11.1%. Yesterday, all of the staff went through Hubbard Prevention to attend a server training program put on by Alcohol and Gaming Enforcement. In past years we had used a state certified presenter of our own, in house. So this year we tried theirs.

Walker stated tomorrow we've got the pre-construction meeting for the Red Bridge Project. That's at 10:00 a.m. at city hall. At 2:00 p.m. in Osage, there's a kick off for the Heartland Trail segment from Osage to Park Rapids. Guy Fischer from Becker County has been spearheading that activity. Apex will be doing the engineering study for that. Konshok questioned does that come all the way into Park Rapids? Walker stated that would be from the city limits of Park Rapids to the wayside rest in Osage. Konshok stated it's up to us to get it from Highway 71 to the west side of town.

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

**13. COMMENTS FROM COUNCIL:** Konshok stated the preliminary projection for the Crosswind Runway Project should be finished by the first week of July. I'd like to work with McKinney to have a ribbon cutting ceremony for that. It's a very good project. We should contact Congressman Nolan's office because of the 90% FAA money in it. Often the congressman's office will take the lead on it if we were going to do something public. We should extend that offer and see if we could do a small open house to accompany that.

Konshok stated I saw the article on the "Save the Trestle Petition Drive" that was on the front page of the Enterprise. I would comment that it's a great idea. Early on in meetings that we had with the DNR, between us, the county, and the DNR, we did ask that very thing, if they would deed the trestle over to us rather than remove it. They did offer that. They said absolutely, no cost on the purchase, however, one very large condition, which was the city would be required to do all the repairs necessary to address life safety issues, as a condition of the transfer. Their initial minimum engineering estimate was \$150,000.00, and it went up from there. We said thank you very much, but no thank you. I understand the sentiment behind the drive, but this is one of those things where we are looking at a cost that is simply prohibitive.

**14. ADJOURNMENT:** A motion was made by Randall, seconded by Nordberg, and unanimously carried to adjourn the meeting at 7:05 p.m.

[seal]

\_\_\_\_\_  
Acting Mayor Paul Utke

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
City Clerk Margie M. Vik