

**INVER GROVE HEIGHTS CITY COUNCIL WORK SESSION
TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 2, 2025 6:00 P.M. - 8150 BARBARA AVENUE**

1. CALL TO ORDER:

The City Council of Inver Grove Heights met in regular session on Tuesday, September 2, 2025, in person. Mayor Dietrich called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

2. ROLL CALL:

Present In-Person: Mayor Dietrich; Council Members: Gliva, Scales, and T’Kach.

Absent: Council Member Murphy

Staff In Attendance: City Administrator Wilson, Assistant City Attorney Mikel, Finance Director Hove, Police Chief Chiodo, Fire Chief Thill, Community Development Director Ziemer, Parks & Recreation Director Lares, City Clerk Kiernan, and Assistant Finance Director Ellison.

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

Motion to approve agenda with additions of Item 4E and 4F by Scales, second by Gliva.

Ayes: 5

Nays: 0 Motion carried.

4. DISCUSSION ITEMS:

A. 2026 Budget Update & City Administrator’s Recommendation

City Administrator Wilson reviewed the 2026 Budget General Fund and Property Tax Levy along with additional information. The budget process follows State statutory requirements. Minnesota cities must adopt a preliminary property tax levy for 2026 by September 30. Once this levy is adopted, it may be reduced but cannot be increased. Inver Grove Heights intends to adopt its preliminary levy at the September 8 Council meeting. Proposed 2026 property tax notices will be mailed to property owners by the County between November 11 and November 24. Between November 25 and December 20, cities are required to hold a public meeting to discuss the budget and tax levy and to receive public input. The proposed Truth-in-Taxation meeting is scheduled for December 8, and the final 2026 tax levy must be adopted by December 28, with Inver Grove Heights proposed to act at the December 15 Council meeting.

The General Fund provides for a wide range of City services. These include Administration, the Mayor and Council, Human Resources, the City Clerk and Elections, Communications, Finance, Community Development, Planning, Inspections, Police, Fire, Engineering, Streets and Street Lighting, Parks and Recreation, and transfers to the Economic Development Authority (EDA) and Parks Capital. The General Fund also covers the Crossings Tax Abatement. Services not included in the General Fund are the Community Center, Golf Course, Utilities such as Water, Sewer, and Stormwater, and the Convention and Visitor’s Bureau.

For 2026, the General Fund is proposed at \$36,668,206. Police services account for \$13,239,384 or 36%. Fire services total \$7,373,584 or 20%. Public Works is budgeted at \$5,080,405 or 14%. Parks and Recreation expenditures are \$3,902,280 or 11%. Administration and Finance total \$3,798,961 or 10%. Community Development is \$2,475,655 or 7%. Transfers to other funds amount to \$797,937 or 2%.

The proposed 2026 preliminary tax levy by fund totals \$36,499,899, which is a 6.3% increase over the 2025 approved budget of \$34,214,757. The General Fund increases from \$28,549,075 to \$30,615,441. The General Fund Tax Abatement is essentially unchanged at \$183,000. The Pavement Management levy rises from \$2,934,750 to \$3,022,792. The Debt Service levy increases slightly from \$2,547,632 to \$2,550,657. Tax Abatement and Debt Service levies remain unchanged. The General Fund and Pavement Management levy amounts have small net reductions, with a \$69,313 reduction to the General Fund and a \$58,696 reduction to Pavement Management.

Known cost increases for 2026 total \$1,455,864 or 4.26% of the levy. These include \$151,900 for Minnesota Paid Family and Medical Leave, \$734,044 for other personnel changes representing approximately 3.5%, \$235,000 for the Fire SAFER savings plan, \$209,300 for phasing in three 2025 Fire hires, \$24,120 for Fire AFLAC benefits, and \$101,500 for phasing in three 2025 Police hires.

Budget adjustments since the initial review include removing \$60,000 for a recodification project, reducing Finance division software by \$20,000 with the Technology Fund available if necessary, moving Special Assessment software costs of \$23,480 from Finance to the PMP budget, removing a Police Department software request of \$16,617, and reducing the Fire Department supply increase by \$30,000. Additional adjustments were made to Fire Department part-time wage and full-time overtime budgets based on forecasted activity. An additional \$8,000 was added for Mayor and Council professional services.

Further adjustments include changing the transfer to the Park Capital Replacement Fund from a 5% to a 3% increase, reducing the levy by \$11,866, and changing the Pavement Management levy from a 5% percent to a 3% increase, reducing the levy by \$58,696. Additional savings were achieved through a new cleaning contract and renewal of property and casualty premiums. In total, these changes result in an overall reduction of \$322,400.

Staffing adjustments include four position reclassifications in Engineering, Fire, Police, and Inspections adding approximately \$40,000. Hour's adjustments result in a net \$28,400 cost to the General Fund, including increasing the Finance Accounts Receivable Technician from 20 to 30 hours per week and increasing the Parks and Recreation Communications Specialist from 25 to 32 hours per week. After these staffing adjustments, the net reduction to the budget is \$254,000.

New staffing requests for the General Fund include a 60% full-time equivalent Parks Maintenance position to work full-time during warm weather months, an additional Communications position, an Assistant City Administrator or additional Human Resources staff, a Fleet and Equipment Manager, an Assistant Planner, and a second School Resource Officer. The second School Resource Officer has no tax levy impact.

Staffing priorities recommended include the second School Resource Officer, with the contract approved by the City Council on August 11, 2025. The Parks Maintenance position is budgeted at \$64,350 for 2026. The Human Resources Coordinator is recommended as a mid-year hire with a 2026 budget impact of \$61,600 and a full 2027 budget impact of \$129,350.

The overall net changes since the initial review include \$322,400 in reductions, \$40,000 for staffing reclassifications, \$28,400 for other staffing adjustments, \$64,350 for the Parks Maintenance position, and \$61,600 for the Human Resources Coordinator mid-year hire. This results in a net reduction to the budget and levy of \$128,050.

A 6.3 % Citywide tax levy increase results in a proposed 2025 Citywide tax levy of \$36,371,890. This increase represents a 1.04% change in the tax rate. Based on a 2025 median valued residential

property of \$362,200, the annual change in City taxes would be \$91.37. For comparison, in 2025 the median valued property was \$349,100.

Mayor Dietrich asked for confirmation that Pavement Management included all the partnership projects.

Administrator Wilson confirmed that the levy for Pavement Management is allocated into the City's Pavement Management funds, which include two separate funds, one for locally managed projects and one for partnership projects. She explained that this amount will allow the City to fund the five-year CIP, covering both Local Streets and Partnership Projects.

Mayor Dietrich requested that the items identified in the budget reductions be reviewed as the City prepares the budget for next year. She emphasized that many of the items are important, if not all of them, and should not be removed from consideration.

Council Member Murphy stated that the \$60,000 recodification project should be considered a priority, noting that delaying it may create further issues with the City Code and that it should be addressed sooner rather than later. He also requested clarification on the \$8,000 budgeted under Mayor and Council professional services.

Administrator Wilson explained that the budgeted amount is intended for the possible use of a professional facilitator, which is a common practice among City Councils to assist in developing either a strategic plan or a focused set of goals and priorities for the coming year. She noted that facilitators generally gather input from individual Council members and then lead a group discussion to ensure all perspectives are considered and goals are clearly defined. She added that no specific facilitator has been identified.

Council Member Murphy stated that the expertise to facilitate goal setting exists within staff or the Council and suggested that the \$8,000 budgeted for professional services may not be necessary. He emphasized that refilling the Assistant City Administrator position should be prioritized over adding to the Human Resources Department.

Council Member T'Kach stated that the recodification project could be delayed given the added strain of an election year, while staff can continue addressing ordinance issues as they arise. She expressed support for prioritizing additional Human Resources capacity over an Assistant City Administrator at this time, noting the wider impacts of HR work across all City departments. She also supported allocating \$8,000 for a facilitator to assist with strategic planning and goal setting, suggesting that such a role could include ongoing check-ins to ensure progress on established goals.

She further highlighted the importance of forestry initiatives, such as public education on tree care, subsidized tree sales, and review of the City's tree ordinance to encourage best management practices. She noted these efforts could help address the impact of the Emerald Ash Borer and promote long-term tree health across the community.

Lastly, she emphasized the need for greater focus on traffic and pedestrian safety, including traffic calming measures, enforcement, and signage improvements. She noted these issues are frequently raised by residents and identified in survey results, making them an important priority.

Council Member Scales supported the new School Resource Officer, noting it does not impact the levy, and agreed that additional Parks labor is appropriate with recent expansions. He did not support funding for professional facilitation services, stating staff has effectively provided direction in

recent years. On the Human Resources position or Assistant City Administrator, he recommended waiting until the new HR Manager is in place next year so their skills and workload can help guide the decision.

Council Member Gliva stated that the \$8,000 for professional facilitation could be handled internally. She emphasized the need to be cautious about adding staff given concerns from residents regarding tax increases and the future cost of the Central Maintenance Facility. She supported hiring a new Human Resources Manager earlier to allow overlap and training with the current manager but expressed caution about adding positions in other areas such as Parks. She also noted that electric bicycles on streets and trails need to be addressed.

Administrator Wilson stated that the Police Chief is working with other Dakota County Police Chiefs regarding the increased use of electric bicycles. She explained that traffic calming is addressed through both physical street design changes and enforcement measures, noting that funding was included in the 2025 budget for additional traffic enforcement signs.

Mayor Dietrich stated that she has spoken with other Mayors and sees the benefit of using a consultant for retreat planning. She asked how close the City is to being able to fund such an effort with existing monies without requiring additional budget allocations.

Administrator Wilson stated that if the Council prioritizes this for next year, the cost could be covered with unspent funds from the current year.

Mayor Dietrich stated that while goal setting with a facilitator does not need to occur every year, it could be a valuable tool for establishing and tracking goals and should be considered for next year. She emphasized the importance of being good stewards by avoiding new hires in the coming year, noting this may result in reduced service levels, but that such outcomes reflect the balance required when cuts are made. She then asked if any preliminary levy percentages from other Dakota County cities were available.

Administrator Wilson reported that, based on conversations with her colleagues in Dakota County, preliminary levy increases vary widely. Farmington is projecting up to a 19% increase, Apple Valley 15.58% with about half attributed to voter-approved Park bonds, and Rosemount 12.9% with approximately 5% tied to debt for a new Maintenance Facility and Police Station. Eagan is projecting 8.9%, Hastings 8.38%, and both Burnsville and Lakeville around 7%. Mendota Heights is anticipating a 5% increase. She noted that she did not have information from South St. Paul or West St. Paul.

Mayor Dietrich asked if Farmington's higher levy projection was related to a major project.

Administrator Wilson stated that she was not aware of what is driving Farmington's levy projection.

Levy options include a 6.3% increase. Removing recommended new staff positions would reduce the increase to 5.94%, and removing both recommended positions and reclassifications would reduce it further to 5.74%. Capturing only tax base growth, which applies a flat tax rate to a growing tax base including new construction and growth in existing property values, would result in an estimated 5.31% increase and require cutting \$342,000. A 3% levy increase would require cutting \$1,130,000.

Additional options include utilizing some portion of the Host Community Fund balance to cover one of the City's smaller existing debt payments of \$261,765, though this was discussed in August and not preferred. Another option is freezing the Technology Allocation charge to departments at 2025 levels and using the Technology Fund balance, saving the General Fund levy \$104,800. Delaying

phasing the costs of three Police Officers hired in 2025 onto the levy by continuing the use of one-time Public Safety dollars would save \$80,000. Freezing the transfer from the General Fund levy to the EDA Operating budget at 2025 levels and relying more on the EDA Fund balance would save \$8,900. All these options involve using one-time funds to cover ongoing expenses, which would result in larger increases in future budget years.

Mayor Dietrich emphasized that drastic budget cuts could affect City amenities, such as sidewalk plowing, and noted the importance of residents understanding the cause and effect of such decisions. She stated that the Council carefully considers how funds are allocated. She then asked for recommendations from the Council on levy percentages or alternatives.

Council Member Scales stated that reclassifications and job expansions should not be cut, as they provide value through internal growth. He noted that the only new staff position he supported was in Parks, but he would be open to managing with existing staff for a year. He expressed concern that a 3% levy increase would require significant cuts that residents may not fully understand. He indicated support for removing new staff positions and setting the levy increase at a maximum of 5.94%, with the option to fine-tune before final adoption.

Council Member T'Kach stated that while a 6.3% levy is difficult, it is reasonable as a maximum. She suggested staff review other potential savings before reducing positions, noting the importance of Human Resources and the added costs of maintaining new Park facilities.

Council Member Gliva stated that she preferred the levy be no more than 5.74%. She supported adjustments to positions and reclassifications to ensure employees are treated fairly but emphasized keeping the levy at 5.74%, leaving it to staff to determine how to achieve that target.

Council Member Murphy noted that removing the recommended new staff positions would result in a 5.74% levy. He asked whether the 20-basis point difference between 5.94% and 5.74% would also apply to the 6.3% option and, if the recommended positions and reclassifications were kept, whether the 6.3% would be reduced to 6.1%.

Administrator Wilson stated that removing the new staff positions would result in a 5.94% levy and would still fund the reclassifications.

Council Member Murphy recommended setting the levy at a maximum of 5.94%, stating he could support and justify that amount to residents.

Mayor Dietrich stated that based on resident feedback, her preferred levy number would be 5.74% and that efforts should be made to reach that target.

Council Member T'Kach emphasized the importance of transparency in explaining the budget, including the value provided and the services not funded. She supported using 6.3% as a starting point, with the goal of refining it further and potentially reaching 5.94%.

Council Member Scales supported a 5.74% levy but emphasized the importance of funding reclassifications, noting they provide employees with growth opportunities and contribute to a positive workplace. He suggested considering the use of other funds to cover the one-time cost and asked for clarification on the amount.

Administrator Wilson stated that reclassifications and staffing adjustments total about \$68,000. She indicated that, consistent with Council direction, a preliminary levy could be set at 5.74% with adjustments made to accommodate the reclassifications and ensure fair treatment of staff.

Mayor Dietrich acknowledged that while a hiring freeze may limit advancement opportunities for employees, it remains essential to uphold the City's commitment to being the best employer possible. She emphasized that this circumstance stems from resident-driven priorities and reflects the financial realities the City faces this year.

Council Member T'Kach asked if 5.94% was the maximum levy.

Mayor Dietrich stated that her preferred levy number was 5.74%.

Administrator Wilson clarified that a 5.74% levy increase would maintain the current staffing structure without imposing a hiring freeze, meaning positions vacated by retirements could still be replaced. She noted that some reclassifications, such as one related to an upcoming retirement in the Fire Department, are critical. She asked the Council to allow staff to refine the reclassification list further while continuing to review the budget for potential reductions.

B. Proposed Ordinance related to Residential Yard Sign and Campaign Signs

Administrator Wilson shared information regarding a proposed amendment to the City Code related to yard signs. This amendment removes content-specific regulations that previously applied to election and campaign signs. It introduces a definition for "temporary sign" and establishes clear regulations regarding temporary signs, including their location, size, and number. Temporary signs would be permitted on residential, estate, and agricultural properties without a permit.

During election season, State law pre-empts any City limitations on the size and number of signs allowed. However, local regulations on location would continue to apply. Election season is defined as the period beginning 46 days before the primary election and ending 10 days after the general election in even-numbered years.

The proposed ordinance specifies that temporary signs must be placed 10 feet back on City streets, with the requirement no longer tied to the right-of-way. The maximum sign size would be 18 inches by 24 inches, and the number of signs allowed would be limited to 4.

Council Member Scales asked about for-sale signs, noting that household sales signs are all different sizes.

Administrator Wilson clarified that for-sale and real estate signs do not meet the City's definition of temporary signs. She acknowledged the code may conflict with content-neutral requirements but stated the risk is minimal.

A policy question was presented for the Council to consider whether the current standards are appropriate for the City of Inver Grove Heights. It was further noted that during election season, State law allows for unlimited signs, with no restrictions on size or number.

Mayor Dietrich asked how this all came about.

Administrator Wilson explained that the review began with complaints about campaign signs and the need to ensure the ordinance is content neutral. She noted past enforcement issues during the 2024 election cycle and stated staff recommends a consistent community-wide standard for yard signs rather than requiring property owners to know exact right-of-way boundaries.

Mayor Dietrich emphasized the need for consistency in sign enforcement, noting issues during the last campaign cycle and suggesting the matter be reviewed by the Planning Commission.

Administrator Wilson acknowledged the challenges of complaint-based enforcement, noting it can consume significant staff time. She suggested using communication tools such as newsletters, social media, and door hangers to clearly inform residents of sign regulations.

Council Member Scales expressed support for the 10-foot setback as reasonable, stated he was open to discussion on the number of signs allowed, and noted the Planning Commission's input would be valuable. He also pointed out that contractor signs placed without homeowner involvement remain prohibited.

Administrator Wilson stated that signs must be set back 10 feet and have the property owner's permission.

Council Member T'Kach asked for clarification on the distinction between commercial and non-commercial signs, citing examples such as utility pole postings, private organizations, and promotional advertisements.

Administrator Wilson stated that non-commercial signs are permitted without size or number limits during election seasons, but all signs must be set back 10 feet from the right-of-way with property owner permission. She added that staff has reviewed enforcement practices and stressed the need for clear community education.

Council Member T'Kach asked how the code applies to temporary signs made of heavier materials, such as painted plywood.

Administrator Wilson stated that a wooden sign in a residential area would not meet the definition of a temporary sign and would require a permit, which likely would not be issued under the residential sign code.

Council Member T'Kach emphasized the importance of distinguishing temporary signs from permanent ones, noting that some large painted signs are not always affixed to the ground as described in the ordinance.

Administrator Wilson noted that there will always be individuals who find ways to work around regulations.

Council Member T'Kach expressed support for using total square footage as a consistent standard, citing alignment with other regulations, and asked for clarification on lighting hours and dwelling unit provisions, suggesting the Planning Commission review them.

Administrator Wilson stated that the only changes in the draft ordinance are those shown with underline and strikethrough. She noted that lighting provisions and other elements remain unchanged and that a broader review of the sign code, including commercial signs, is planned but is outside the scope of this ordinance.

Council Member T'Kach agreed and stated she would like to hear the Planning Commission's input on the number of signs and related matters.

Council Member Gliva supported keeping the ordinance simple and emphasized the importance of clear communication. She expressed support for the 10-foot setback, noted flexibility on size and number of signs, and stated the Planning Commission may provide useful recommendations.

Council Member T'Kach referenced Section 10-15E-7 regarding household nameplate signs and questioned whether they were included in the changes, noting she had initially thought the entire ordinance was being revised.

Administrator Wilson stated that the provision is not being changed at this time.

Mayor Dietrich asked if there was sufficient direction to proceed and stated it would be beneficial to bring the matter to the Planning Commission before the next election cycle.

Administrator Wilson stated the goal is to complete the ordinance update in a non-election year and to have it finalized before the end of the year.

C. Proposed Ordinance related to Identification to Individuals providing public comment.

Administrator Wilson provided information regarding requirements for providing public comment. The current City Code, Title 1, Chapter 5, Section 7, addresses the procedure for speaking before the Council. Each person addressing the Council shall give his/her name and address in an audible tone for the records and, unless further time is granted by the presiding officer, shall limit his/her address to a reasonable time except at a public hearing when the limit shall be three minutes.

She also identified several options for consideration in updating or clarifying the requirements. These include whether individuals should be invited or required to provide identifying information, whether comments should be submitted in writing or delivered verbally, and what type of address information, if any, should be disclosed. Possible options for address information include providing a block and street, City of residence, or not requiring any address details at all.

Council Member Scales supported inviting residents to provide input, noting that recent feedback has been helpful to discussions and that comments from those in the neighborhood carry added weight.

Council Member Gliva agreed with inviting residents to speak and suggested it would be helpful to at least identify them as Inver Grove Heights residents, while allowing flexibility on whether they provide a full name and address.

Council Member T'Kach supported inviting residents to speak and suggested encouraging them to provide contact information for follow-up, such as through a sign-in sheet, while noting the importance of making the process comfortable to increase public participation.

Council Member Scales stated that the City already has a process in place for residents who wish to be contacted, noting that a form is available for them to provide their information. He added that if residents choose not to leave their address or other contact details, it indicates they do not wish to be contacted further.

Administrator Wilson suggested keeping some of the forms available in the Council Chambers.

Mayor Dietrich noted that the forms available are not mandatory and stated they should continue to be provided.

Council Member T'Kach suggested making the forms available both in the back and in the Council Chambers, noting she had no preference on placement if it works for staff.

Administrator Wilson noted that staff often use addresses to confirm correct spelling of names or to clarify comments. She added that residents vary in comfort level, with some providing minimal information and others sharing detailed personal context.

Council Member T'Kach asked whether developers and business representatives would still be required to state the location of their business.

Administrator Wilson noted that developers already provide business information through applications such as rezoning, PUDs, or plats, so there is less need to require it separately at meetings.

Council Member T'Kach noted that the public does not have access to that information.

Mayor Dietrich stated that the code would apply to all and emphasized the importance of knowing whether speakers are City residents, supporting the option of inviting them to provide their name and address.

Administrator Wilson stated that staff will bring forward a first reading, which will provide the Council an opportunity to make further adjustments if needed.

D. Interview Process for Civic Legal Services

Administrator Wilson reported that the City issued a Request for Proposals (RFP) for civil legal services, receiving five responses. A staff committee reviewed the proposals and recommended three firms for further consideration. She asked whether the Council preferred to conduct interviews in an open meeting or appoint two members to join staff on an interview committee.

Council Member Scales expressed that participation by the full Council was unnecessary and recommended selecting two members to serve on the interview committee.

Mayor Dietrich asked for volunteers to serve on the interview committee.

Administrator Wilson stated that while the RFP suggested interviews occur between the 8th and 19th, scheduling conflicts make this difficult. She recommended September 29 or 30 in the afternoon as more realistic dates, which would still allow a decision to be made in October.

Council Member Murphy stated he would make room in his schedule to serve if the Council so chooses. Council Member Gliva also volunteered to serve on the committee unless another member preferred to do so.

Mayor Dietrich nominated Council Member Murphy, noting that he appeared agreeable to serving.

Administrator Wilson confirmed that Council Members Murphy and Gliva would serve as the two Council representatives and stated staff would coordinate with them on the specific date and time.

Council Member T’Kach stated she was also interested in serving and noted she thought Council Member Gliva had declined.

Council Member Gliva asked whether guidance would be provided on how the interview process would be conducted.

Administrator Wilson explained that Council members would receive the proposals and a set of suggested interview questions, with the option for follow-up questions. She added that a feedback form would be provided to organize thoughts, though numerical scoring would not be used, as the City retains discretion in selecting professional services.

Council Member Murphy asked who makes the final decision, assuming it would be the City Administrator.

Administrator Wilson stated that she would bring forward a recommendation, and the Council would make the final award decision.

Council Member Gliva offered to serve as a backup if scheduling did not work for the other two members.

Council Members T’Kach and Murphy were appointed to serve on the interview panel, with Council Member Gliva designated as the alternate.

Mayor Dietrich introduced discussion of the September 8th meeting time, noting the possibility of moving the regular Council meeting to 5:00 p.m. instead of 6:00 p.m., and asked Council members about their availability.

Council Member T’Kach asked whether an EDA meeting would also be held before or after and inquired about its expected length.

Community Development Director Ziemer stated that the special EDA meeting agenda includes extension of the purchase agreement with Interstate and presentation of a draft business subsidy policy. He explained that the policy would be introduced for review, with a public hearing to be held at a future meeting for adoption.

Director Ziemer estimated the two EDA items would take less than an hour, noting the purchase agreement extension should be brief and the draft business subsidy policy would be introduced for review with time for questions.

Administrator Wilson stated that a special EDA meeting will be held at 4:30 p.m. on Monday, September 8, followed by a special Council meeting at 5:00 p.m., and that the previously scheduled 6:00 p.m. Council meeting will be canceled.

Mayor Dietrich asked that the meeting update also be shared on social media.

Administrator Wilson stated that the time change will be highlighted in both printed notices and social media postings.

E. Location of remaining 2025 Work Sessions

Administrator Wilson reported that work sessions were previously held at the Community Center with positive feedback but moved back to the Council Chambers during budget season to ensure meetings were televised. She noted two remaining work sessions in October and November and stated staff plans to return them to the Community Center unless directed otherwise.

Mayor Dietrich asked what staff feedback had been regarding holding work sessions at the Community Center.

Administrator Wilson reported that staff feedback has been positive, noting that the less formal setting encourages more robust policy discussions. She emphasized that the meetings remain open to the public, are not televised, and no actions are taken until brought back to the Council Chambers for final approval.

Mayor Dietrich stated she had not received any feedback from residents regarding the work sessions and asked if other Council members had heard any.

Council Member Scales stated that attendance at the work sessions speaks for itself and expressed support for returning them to the Community Center, noting that he preferred the more informal style of discussion there.

Mayor Dietrich confirmed that future work sessions will be held at the Community Center.

5. ADJOURN:

Motion to Adjourn at 7:36 p.m. by Gliva, second by Scales.

Ayes: 5

Nays: 0 Motion carried.

Minutes prepared by Recording Secretary Tammy Greenlee