

**INVER GROVE HEIGHTS CITY COUNCIL MEETING
MONDAY, DECEMBER 12, 2022 - 6:00 P.M. - 8150 BARBARA AVENUE**

1. CALL TO ORDER:

The City Council of Inver Grove Heights met in regular session on Monday, December 12, 2022, in person. Mayor Bartholomew called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

2. ROLL CALL:

Present In-Person: Mayor Bartholomew, Council Members: Piekarski Krech, Dietrich, Murphy, Gliva; City Administrator Wilson, City Attorney McCauley Nason, City Clerk Kiernan, Communications Manager Looze, Finance Director Hove, Community Development Director Rand, City Planner Hunting, Parks and Recreation Director Lares, Public Works Director Connolly

Others Present: Roger Fink, Senior Vice President, Principal of Trident Development; Andy Brummer, Trident Development

3. PRESENTATIONS:

A. Recognition of Mayor Tom Bartholomew and Councilmember Rosemary Piekarski Krech.

Councilmember Murphy mentioned that Mayor Bartholomew and Councilmember Piekarski Krech, have served city residents for a combination of 45 years. He felt both would be proud of the footprint they have left in this city.

He shared on behalf of the residents, Council, and Staff, that it was his honor to present them both with plaques commemorating their service to the City of Inver Grove Heights.

Councilmember Piekarski Krech shared that it has been fun and interesting. She will enjoy being able to come to meetings and say what she wants to say. She thanked everyone who has voted for her over the different elections, the people she has met, and those who were supportive when her husband passed away. She said this is truly a good community to live in.

Mayor Bartholomew thanked everyone that has made the Council successful, the staff, employees, directors, and legal team. He appreciated the mentorship from previous Councilmembers. He said he has confidence in the staff and new Council coming forward.

4. CONSENT AGENDA:

A. Approve minutes from the September 26, 2022 City Council Meeting

B. Approve minutes from the October 3, 2022 City Council Work Session

C. Approve minutes from the October 10, 2022 City Council Meeting

D. Approve minutes from the October 24, 2022 City Council Meeting

E. Approve minutes from the November 7, 2022 City Council Work Session

F. Approve minutes from the November 14, 2022 City Council Canvass Meeting

G. Approval of Disbursements. **Resolution 2022-272**

H. Personnel Actions

I. 2023 City Council and Economic Development Authority Meeting Schedules

J. 2023 Meeting Schedule for Advisory Commissions

K. Resolution 2022-273 Designating 2023 Polling Locations and Establishing Stipends

L. Stipends for 2022 Polling Locations. **Resolution 2022-274**

M. Resolution Approving Inclusion of the Assistant Fire Chief/Fire Marshal and Firefighter/Fire Inspector Positions in the MN PERA Police & Fire Plan

N. Resolution 2022-275 Adopting 2023 City Fee Schedule

O. Approval of Massage Therapist License

P. Approve Acquisition and Implementation of Special Assessment Software and Carryover of Funds to 2023. **Resolution 2022-276**

Q. Final Compensating Change Order and **Resolution 2022-277** Accepting Work for City Project Nos. 2015-09D, 2017-21, 2018-08 and 2018-11

R. Adoption of the Dakota County All-Hazard Mitigation Plan. **Resolution 2022-278**

S. **Resolution 2022-279** Accepting Consultant Services Proposal from SEH and Authorizing Traffic Counting for Municipal State Aid System Streets

T. Final Compensation Change Order, Final Pay Voucher, Park and Recreation Director's Report of Acceptance and **Resolution 2022-280** Accepting Work for City Project No. 2112 - Vista Pines Park Construction

U. Approve Amendment to Contract with ISD 199 for Golf Course Usage

V. Approval of Lease Agreement for National Guard Armory

W. Approve **Resolution 2022-281** and Development Contract for Bethesda 2nd Addition.

X. **Resolutions 2022-282 & 2022-283** approving Preliminary Plat and Variance for Robert Trail Woods Subdivision

Y. Approve the 2023 Seasonal, Temporary, On-Call, and Non-Regular Status Employees Pay Plan

Z. Ordinance Allowing Small Cell Wireless Facilities Abutting Single-Family Residential Districts

AA. Approve the 2023 Compensation Plan and Wage Adjustments for Non-Union Employees

BB. Approval of Summary of Conclusions Regarding Performance Evaluation of City Administrator

CC. **Resolution 2022-284** Authorizing the Application and Receipt of Dakota County Community Development Block Grant Funds for Program Year 2023

DD. **Resolution 2022-285** Adopting Policy on the Extension of Certain Benefits to Non-Union, Police Command Staff

Mayor Bartholomew stated he was asked by the City Clerk to pull Agenda Items 4I, 4N, and 4O.

City Administrator Kris Wilson requested pulling Agenda Item 4DD. Further discussion is needed on this item. It will return before the Council in the future.

Councilmember Dietrich mentioned that she has a comment on Agenda Item 4I.

City Clerk Rebecca Kiernan mentioned the following changes/corrections:

- Agenda Item 4I. had a typo with the May date. It should be May 22nd.
- Agenda Item 4N. has a typo in open skating. It should read \$6.00.
- A Massage Therapist and a Business License is being added to Agenda Item 4O.

Councilmember Murphy questioned if Agenda Item 4N. would have any impact on work done with the short-term licensing issue in the city.

City Clerk Kiernan replied no. It will be updated.

Councilmember Dietrich asked if there could be an alternate date for Agenda Item 4I, the retreat, as opposed to January 30th.

City Administrator Wilson replied staff is still looking for a date for the retreat in early 2023.

City Clerk Kiernan stated resident Kelly Kayser requested Agenda Item 4BB. be pulled.

Agenda Item 4BB. Approval of Summary of Conclusions Regarding Performance Evaluation of City Administrator.

Kelly Kayser, 1953 59th Court East, mentioned that it was a great performance evaluation. She said it's been great working with the City Administrator this past year as a resident.

Motion by Murphy, second by Gliva, to approve the Consent Agenda with the changes as discussed.

Ayes: 5

Nays: 0 Motion carried.

5. PUBLIC HEARING:

A. Public Hearing for 2023 Liquor License Renewal Applications and Approval of Change in Managers or Officers

City Clerk Rebecca Kiernan presented nine liquor license renewals. Three have changes to Managers/Officers:

- Moose Lodge has three new Officers:
 - Amanda Biermeier
 - Luke Seidl
 - Leslie Schultz
- Cub Foods has a new Manager:
 - Christopher Hagedorn
- Speedway #4411 has four new Officers:
 - David Seltzer
 - Robbie Radant
 - Rory King
 - Keith Jones

All went through full background investigations, their personal history statements were received, and have been approved by Police Chief Chiodo. Staff recommends approval of the liquor licenses, managers, and officers.

Mayor Bartholomew closed the Public Hearing at 6:10PM

Councilmember Dietrich asked if there were any that came in late.

City Clerk Kiernan replied staff is still waiting on two.

Councilmember Dietrich asked if there was opportunity to have them completed by January 1st.

City Clerk Kiernan replied it was not likely.

Motion by Gliva, second by Dietrich, to approve the 2023 Liquor License Renewal Applications and Approval of Change in Managers or Officers as presented.

Ayes: 5

Nays: 0 Motion carried

6. REGULAR BUSINESS:

A. 2023 Budget & Tax Levy. Resolutions 2022-286, 2022-287, & 2022-288

Finance Director Amy Hove discussed Budgets and Tax Levies for 2023:

2023 Budget Calendar - Key Dates:

- September 26, 2022: Council adopts preliminary 2023 governmental fund budgets and tax levies.
- November 15, 2022: Dakota County mails out proposed tax notices
- December 5, 2022: Public meeting to discuss the 2023 budgets and tax levies (also known as Truth in Taxation Meeting)
- December 12, 2022: Council to approve the final 2023 budgets and tax levies
- December 28, 2022: Deadline to certify to Dakota County

2023 Budget Summary:

- There are 25 fund budgets up for approval.
 - General Fund
 - 5 - Special Revenue Funds
 - 2 - Capital Project Funds
 - 6 - Debt Service Funds
 - 7 - Enterprise Funds
 - 4 - Internal Service Funds
- Revenues
 - Tax Levy: \$30,334,795
 - Other Revenues: \$46,234,776
- Total Expenditures: \$81,049,059
- Net/Use of Fund Balance: \$4,477,488

Citywide Tax Levy by Fund:

- Levy for the General Fund: \$24,889,311
- Pavement Management: \$2,900,000
- Debt Service Funds: \$2,545,484
 - Overall percentage change of 8.4%
 - To note: Some of the general fund tax levy goes to other funds:
 - EDA next year is expected to receive \$143,600
 - Parks Capital Replacement Fund receives \$300,000

Impact of 8.4% Citywide Tax Levy Increase on Median Valued Property (\$337,100)

- Annual change of \$128.70

2023 Key Budget Investments:

- 3% general wage increase
- 9% increase to health insurance costs
- 5.5 new staff hires:
 - 2 Police Officers
 - 1 Street Maintenance Worker
 - 1 Parks Maintenance Worker
 - 0.5 Communications Specialist
 - 1 EDA Specialist and/or used for consultants
- Additional dollars for seasonal staff in Streets and Parks
- Wage increases for Paid on Call Firefighters
- SAFER Savings Plan. An additional \$175,000 set aside to prepare for the end of grant funding
- Additional \$350,000 levied for the Pavement Management Program. \$2,900,000
- Inflationary increases for goods and services

General Fund Summary:

- Takes in just under \$25 million dollars (property tax levy)
- Other revenues are \$5.9 million of the total revenues
- Expenditures are at \$30,790,881
- 81% comes from property taxes
- 6% from licenses and permits

Expenditures by Department:

- Administration went down due to breaking out two new changes within the fund:
 - Human Resources
 - City Clerk
- Pulled out the Technology/Operational Budget and turned it into an Internal Service Fund
- To note: There is the addition to the tax abatement. 2023 will be the first year.

General Fund - Expenditures by Function:

- Police
- Fire
 - Public Safety makes up 55% of the overall general fund expenditure budget
- Public Works
- Parks and Recreation
- General Government
- Community Development

General Fund Cost Categories:

- Wages and Benefits make up 67% of the total expenditures
- Purchased Services and Equipment at 19%

2023 Fund Budgets - Special Revenue Funds:

- The Convention & Visitors Bureau, Community Center Operating, and the Community Center Capital are projecting a net change of zero
- Economic Development Authority (EDA)
- Host Community Fund

The only Special Revenue Fund that receives tax levy funding is the EDA which receives it indirectly via a transfer in from the General Fund. Budgeted at \$143,600.

2023 Fund Budgets**Debt Service Funds:**

- G.O. Improvement Bonds: 2015A G.O., 2016A G.O., 2017B G.O., 2018A G.O., 2019A G.O., and 2020A G.O.

All above funds are scheduled to receive property tax support in 2023 with exception of the 2020A G.O. Improvement Bonds which are being funded by a transfer in from the Closed Bond Fund.

- Capital Project Funds:

- Pavement Management Program (PMP) - Local Streets
 - Receives the property tax levy
 - Receives revenues from Franchise Fees and Special Assessments
 - Where the Host Community Fund transfer goes
- PMP - Partnership Projects (New. Gives the opportunity to sort out pavement related projects not necessarily ours).
 - Helps identify which are local streets versus other projects

In 2023, will start bonding for the special assessment cost of annual projects.

- There are 7 Enterprise Funds. These do not receive tax levy dollars:
 - Water Operating and Water Capital
 - Sewer Operating and Sewer Capital
 - Storm Water Operating and Stormwater Capital
 - Inver Wood Golf Course
- There are 4 Internal Service Funds. These are supported by transfers in from other funds:
 - Risk Management
 - Central Equipment (Estimated to increase its balance)
 - City Facilities (Larger volume of projects, will show a decrease)
 - Technology

Storm Water Special Taxing District Levy:

- Established under M.S. 444
- Used to fund trunk storm sewer improvements instead of special assessments under City Project 2001-02
 - For Babcock Trail, South Grove, 70th Street
- Covers approximately 3,000 parcels
- 10-year term (2018 through 2027)

- \$79,394 annually

Final Steps. 3 Resolution approvals needed:

- Set Final Citywide Levy
- Set Final Special Taxing District Levy
- Approve Fund-Level Budgets

Kelly Kayser, 1953 59th Court East, stated there was discussion at the last Work Session about doing research on the background of special taxing districts. She requested a copy of that information.

Mayor Bartholomew stated he supports all requests and felt the budget was ready for consideration for approval.

Councilmember Murphy said he supports the request.

Councilmember Dietrich referenced Agenda Item 4DD., that has been pulled from the Agenda and questioned how that would be extracted from the budget.

City Administrator Wilson replied it was her recommendation that the funding remains in the budget so there can be continued conversations. If coming to a compensation budget the Council is comfortable with, there would be funding to implement it. If that does not take place it would remain unspent and not included in the 2024 Budget.

Councilmember Piekarski Krech stated she was concerned because this was the first time in her history, they are approving the same budget that was approved in the beginning. Previously they were always able to reduce costs. She is not faulting staff. She is very concerned they are starting to spend at a level that concerns her. She said she cannot support going with the levy that was approved in September.

Motion by Murphy, second by Dietrich, to approve the 2023 Budget & Tax Levy. Resolutions 2022-286, 2022-287, & 2022-288

Ayes: 4

Nays: 1 (Piekarski Krech) Motion carried.

B. 3rd Reading of Ordinance Amending Development Fees and Utility Connection Fees

City Administrator Wilson discussed the 3rd Reading of the Ordinance Amending Development Fees and Utility Connection Fees. Process:

- Annual action of the City Council
- Required by State Statute to be completed via ordinance
- Ordinance requires 3 Readings
- No changes have been made since the 2nd Reading

Scope of the proposed Ordinance Amending 3 Sections of the City Code:

1. Water, Sewer, and Stormwater Connection Fees
Sanitary Sewer and Water Trunk Area Assessments
Fees/charges that are paid as a part of the development process
2. Stormwater System Rates and Charges
Language change. Moving to a citywide approach with stormwater connection fees
3. Land Use Approval Fees and Deposits
Fees applicants pay when applying to have land rezoned, platted, variances, and conditional use permits

Section 1 – Water Connection Fees. Steps are being made to have a more streamlined approach:

- Have unique rates in the NWA and the remainder of the city. Proposing:
 - Water Plat Connection Fee

- Water Building Permit Connection Fee
- Proposed to establish a single rate city wide:
 - Water Treatment Plant Fee
 - Water Core Connection Fee

Water Building Permit Connection Fee:

- Per SAC (Sewer Access Charge) Unit (a single-family home is one SAC Unit)
- All other types of development are measured off that
 - A large industrial building might be assigned 40 or 50 SAC Units

Water Treatment Plant:

- Brought together for a single rate
- Currently \$870 outside the NWA. \$810 inside the NWA
- Proposing \$900 across the board

Water Core Connection Fee:

- Depends on the water meter size going in to a property

Section 2 - Sanitary Sewer Connection Fees:

- There is a plat connection fee and a building permit connection fee
 - Recommend continuing unique rates for the NWA and non-NWA due to the fronted cost of the extension of sanitary sewer to the NWA.
 - The city took on debt to do this and is still making payments.
 - Higher fees in the NWA would help recoup costs and make debt payments.
- Proposed to establish a single rate city wide:
 - Sewer Core Connection Fee
- Unique and proposed to continue in the current single rate city wide:
 - MCES (Metropolitan Council Environmental Services) SAC Unit Fee - no change for 2023
 - B-Line Special Connection Charge - flat 3% increase

Section 3 and 6 of the Proposed Ordinance - Stormwater Connection Fees:

- Section 6 amends establishing language to authorize stormwater connection fee city wide
- Section 3 sets the fee amounts for 2023

Proposed Stormwater Connection Fees:

- Going from 7 or 8 different groups down to 3
- Having a rate inside and outside the NWA

Section 4 - Trunk Line Assessments for Water and Sewer:

- The city extended water and sewer into the NWA without assessing the property owners
- There is still the option if an area develops or has extensions in the future
 - Council at the time will have the option
 - A property preparing to develop or be connected would either pay the following fees or plat connection fees, not both.
 - Water Trunk Line proposed: \$5,418
 - Sewer Trunk Line proposed: \$5,418

Section 5 - Land Use Application Fees and Deposits:

- Only one of the city fees is proposed to be increased
- One new fee is proposed to be added
- Changing how the Abstract Fee is listed
- Based on past history, proposing to increase several escrow amounts

Section 6 - Effective Date: January 1, 2023

Requested Action: Move to approve the 3rd Reading and grant final adoption of the Ordinance as presented.

Motion by Gliva, second by Dietrich, to approve the 3rd Reading of Ordinance Amending Development Fees and Utility Connection Fees as presented.

Ayes: 5

Nays: 0 Motion carried.

C. Approval of Summary Publication Resolution for Ordinance Amending Development Fees and Utility Connection Fees. Resolution 2022-289

City Attorney Bridget McCauley Nason stated State Statutes authorize cities to adopt a summary publication resolution that the Council must approve. If approved by a 4/5 vote, a summary ordinance is published in the newspaper. The entire Ordinance is available for public inspection in the City Clerk's office. This is a way for the city to save on publication costs while still providing required public notice.

Motion by Dietrich, second by Gliva, to approve Summary Publication Resolution 2022-289 for Ordinance Amending Development Fees and Utility Connection Fees.

Ayes: 5

Nays: 0 Motion carried.

D. Rental Housing Licenses

Community Development Director Heather Rand presented three rental housing licenses. Staff found all three to have complete applications including backgrounds checks. The Police Chief and/or Designee reviewed the applications and found them complete. Staff recommends approval of the following:

- 3302 Lower 67th - Douglas Steven
- 3459 Cloman Way - Douglas Steven
- 6690 Catherine Ave - Douglas Steven

Motion by Gliva, second by Piekarski Krech, to approve the three Rental Housing Licenses as presented.

Ayes: 5

Nays: 0 Motion carried.

E. Preliminary Plat and Multiple Related Land Use Actions for land located at Diffley Court and South Robert Trail. Resolutions 2022-290 & 2022-291

City Planner Allan Hunting discussed a multi-part application for land located at Diffley Court and South Robert Trail.

- Project is proposed as multi-family for Robert Curve 4th Addition plat
- 3 lot plat
- Apartment building on one lot, townhomes on two lots
- Request includes vacating all existing easements
 - This has been replatted a couple of times based on the original plan approved in 2000
 - Easements for utilities would be vacated and rededicated on the new plat

The second part of the request is for Rezoning of the Property

- Currently zoned Planned Unit Development (PUD)
 - A mixed-use PUD approved in 2000 was not built
- Zoning would be two different categories, R-3C for the apartment building, the other two lots would be R-3B and includes 54 townhome units

Preliminary PUD Development Plan:

- 1 apartment building consisting of 190 units (along railroad tracks on the east/northerly portion)
- 10 complexes of townhomes equaling 54 units (south end of site)

- Multiple family portion is about 15.5 acres with a density of 15.7 units per acre
- Mixed Use Comprehensive Plan for the property allows for up to 35 units per acre

Applicant requests the following for Preliminary PUD:

Requesting Planned Unit Development as opposed to straight zoning

1. Density on Lot 1 - Apartment building
 - Zoning standards allow 169 units. Applicant proposes 190.
 - Planned Unit Development Ordinance allows a PUD to have greater density. Need to provide other open space and amenities of which the project has done.
 - Has trail systems and open space around the perimeter and other amenities
2. Structure Setbacks
 - Along Diffley, 25-foot setback. 2 end townhome units would have a setback of 21 feet
3. Parking (Apartment building only, townhomes meet standards)
 - Requesting to have 383 parking spaces proposed for the building
 - Code states 475 spaces or the option of 380 and show proof of parking on the balance of 92
 - Through the PUD, information from the applicant, number of units with smaller bedroom count, and typical demands, they meet the two units per building
 - Due to this, applicant is requesting flexibility
 - Staff does not see this as an issue
4. Impervious Surface
 - Exceeding by 4%. This was based on staff's requests and part of their density to have more open space, amenities, trails, and sidewalks.
5. Building Height
 - Proposing a four-story building. Total height would be 50 feet whereas 35 feet is the maximum/standard zoning
 - Staff is noticing this to be a typical height, going to four stories
 - Staff supports the request

Park Dedication:

- Property lies within an Inver Grove Heights/Eagan Joint Powers Agreement (JPA)
 - Projects in this location would connect to Eagan utilities
 - City pays Eagan rates on the fees
- Requires the developer pay Park Dedication fees to Eagan
 - Inver Grove Heights fees for multiple family are slightly higher than Eagan's
 - Collect fees based on Inver Grove Heights numbers
 - Pay Eagan their rates at the time of final plat approval (Assuming to be in 2023)
- Inver Grove Heights would retain \$157,000 in park dedication fees

Action Requested:

- Council is to consider the ordinance amendment for rezoning, resolutions approving a preliminary plat, preliminary PUD plan, and vacating existing easements
- Planning Commission recommended approval of the three action items (6-0)
- Staff recommends approval of the ordinance and two resolutions

Mayor Bartholomew referenced the Planning Commission's discussion regarding traffic.

City Planner Hunting replied there was a traffic study done in 2017. The applicant submitted an updated traffic study with calculations, the numbers go down a bit. The intersection was constructed based on the 2017 study. Staff does not see an issue with the traffic generated.

Mayor Bartholomew requested further understanding of the parking situation.

City Planner Hunting responded Code allows to build now or show proof and build later if needed. The applicant is proposing the lower number up front based on their background and experience with developments of this type. This approves a specific number.

Councilmember Piekarski Krech asked if the underground parking spaces were included in rent or if there were extra fees.

Councilmember Murphy said he would be more comfortable if staff had the same experience with parking. He was unsure where people would park if there were too many cars.

City Planner Hunting replied that The Crossings development was approved with a lesser number. Staff was not aware of any issues. He mentioned staff has been hearing from developers working with other cities that they are not using the older standard of 2.5 spaces per apartment. They are finding there are less cars with renters of newer units.

Councilmember Murphy felt two spaces may be more common than 2.5.

City Planner Hunting replied it would be somewhere within that range.

Councilmember Murphy asked if there was a formula dictating how much greenspace there should be to accommodate the density. He asked if there was a color diagram showing greenspace.

City Planner Hunting displayed a diagram of the area and replied that the PUD Ordinance does not have a mathematical formula.

Councilmember Murphy asked about Park Dedication fees.

Parks and Recreation Director Adam Lares responded with Park Dedication fees; the City of Eagan would receive the full allotment for residential units. Eagan would be paid according to their fee rate in 2023. The City of Inver Grove Heights would retain \$157,000. According to the JPA with Eagan from 1997, since Inver Grove Heights is using Eagan's water and sewer connection, the agreement is to give them our park dedication fees. Another reason is due to parks in closer proximity to Eagan.

Public Works Director Brian Connolly stated Inver Grove Heights is also paying Eagan for their sewer and water connection fees. Anyone that has sewer/water that use or drains to Eagan is outlined in the JPA.

City Attorney Bridget McCauley Nason clarified that this was the first time this issue has arisen for many on the Council. There is a JPA with the City of Eagan dating back to 1997. The city, in order to allow development in areas bordering Eagan, did not have the pipes necessary for water/sewer except through the City of Eagan. A JPA was drafted/agreed upon. The JPA spells out connection related fees, costs, and who pays for what. One term states the City pay Eagan the park dedication fees it receives from the developer. The city of Inver Grove Heights pays Eagan what they would have received in park dedication. Eagan's rates are lower than Inver Grove Heights' fees therefore the city retains the difference.

City Administrator Wilson stated the JPA does not have an expiration date. There is no mechanism to force renegotiation of a different deal. It's tied to a geographic line on a map. If needing Eagan to provide water/sewer to other areas of the city, there may be opportunity to negotiate a different JPA.

Councilmember Murphy asked if having no expiration date was typical of a JPA.

City Administrator Wilson replied she wouldn't say it's typical, in her experience the JPA was unusual but not unheard of.

Councilmember Murphy asked if the City of Eagan could be asked for that money.

City Administrator Wilson replied she met with Parks and Recreation Director Adam Lares, Eagan's Parks and Recreation Director, and their City Administrator who then went before Eagan's City Council and determined they were not interested in forgoing money.

Councilmember Dietrich asked if the distance was known between the back of the apartment building and the railroad tracks and if there was still room for a walking trail.

City Planner Hunting replied the requirement is at least 30 feet from the easement. There would still be room for a walking trail.

Councilmember Gliva wanted clarification on what she read in terms of increasing the number of units but decreasing the number of parking. There would be increased green space and trails but that causes impervious surface to increase. If there were two cars per unit, she asked if there would be enough parking space especially with snow removal. She referenced the addition of another floor stating there was also an increase in height.

City Planner Hunting replied he thought there was space to the north or west to push snow. There is underground and surface parking. He addressed the height stating the current ordinance based itself on most apartments being three stories. Staff is noticing current developers proposing a bit higher, with four stories being more typical than three.

Mayor Bartholomew asked if there was overlay precluding the height.

City Planner Hunting replied no.

Mayor Bartholomew stated Code requires 475 parking stalls, the request is for 383 with proof of 92.

City Planner Hunting replied they would not be required to show proof, the applicant would be building 383. Code states 380 could be built now but to show space on the development where 92 more would go if needed.

Roger Fink, Senior Vice President and Principal of Trident Development, St. Cloud, Minnesota. He mentioned his associate, Andy Brummer, Lead Team Member from Trident, is also in attendance. He said Trident Development was formed in 2006. They primarily focus on multifamily housing, market rate apartments, and senior living developments. They have created 4,000+ dwelling units in Minnesota.

He shared that they have conducted a neighborhood meeting, a traffic analysis report, and attended the Planning Commission meeting in October. They are proposing two types of product on the same site: a 54 rental townhouse and a market rate 190-unit apartment building. Properties will be owned by the same ownership group. All properties are designed with the intent for long term ownership. There will be professional third-party management (not selected yet). The architects and consultants are those they have worked with for many years.

Mr. Fink addressed onsite parking stating the townhome product meets city requirements for off street parking. They are looking for flexibility with the apartment parking. With the different developments they have worked on in the suburbs, it's rare to come across a 2.5 parking stall per dwelling unit. He referenced one development he worked on in Ramsey stating they have owned it for over ten years, there are many vacant/extra parking stalls all year. With those less than 2.5, they are finding the demographic of renter population to be more single member family households. Due to that, they have been creating more studio and one bedroom unit plans. This takes pressure off parking demand. This development has 10% studio units. In the past they have done parking demand analysis by third party professional consultants. They have noticed studies come out less than 2 to 1. As a developer, he was not comfortable with less than 2/1. He likes to maintain at least that. He believes they are slightly over 2/1 with this project.

He mentioned there is one per unit covered parking with underground parking and a covered garage section on the first floor of the building. This covers at least 190 parking stalls.

He said it was undetermined if the covered parking stalls would be included in the rent. The way their financial Performa is projected they are planning to charge extra for covered stalls if chosen. That's typically a pricing mechanism driven by the marketplace.

He addressed snow removal stating there are several places on the site plan they can stockpile snow. There have been other properties that have had snow trucked off site.

He stated they were asking for Council consideration/approval on rezoning, preliminary plat, planned unit development, and the vacation of easements. If approved, they would be moving forward with a request to terminate and cancel old development agreements on the title work for this project from past developments.

Andy Brummer, Trident Development, provided detail on the buildings:

Townhomes (10 total buildings):

- Includes two- and three-bedroom units
- Buildings include four units, five units, and six units
- Exterior includes LP Smart Siding and a mixture of brick
- Fourplex townhomes consist of:
 - Main level includes the garage, kitchen, living area, stairs leading up
 - Upper level contains bedrooms, bathrooms, closets, and other living areas

Apartment: Underground parking on the bottom floor includes:

- 166 stalls
- Storage
- Dog wash
- Maintenance room, trashes, storage areas, elevator room

Apartment first floor:

- South wing includes 27 first floor parking stalls
- Main entry with office space
- Community lounge
- Golf simulator
- Fitness Room/Yoga
- Exterior:
 - Open space
 - Playground
 - Covered patio
 - Barbeque areas
 - Pool area
 - Putting green
 - Big dog run

Apartment Unit Mixes:

- 190 total units
- 21 studios
- 84 - 1 bedroom
- 76 - 2 bedrooms
- 10 - 3 bedrooms

Apartment second floor: Open foyer

Apartment third floor: Common area, game room, rooftop patio, community room

Apartment unit layouts:

- Each unit has a balcony/patio
- Vinyl plank flooring, carpeting in the bedrooms
- Stainless steel appliances
- Granite countertops
- 2" wood blinds

Councilmember Piekarski Krech asked if buildings would be wired for cable/broadband.

Mr. Brummer replied yes, it's all hooked up before moving in.

Councilmember Gliva asked how many parking spaces there were for the apartments.

Mr. Brummer replied there were 166 underground. The parking area encompasses the entire footprint of the building. The main/grade level would have 27, for a total of 193 covered stalls. There are also exterior parking stalls.

Councilmember Piekarski Krech said if there were more than 200 people that chose not to pay to park underground, there would be a parking shortage.

Mr. Brummer responded they have found that Minnesota people like underground parking because it's heated, covered, and secure. They don't have issues renting those spaces out.

Councilmember Murphy asked how many outside stalls were around the apartment.

Councilmember Dietrich asked what the parking demand analysis determined.

Mr. Brummer replied there has not been a parking demand study done yet.

Councilmember Dietrich asked when that could be expected.

Mr. Brummer replied they could get it within 3-4 weeks.

Councilmember Gliva asked what wanting the analysis results does for the item before the Council.

City Attorney McCauley Nason replied the request is for a preliminary plat and preliminary PUD. Part of the flexibility incorporated in the PUD is parking flexibility. What the Council sees and approves at the preliminary PUD will carry through to the final PUD unless the developer has revisions. Once approving the preliminary PUD, if approved with the requested parking flexibility, would be the number Council approves. If Council believes it needs that information before action on the preliminary PUD, the Council would have to do the following:

- The 60-day deadline runs on the 17th. This is the second. Action needs to be taken before the 17th. If the Council requests more information the applicant would have to request/approve in writing an extension of the deadline to a time after they believe they would provide that information to the Council.

Mr. Fink requested approval be granted with a condition stating that before final plat be granted, the developer provides a satisfactory parking demand analysis for Council approval.

Mayor Bartholomew said his concern would be if approving the preliminary with this condition, there is still a preliminary in hand. He was unsure the condition would hold.

City Attorney McCauley Nason replied a condition could be added that it's approved, subject to receipt of the city, of a parking analysis that shows that the parking number included in the preliminary PUD satisfies the parking requirements for the development to the satisfaction of the City Council. If the parking analysis is received and shows a different number or Council doesn't feel the analysis was thorough enough, it doesn't leave them in the same position as they would be if waiting for final approval.

Councilmember Murphy said he felt 2 for a parking ratio seemed more reasonable. He asked how many total units and total parking spaces there were in the whole development.

Mayor Bartholomew asked if they contemplated spill over parking from the apartment into the townhomes.

Mr. Fink replied he didn't have the total number. They do not anticipate spillover. He mentioned they had one situation where they went into a development in a transit-oriented district. That city believed due to the access to public transportation, off street parking to the development could be reduced to 1/1. They discovered there was still a high utilization of cars. People were parking off site because they were not using underground parking. When noticed, action was taken with the management company to incentivize renters to start utilizing covered parking.

They restructured the rental program/renewals and began to carefully monitor who was using the parking lot; be it tenant, non-tenant, or guests.

Councilmember Piekarski Krech asked if there was guest parking.

Mr. Fink replied the townhome layout included specific areas for visitor parking. The apartments have a large broad parking lot for parking wherever they choose. He said the 2/1 ratio they have experienced has been a strong indicator that there will be enough parking for residents and guests. There are 383 total spaces for the apartment building only.

Councilmember Murphy mentioned that was 2/1 for the apartments. He asked if the townhomes were 2/1 parking.

Mr. Fink replied the townhomes have a two-stall garage and driveway parking. It meets Code.

Mayor Bartholomew said he felt the parking was adequate as it was. He knows there are limitations with no off-street parking. If having visitors, he questioned where they would go.

Councilmember Piekarski Krech said she was leery as there were only 166 underground spots.

Councilmember Murphy believed the market would take care of the underground parking spots. His concern was off street parking. He was comfortable with 2.1 for parking, he felt it was a nice product.

Councilmember Gliva asked about snow removal and if there would be less space for parking.

Mr. Brummer replied if snow needed to be piled up it would be temporary. If it took up space it would be removed.

Councilmember Dietrich stated she was comfortable moving this forward if they receive the parking demand analysis as described. It would provide answers for residents if there is an issue in the future.

Councilmember Piekarski Krech said with a large snowfall, snow cannot be removed with cars there.

City Attorney McCauley Nason stated if Council wanted to require the applicant provide the parking analysis the Council would approve the resolution with the proposed condition: "The developer shall provide a parking analysis completed by a qualified third party to the city showing that the proposed 383 parking spots for the apartment building is sufficient to meet the parking needs of tenants and their guests and the sole determination of the city prior to approval for the final PUD. In the event the developer fails to provide the required parking analysis or the analysis does not demonstrate in the sole determination of the city that the proposed 383 parking spots for the apartment building residents and guests is sufficient, then the final PUD plan shall be revised to include parking in the amounts sufficient in the reasonable determination of the city to serve the residents and guests of the apartment building".

Motion by Gliva second by Piekarski Krech, to approve Preliminary Plat and Multiple Related Land Use Actions for land located at Diffley Court and South Robert Trail with the addendum regarding the parking plan stating that the developer shall provide a parking analysis completed by a qualified third party to the city showing that the proposed 383 parking spots for the apartment building is sufficient to meet the parking needs of tenants and their guests and the sole determination of the city prior to approval of the final PUD. In the event the developer fails to provide the required parking analysis or the analysis does not demonstrate in the sole determination of the city that the proposed 383 parking spots for the apartment building residents and guests is sufficient then the final PUD plan shall be revised to include parking in the amounts sufficient in the reasonable determination of the city to serve the residents and guests of the apartment building. Resolutions 2022-290 & 2022-291

Ayes: 5

Nays: 0 Motion carried.

F. Establishing 2023 Stormwater Utility Rates. Resolution 2022-292

City Administrator Wilson presented the resolution establishing the 2023 Stormwater Utility Rates:

- Charged to all properties within the city
- Included on quarterly or monthly water/sewer bill if connected to municipal water or sewer services
- Billed annually, in December, for those not connected to municipal water or sewer
- Rate is based on property type and location within the city

Proposed increase for 2023:

- 25% increase to rural and urban
- 5% increase to NWA-developed
- 2023 would be the second year of this approach
- Goal is to gradually bring rates together so there is no difference between rates by area

Proposed rates for 2023:

- Properties zoned R-1B. In urban areas outside of the NWA: \$4.50. In NWA developed: \$9.53
- Rates would converge in approximately 2027
- For non-residential rates, there is not actual property in every category. Example: There are no shopping centers in the rural area.

Justification for increase:

- Stormwater rates have not/are not bringing in sufficient revenue to cover costs.
- Pavement Management Fund dollars have consistently been used for stormwater projects/portions of projects because there isn't enough money in the Stormwater Fund.
- To fund the 5-year Public Works CIP, multiple years of rate increases will be necessary, but not enough.
- 2023 Stormwater Fund Budget also relies on a \$1,000,000 transfer from the Host Community Fund: the first of three annual transfers. The second and third year will depend on Council votes in those years.

Projected cash flow for stormwater:

- This utility starts 2023 with approximately \$86,000
- If adopting the resolution tonight, staff projects it would yield \$782,000 in revenue
- \$1 million dollar transfer in from the Host Community Fund
- Revenues and transfers in should give \$1,782,850
- Operating costs for 2023: \$690,000
- Adopted Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) would be \$743,000
- Spend about \$1.4 million dollars, leaves about \$400,000
- Two projections were made:
 - Assumed a 15% net increase in revenue per year
 - Under operating cost, assumed a 5% increase per year
- CIP needs growth. Once the transfer in of \$1 million dollars is stopped, it would be back in the negative in 2027

Requested Action: Move to adopt Resolution establishing the 2023 Stormwater Utility Rates

Mayor Bartholomew said the need is clear regarding the adopted CIP for stormwater. He urged to find other ways to add to this fund. He felt the resolution needs to be adopted for 2023.

Councilmember Piekarski Krech mentioned things are being increased, fees do not show up in the General Tax Fund. When adding everything up along with the fees, it begins to snowball. She said they need to be cognizant of that. She felt they need to look elsewhere because resident taxpayers are footing the bill for a lot more. She said she only went along with the utility because it meant that every property owner in the city paid for this.

Councilmember Murphy agreed it was necessary.

Motion by Dietrich, second by Murphy, to adopt Resolution 2022-292 Establishing 2023 Stormwater Utility Rates.**Ayes: 5****Nays: 0 Motion carried.****G. Continuation of 2nd Reading of Ordinance Regarding the Licensing of Rental Housing and Short-Term Rentals**

City Administrator Wilson presented the 2nd Reading with the following updates:

- Current Code language does not speak specifically to short term/vacation rentals
- Process of administering the current code language has raised several issues/challenges
- Current Code language has not interpreted to apply to short term rentals

Timeline of discussion:

- August 1, 2022 - Council Work Session Discussion
- August 22, 2022 - 1st Reading (approved)
- September 26, 2022 - 2nd Reading (tabled)
- December 12, 2022 - discussion of alternative(s)

Continuum of options from the August 1st discussion:

1. No regulation. Properties are subject to the same ordinances as any other property in the City.
2. Apply existing Rental Licensing Ordinance. Done proactively with the Council.
3. Create new license specific to short term rentals.
 - a. At the 2nd Reading property owners provided testimony. Council was requested to consider an alternative.
4. Restrict short term rentals to specific types of properties such as homesteaded properties.
5. Prohibit short term rentals via a minimum rental period of 30 days.
 - a. Council requested Staff develop an Ordinance accomplishing this. The 1st Reading passed; the 2nd Reading was presented.

She mentioned she met with Community Development Director Heather Rand to discuss applying the existing rental licensing ordinance or creating a new licensing ordinance specific to short term rentals. They met with the individuals who provided testimony for the 2nd Reading for further discussion.

Reasons why to have a license specifically for short term rentals:

- Regular rental licensing ordinance doesn't "fit" in some ways.
 - Has a requirement for a Crime Free Lease Addendum. (Criminally background check every tenant).
 - Desire to require collection of lodging taxes.
- Gives the opportunity to address unique challenges such as hosting events like weddings.

Policy Issues for Council consideration:

Who would need a license. The current rental licensing ordinance exempts:

- Hospitals, state licensed residential care facilities, assisted living facilities, nursing homes, hotels, or motels
- Single family homes in which an individual owns the home and resides in a portion of the building where there is a rental dwelling unit and there is a total of no more than three people within the rental dwelling unit that are unrelated to the owner and to each other
- Accessory dwelling units pursuant to section 10-18-1 of this Code
- Supervised student housing (Dorms) pursuant to subsection 10-14-2H of this Code

Should the Ordinance speak to:

- Neighborhood notification. (City of Burnsville requires people to attest on a short-term rental registration form that they have notified abutting neighbors).

- Events. Some cities regulate events. Some regulate how many people can stay in the property without regards to size. Have noticed some with 3-4 guests.
- Parking. Currently written to have those with short term rental license must park on site.

To be determined:

- Term of Rental License (currently every two years)
- Rental License Fee

Other Ordinance Provisions:

- Items to be included on the application
- Background check for owner and keyholders
- Insurance requirements
- Process/terms for license denial
- Ability to inspect property if necessary (not proactive inspections)
- Requires city lodging tax to be collected and remitted (not in the regular rental licensing ordinance)

Mayor Bartholomew said he was unsure the accessory dwelling unit Statute allows for renting. He thought those were for family members.

City Administrator Wilson replied accessory dwelling units (ADU) are often referenced as providing housing for an elderly relative or young adult. The ordinance does not restrict the use to that, it states a rental license is needed if the code requires one. The rental license code specifically excludes accessory dwelling units that are under the ordinance. ADU's are only allowed under homesteads.

City Attorney McCauley Nason stated the property owner needs to reside in either the primary residence or the ADU.

Councilmember Piekarski Krech believed the thought was that it was just for family.

City Administrator Wilson replied there was no restriction as to who can reside in an ADU.

Mayor Bartholomew commented there were a lot of changes from the 1st to 2nd Reading. He asked if this should start off as a new 1st Reading and do away with the other 1st Reading.

City Attorney McCauley Nason replied changes can be made between the 1st and 2nd, and 2nd and 3rd Readings. The 1st Reading stated there would not be any short-term rentals. The 2nd Reading has an ordinance that would allow, with a separate license, short term rentals. The question before Council is which is preferred.

City Administrator Wilson replied it was the Council's discretion whether or not a 1st Reading would be brought back or another alternative of what had been presented.

Mayor Bartholomew replied his position would be a 1st Reading. He said he could not support the 2nd Reading as outlined, he would vote against.

Councilmember Murphy agreed it was a lot of changes. He was thinking that more time may be needed and to table the 2nd Reading. He said if the Council moves forward with this 2nd Reading, they would need to address any rentals, rented accessory dwelling units, and parking. He asked if surrounding cities had a minimum time they could be rented.

City Administrator Wilson replied she did not provide a summary of other cities. She felt those were all over the board from having a rental period of 30 days, prohibiting them, or only allowed in homesteads. The City of Burnsville has registration instead of licensing.

Councilmember Murphy stated residents in support of this have said the city's location is important to short term rentals. He asked if there was information from Eagan and South St. Paul that could be provided. He said he was not really in support of short-term rentals.

Councilmember Murphy mentioned he didn't see information on a second or third strike rule.

City Administrator Wilson replied that was not included. Staff could provide that information if the Council wanted. It would have to be defined in a way that provides due process.

Councilmember Gliva asked if the rental unit owners had rental units in other cities and what those owners were looking for.

City Administrator Wilson replied it was a mix of responses. One individual operates several in the city and no where else. Another individual had some in Minneapolis, St. Paul, and one in Inver Grove Heights. Another operated in Crystal with a couple in the city. When asked how other cities were done, some had specific short term and long-term rental licenses, others got a regular rental license.

Councilmember Dietrich stated she would like to start at the fundamentals. She questioned what the benefits would be to short term rental owners when registering with the city. She shared when she was out door knocking, she noticed several people doing this. She asked how people could be motivated to register. She mentioned there was a lot of staff and legal time put into this which is taxpayer money. She asked how much they would want to spend on this. She said she didn't know this was a priority a year ago. She felt it needed to be tabled until a retreat is done with department heads to ensure all are on the same page. There are limited resources and she wanted to be respectful of them.

City Administrator Wilson agreed there are limited resources. Staff wants to be working priority areas. She stated this discussion took place at the August 1st Work Session; the Council directed going down this path. Prior to that several email complaints were received about them. She was requested by the Council about how to address the concern which led to the Work Session.

Councilmember Dietrich said she attended a convention; some cities have put a six month pause on any new ones until further information was gathered. She did not think that was something that should be done here, but felt they need to see where priorities lie. She was starting to see staff time add up which was why she asked the question.

City Administrator Wilson shared that residents with concerns have said the benefit isn't to the operator, it's to the quiet enjoyment of those living in the surrounding area. Those she met with were supportive and wanted to be good neighbors. She did not feel there was pushback to the license requirement.

Councilmember Murphy felt there was too much information and change from the 1st version to the 2nd. He was leaning toward pausing/tabling. He believes it needs to be addressed sooner rather than later. Mayor Bartholomew said he liked the 1st Reading.

Councilmember Gliva said there was too much that Council has not fully considered. They need to determine how much staff time they want to spend. She agreed it needs to be addressed. She would not be in favor of moving forward with this today.

City Administrator Wilson asked if there was any further work the Council would like staff to do on this topic and when it should be brought back for discussion.

Councilmember Murphy said he would like to know more about parking, the two strikes, spending time on potential verbiage/criteria, and to have restrictions in place for the neighbors who don't want this. He was unsure for those renting and if that eliminates them from doing business at all. Mayor Bartholomew stated his concerns were with the conflict of resident and business and the possibility of being poor neighbors to the existing neighborhood. He would like to see deference given to residential areas and define what can happen in terms of noise, volume, parking, and what types of parties can be had.

City Administrator Wilson stated awhile back the Mayor had asked how this compares with home-based business requirements. The home-based business ordinance prohibits tourist houses but doesn't define what a tourist house is.

City Administrator stated staff would do additional work on the idea of three strikes, bring a more detailed analysis on how immediate neighboring cities regulate this topic, and schedule discussion for the February Work Session. Another option would be to pause until there is a 2023 City Council Retreat that decides priorities and work plans for the upcoming year.

Councilmember Murphy agreed with what was stated and felt February was best for discussion. Councilmember Dietrich asked if February would be after the retreat.

City Administrator Wilson replied it would be closely after the retreat.

Joe Fahnhorst, 9395 Tyne Lane, stated he was the one that brought forward the pub last time this was discussed. He shared concerns about parking; there were 10 cars parked in the front of the home on December 2 and 3. There is also concern about noise and safety. He did not feel this was in zoning compliance. He commented there are commercial use entities running as commercial use entities in their neighborhoods. He encourages commercial use in the community, but felt it was hard to understand why they would encourage this through licensing. He thought they were moving forward with the 2nd Reading, which he supports. He thought it was consistent with the City of Eagan which states you cannot rent for less than 30 days. He prefers moving forward with the first original proposal. He suggested looking into the Police Blotter to see if there are issues at the home.

Paul Hooyman, 9472 Esk Lane, said his neighborhood supports the 1st Reading. He said there was a private meeting with those who own rentals but don't live in their community. He felt the change in direction was based off that conversation. He asked where the neighborhood was for that discussion. It should be what's best for the community, not outside interests. He felt approval would result in more issues. He suggested talking to others and asking them if they would want something like this next door.

Jeff Koslowski, 9232 Avalon Path, said he is retired law enforcement and knows what bringing alcohol into communities does. There are a bunch of children in the neighborhood, he would hate to see anything happen to any of them. He said he has spoken with the Inver Grove Heights Police Department about this, their response was that area of the city was the largest in their patrol zones with the fewest number of calls. He said without the lack of patrolling in the neighborhood there could be problems with parking. There were cars in the road even before the snow hit a couple of weekends ago. The owners have no sense of ownership to the property, no stake in their community. He loves the community and would hate to have it be destroyed by a pub. He said it is not a homesteaded property as listed on the Dakota County Property page. He supports the 30-day limit.

Paul Windels, 9441 Tyne Court, mentioned this came to his attention in July. He felt they were exploiting a loophole. He said the problem is that they are absentee landlords, don't live in the community, and don't care if there is a noise complaint. He supports the 30-day limit as originally proposed. If going with licensing, he suggests it be homesteaded. He was concerned about parking and occupancy. He prefers no short-term rental, but if allowed, there be restrictions.

Mike Gannon, 9322 Esk Lane, said he understands this is much bigger than one neighborhood/commercial entity. He felt it was imperative to go back to the purpose statement. It is well written and approaches the essence they want as a community. By bringing in short term rentals the number of rental properties would increase because of the underlying revenue stream. That would increase rental prices on the other 4,400 properties. That affects the entire city, not just their community. He shared

that Roseville/St. Paul charges about \$540 per license. He suggested averaging what an Inver Grove Heights Police Officer makes per hour, \$28.51. Every house call with two officers per car equals \$60.00 per hour just to come out. This could entail ticketing, towing, and follow up. The current parking restriction is to not be in any Inver Grove Heights street for 20 hours consecutively. Calls need to be made to extend that time, resulting in additional staff work to take those calls.

John Stiles, 7473 Dickman Trail, stated he does not currently operate short term rentals, but does have experience operating in the past. Short term rentals can be a bedroom in the home, an auxiliary dwelling unit, or a duplex or four plex. He has a duplex and has considered renting out the other unit short term. He felt problems that have arisen have been with one or two properties instead of dozens. He is in favor of licensing and wanted the Council's consideration. He said he spoke with someone in the City of Cottage Grove which incorporates their short-term rentals the same as long term rentals.

Stephen Dick, 1630 52nd Street East, stated he owns the Airbnb right next to the home he lives in. He is very communicative with his renters. Over time, he found ways to limit any issues he has had such as having a security deposit. He has a 10:00 rule that nobody can be outside. He felt there were many things that can be done to limit the problems discussed by residents. He said if going with the three strikes option, it sounded like this property could have issues quickly and would be revoked. He said they shouldn't ban all Airbnb's due to one bad situation. He felt it came down to tenant communication such as stating how many cars and having security cameras on the driveway. He felt licensing was the way to go.

Lisa McGinnis, 9185 Inver Grove Trail, stated she has experience with short term rentals and has properties in St. Paul and Minneapolis. They own a home in Inver Grove Heights and have plans to have a short-term rental with an ADU at their residence. She mentioned she participated in the session with Community Development Director Rand and City Administrator Wilson. She agreed with the purpose statement. She felt the lines of communication have been opened for those that want to do a quality job in this business and have a positive impact on the community. She supports the 2nd Reading.

Mayor Bartholomew stated this item would be tabled for more information and moved to a Work Session for further discussion.

7. PUBLIC COMMENT:

Kelly Kayser, 1953 59th Court East, asked if Eagan's park dedication fees exceed Inver Grove Heights, if the city would be obligated to pay the difference to Eagan from other funds in the city.

City Attorney McCauley Nason replied they would collect the higher of the two fees.

8. MAYOR AND COUNCIL COMMENTS:

Mayor Bartholomew stated as his last evening as Mayor, that he wanted to thank Staff for all their hard work and diligence put into presenting information for these meetings and taking input. He thanked the on the ground departments and said they are a fine group of workers. He said this is a wonderful city, residents are proud of their city, work hard, are diligent, and engaged. He appreciates all the residents and everyone here that adds to the color of the city. He wished the best for the future. He said it's been fun and a great joy. He was proud to say he has worked with residents and staff. He shared that he would be staying in Inver Grove Heights because he enjoys it here.

Councilmember Piekarski Krech said she agreed with everything said by Mayor Bartholomew. She said it has been enjoyable to serve on the City Council. There have had a great bunch of people that worked well together. She said the city has a fantastic staff. She felt those working for the City of Inver Grove Heights are proud of the city they work for and do well. It's a good city, a good community that is there to support you when you need it.

Councilmember Dietrich thanked Mayor Bartholomew and Councilmember Piekarski Krech for their service to the city.

She mentioned she received an email today that she would like submitted to the record from Wayne Schmidt, 11680 Alexandria Court.

City Administrator Wilson requested a copy of the email as staff had not received it.

Councilmember Gliva thanked Mayor Bartholomew and Councilmember Piekarski Krech for their years of service and history, she appreciates it. She said they should be thankful for the people who have served like them.

She stated she was at a Municipal Legislative Meeting, and they were recognizing Mayors who were retiring from service. She presented Mayor Bartholomew with a plaque.

Councilmember Murphy stated this Council was able to get a lot of work done. He felt that was a good definition of success. He appreciated Mayor Bartholomew and Councilmember Piekarski Krech for putting up with all his questions. He was hopeful the next Council is as hard working and as much fun.

9. ADJOURN:

Motion by Dietrich to adjourn the meeting at 9:14 p.m.

Minutes prepared by Recording Secretary Sheri Yourczek