

**Minutes
Minnetonka City Council
Monday, December 7, 2020**

1. Call to Order

Mayor Brad Wiersum called the meeting to order at 6:31 p.m.

2. Pledge of Allegiance

All joined in the Pledge of Allegiance.

3. Roll Call

Council Members Susan Carter, Deb Calvert, Bradley Schaeppi, Kissy Coakley, Brian Kirk, Rebecca Schack and Brad Wiersum were present.

4. Approval of Agenda

Carter moved, Kirk seconded a motion to accept the agenda with addenda to Item 14.A. All voted "yes." Motion carried.

5. Approval of Minutes:

A. November 9, 2020 regular meeting

Schack moved, Calvert seconded a motion to accept the minutes, as presented. All voted "yes." Motion carried.

6. Special Matters: None

7. Reports from City Manager & Council Members

City Manager Geralyn Barone reported on upcoming city events and council meetings. She explained staff was recruiting advisory board and commission members at this time. Those interested in serving were encouraged to sign up online on the city's website or to call city hall for further information.

Carter inquired if staff had any updates on how the recruiting process was going. Barone commented she had 16 inquires last week, which was good to see. She noted the city had 27 applicants to date.

Schaeppi asked what the deadline was for submitting an application for the board and commission positions. Barone reported the deadline was January 1, 2021.

Calvert discussed the housing assistance deadline and encouraged residents that were having trouble making rent payments to reach out to the state or county for aid.

Wiersum encouraged everyone to do their share to prevent the spread of COVID-19. He shared a simple message from the Minnesota Department of Health asking everyone to wear a mask, keep their distance and do their part.

Carter thanked the mayor for reinforcing this message. She explained she had residents asking if COVID-19 inoculations would be mandatory. She asked if Minnetonka would have control over the vaccines and their distribution. Barone reported the city would not have control over who gets the vaccine or how they would be distributed. She indicated the city may be called upon to help in the process of distribution, having locations in the city that may be appropriate and communication efforts with the public.

Wiersum stated his expectation would be that a requirement to be vaccinated would likely not occur and would not be within the purview of the city. He indicated it would be a real challenge for city or state government to require this.

Calvert explained that for those that feel safe taking the vaccine, she encouraged residents to do so. She noted Hannukah starts on Thursday, December 17, 2020. She wished everyone Happy Hannukah.

Wiersum wished everyone a safe and happy holiday season.

8. Citizens Wishing to Discuss Matters not on the Agenda: None

9. Bids and Purchases:

A. Bids for the Williston Lift Station Rehabilitation

City Manager Geralyn Barone gave the staff report.

Schack moved, Calvert seconded a motion to award the contract. All voted "yes."
Motion carried.

10. Consent Agenda – Items Requiring a Majority Vote:

Schack requested Item 10.A be pulled from the Consent Agenda for separate discussion and consideration.

Calvert requested Item 10.C be pulled from the Consent Agenda for separate discussion and consideration.

B. Resolution amending Resolution No. 2016-015 for Yellow Brick Road, a licensed daycare, at 10401 Bren Road East

Kirk moved, Coakley seconded a motion to adopt Resolution 2020-101 approving the request. All voted "yes." Motion carried.

D. Resolution to adjust 2021 non-union employee salaries and benefits

Kirk moved, Coakley seconded a motion to adopt Resolution 2020-xxx. All voted "yes." Motion carried.

A. Resolution denying the rezoning of the existing property at 4144 Shady Oak Road from R-1 to R-2

Wiersum explained a vote in support on this item was a vote to deny the rezoning.

Schack stated she stands by her comments from the last meeting. She believed a denial was inconsistent with the city's policy and zoning goals.

Kirk moved, Coakley seconded a motion to adopt Resolution 2020-100 denying the rezoning. Carter, Schaeppi, Coakley, Kirk voted "yes." Calvert, Schack and Wiersum voted "no". Motion carried.

C. City manager performance pay

Calvert discussed the process the council follows for the city manager performance review. She commented on the average scores for the city manager in an unprecedented year and thanked City Manager Barone for her tremendous service to the community.

Wiersum stated he appreciated the work City Manager Barone had done in 2020. In addition, he appreciated the work the entire city staff and city council has done in 2020, which has been an incredibly challenging year.

Calvert moved, Schack seconded a motion to approve the 2020 city manager performance pay. All voted "yes." Motion carried.

11. Consent Agenda – Items requiring Five Votes:

A. Items concerning an accessory structure, with an accessory apartment, at 4225 Tonkawood Road:

- 1) Conditional use permit for an accessory structure in excess of 12-feet in height, with a setback variance;**

2) Conditional use permit for an accessory apartment with a locational variance

Calvert moved, Kirk seconded a motion to approve Resolution 2020-103 and Resolution 2020-104 approving the request. All voted "yes." Motion carried.

B. Resolution approving a conditional use permit, with a variance, for Blue Pearl Veterinary Hospital at 10301 Wayzata Boulevard

Calvert moved, Kirk seconded a motion to adopt Resolution 2020-105 approving the request. All voted "yes." Motion carried.

C. Applications for renewed liquor licenses for 2021

Calvert moved, Kirk seconded a motion to approve the licenses. All voted "yes." Motion carried.

12. Introduction of Ordinances:

A. Ordinance relating to accessory dwelling units in residential zoning districts

Community Development Director Julie Wischnack and City Planner Loren Gordon gave the staff report.

Calvert asked if an accessory dwelling unit (ADU) has to be served by municipal water. Gordon reported all ADU's would use the service lines that exist on the property today and would not create an additional connection to the property.

Carter explained she had a neighbor that had a lot and a half and she has had some issues with a significant RV being parked 10 feet from her home. She questioned if an ADU had a front facing entrance or a side facing entrance. Gordon stated the ordinance anticipates that most of the lots that could have an ADU would not be corner lots. He indicated he did not have a definition for a side lot. He reported the code would require the door for ADU's to face a side yard.

Carter requested the planning commission consider how neighbors would be impacted if the entrance and exit to the ADU were to face their property and not the property owner. She inquired if an ADU could be required to be placed closer to the property owner's home than the neighbor's property line. She reported the neighbors have no control about how close the ADU was to the property line. She explained a 900 to 1,000 square foot home was not small and would impact the neighbors on all sides. She indicated a second driveway would also impact the neighbors.

Kirk stated he was curious about consent agenda item 11.A and how this addressed accessory structure parking. Gordon explained this item could have been under this ordinance. He noted there was one aspect of that application that would have required a variance based on the location in the front yard.

Kirk asked if the primary structure had a garage, could the ADU also have a garage. Kirk questioned if the ADU could be placed above a two car garage. Gordon reported if a resident were to convert a garage, an ADU could be located above this garage. He indicated the size would be over 1,000 square feet on the property and this would require a CUP.

Kirk stated the city may get push back if very large structures were built in back yards with living quarters. He indicated he wanted to better understand the mass and scale of the type of ADU's that could be located in back yards. He explained he understood the need for ADU's for aging relatives and stated he did not want to discriminate against renters or contractors. Gordon commented the thought process was that the burden was on the neighborhood. He noted if there were two home based businesses, this ordinance does allow a certain level of traffic to come onto the property. He explained the thinking was that if the home based business were to extend to the ADU, the impact could be doubled. He noted ADU's were to be made available to most situations, but not all situations.

Kirk encouraged the planning commission to consider the minimum and maximum size ADU that should be allowed on a lot based on the square foot of the home and lot.

Schaeppi stated it was exciting to see this item being brought forward to the city council. He thanked staff for their efforts on this ordinance. He indicated he would like to see the planning commission discussing the practical application and enforcement of this ordinance. He discussed how COVID-19 has impacted the number of cars in driveways and suggested the number of cars parked on driveways be further considered.

Schack commented this ordinance was a good way to assist in diversifying the housing in Minnetonka. She explained she supported the ADU size limits. She did not want the ADU ordinance to allow people to turn their homes into a twin home. She stated she was looking forward to seeing what the planning commission had to say about this ordinance. She recommended front doors on ADU's not face neighboring properties.

Calvert indicated some of the questions that have been brought up would be good for the planning commission to further explore. She noted there was a home down her street that had an ADU on a pond and explained this unit did not detract. She stated ADU's would be a good way for the city to address

affordable housing units and she was excited that the city was introducing this ordinance.

Coakley asked if the renter of a home could put an ADU the land. Wischnack stated in the lease for the land, this would have to be an allowable use. She explained this would be a private property issue and would not be regulated by the city.

Wiersum stated this was an exciting ordinance. He explained Minnetonka was a large lot city and there was a strong commitment to .5 acre lots among residents. He reported the ADU's would allow for new housing options while maintaining the integrity of neighborhoods. He encouraged the planning commission to consider home businesses, the location of the door on ADU's, and architectural consistency with the primary home when considering this ordinance. He stated he did not anticipate ice fishing trailers would become permanent living structures, but the character of neighborhoods also had to be considered.

Kirk moved, Carter seconded a motion to introduce the ordinance and referred it to the planning commission. All voted "yes." Motion carried.

Wiersum recessed the city council meeting.

Wiersum reconvened the city council meeting.

13. Public Hearings:

A. Utility rates related items:

- 1) Municipal water and sanitary sewer rates**
- 2) Municipal water and sanitary sewer connection fees (REC)**
- 3) Interest rate for SAC/REC deferral program**
- 4) Recycling fee**
- 5) Storm water fee**

Finance Director Darin Nelson gave the staff report.

Calvert explained she has been following the recycling conundrum for several years. She indicated she would work with the League of Minnesota Cities committee she serves on regarding this issue. She reported there may be some things the United States can do domestically to address this concern. She thanked staff for the thorough presentation.

Schaeppi thanked staff for the presentation. He asked when curbside organics recycling would have to be offered curbside. Nelson reported this would have to occur by 2022. He explained the city's recycling contract would end in 2021 and a new contract would be pursued for 2022 to include organics recycling.

Wiersum opened the public hearing.

With there being no comments, Wiersum closed the public hearing.

Calvert stated the council does not relish in raising utility rates for its residents. However, she did take pride in the fact the city of Minnetonka does not levy for special assessments. She applauded staff for bravely bringing forward a number of infrastructure projects that were required even if it meant utility rate increases.

Wiersum commented he was proud of the fact Minnetonka was a fiscally conservatively run city. He appreciated the fact that Minnetonka was prepared when many other cities were not. He took pride in the fact the finance staff was well prepared and did not surprise the council with big expenditures.

Calvert moved, Kirk seconded a motion to hold the public hearing and adopt Resolution 2020-106, Resolution 2020-107, Resolution 2020-108, Resolution 2020-109 and Resolution 2020-110. All voted "yes." Motion carried.

14. Other Business:

A. Resolution approving conditional use permit and site and building plans for a 21-resident nursing home at 16913 Highway 7

City Planner Loren Gordon gave the staff report.

Calvert stated she appreciated the assessment that putting the utilities on the other side would cause significantly more tree loss. She indicated the residents that abut this property, the southerly easement abuts their property and the viewshed. She understood there would be landscaping, but not on the easement. She requested further information regarding the landscaping. Gordon reported the policy was to not have overstory trees and evergreen trees within a public utility easement because it would inhibit access.

Calvert commented because trees would be removed, she wanted to be assured for residents to the south what the city can do, and was responsible for, when it comes to buffering. She then asked why the garage had to be raised two feet. Gordon commented further on the landscaping plan and noted the garage was coming up in elevation due to the driveway grading plan.

Schaeppi stated he was still working through the north versus south options. He inquired if the city was working to preserve trees that would die in the future. Gordon explained when a field review of trees was completed the city looks at the tree size and health. He commented further on the analysis that was completed by staff.

Schack commented on a previous project that had a great deal of consternation by the surrounding property owners. She questioned what the options would be to true medium density on this parcel. She inquired what the standard would be regarding trees if townhomes were pursued on this property. Gordon reported the city has had several proposals for this property. He indicated medium density would allow for up to 12 units per acre and this site could support 21 housing units. He explained the other concept plans required some sort of subdivision.

Coakley stated she visited the homes south of the proposed site. She questioned asked if this was an R-1 property, surrounded by R-1 properties, why the developer was requesting a rezoning to R-2. She stated she was concerned with how close the proposed home would be to the electrical lines. Gordon reported with the application for the CUP the zoning would remain unchanged. He noted the site plan had a setback of 50 feet from the southerly most corner of the building to the property line. He estimated the building would be 45 feet from the overhead lines.

Coakley explained she received comments from several of the neighbors and she understood why the building height and the size of the building was a concern for these neighbors. She noted she spoke to the city manager earlier today and how there was a need to diversify the housing stock in Minnetonka.

Calvert questioned if emergency vehicle access had been taken into consideration for the proposed building. Gordon discussed how fire trucks and other emergency vehicles would enter and exit the site. He commented further on the hammerhead design of the parking lot.

Wiersum invited the applicant to speak.

Dave TeBrake, Lake Minnetonka Care Center representative, introduced himself to the council. He thanked staff for the thorough presentation. He discussed why the garage elevation would be raised. He noted the planning commission discussed additional parking for special events or holidays. He explained additional parking had been proposed on the grassy area. He commented on the location of the utilities and noted a line had to run all the way across the property, which meant more trees had to be removed along the south property line.

Jeff Sprinkel, Lake Minnetonka Care Center Administrator, stated he owned and operated the smallest nursing home in the state of Minnesota with only 21 residents. He reported the only other comparable facility in Minnetonka closed down in September, which was Hillcrest of Wayzata. He noted he has been operating for over 33 years in Minnetonka.

Kirk asked why the building was positioned as is. Mr. Tebrake explained the building was positioned as is in order align the entrance of the building with the driveway entrance into the site. In addition, he indicated he was trying to minimize the number of trees that were impacted or would be lost, while also making the grades work. He reported the building would not be seen from Highway 7 due to the trees on the site.

Wiersum opened the meeting for public comments.

David Devins, 17100 Sandy Lane, explained he lived immediately next to the small wedge of property where the utilities will be connected. He reported he was the president of the homeowner's association as well. He commented over the last few years a number of proposals have come to the city for consideration. He stated for the most part he and the residents support the proposed use. He indicated the association would prefer to have the utility connection on the north side of the property versus the proposed location. He commented on how his side of the property would be decimated by tree removal and noted no one was in favor of that. He explained he also has concerns with the future development of the property at 17101 Highway 7. He indicated this was a smaller property that was listed for a tear down and redevelopment site. He stated he had serious safety concerns with the ingress and egress from this property. He explained he provided staff with a detailed letter and sketch of the issues regarding the connection of water and sewer along Sandy Lane. He reported Sandy Lane was a soft road that had tremendous drainage problems. He commented on the problems this roadway has had and noted the HOA residents have spent \$50,000 to remedy the situation. He wanted to make sure that if the roadway was disrupted that the residents were protected and that the trenching would be minimal. He questioned what the width of the water and sewer easement would be. He thanked staff for being cooperative and for fielding his questions and comments.

Brady Johnson thanked the council for their time. He explained his major concerns were with increased traffic flow along Highway 7, considering this was already a busy roadway. He respectfully disagreed with staff's assessment that the care center would only have 13 trips per day. He estimated that this would be closer to 30 and noted this included large trucks. He commented on how the alternation of the proposed lot would impact the neighboring properties. He reported the additional blacktop and large building was not in keeping with the character of the neighborhood. He stated 25 of the 44 high priority trees would be

removed, which would increase the noise to the neighborhood. He discussed how long it would take to rebuild the tree buffer. He questioned why the city was proposing to have a commercial property abutting residential homes. He stated the neighboring homes already had to deal with Highway 7 and he anticipated the proposed care center would adversely impact property values. He did not believe a commercial, for profit entity should be located on an R-1 residential lot. He commented further on the accidents that occur each winter near his driveway. He indicated Gary Anderson was against the property sale. While he had the utmost respect for the planning commission, he believed this project should have a closer look taken. He explained the neighbors and environment would be adversely impacted by the proposed project.

Robin Hemmesch thanked the council for their time. She reported she lived directly behind the proposed property and moved in on July 31, 2020. She indicated she was a new resident of Minnetonka and was only recently made aware of the care center proposal. She noted her property would be most greatly impacted by the proposed care center. She requested she be allowed to meet with staff and the developer prior to the council taking action on this item. She explained she was greatly concerned about how her property value may be adversely impacted due to the close proximity of the care facility to her home. She indicated she was concerned about the size, scale and mass of the proposed building. She reported the current view from her home was trees and this would be replaced with a large building. She proposed that consideration be made to lessen the height of the building to keep it more in line with the neighborhood. She explained she had serious concerns about the number of trees that would be removed and to the wildlife that would be impacted. She indicated she also needed to better understand the impact of the new utility installation. She understood trees could not be planted within the utility easement, which meant not one tree could be planted between her property and the back of the new building. This was very concerning to Ms. Hammisch. She understood that she did not own the skyline or the property at 19613 Highway 7. However, she believed there was a better solution for the proposed building. She recommended that the developer consider additional sound and visual barriers within the development. She requested the council be empathetic and wait to vote on this proposal until she can meet with the developer and the city to better understand the impacts, if any, on her property. She believed that whoever developed this site would want to be a welcomed addition to the neighborhood, that worked with the existing neighbors to ensure impacts were minimal. She thanked the council for allowing her to speak to express her concerns.

Wiersum requested staff provide a response to Mr. Devins question.

Gordon reported he has had a number of correspondences with Mr. Devins. He discussed the need for a utility connection along Sandy Lane. He explained the

developer would work with the property owners to get the utilities in the ground at this location, while not being overly disruptive.

Calvert stated many of the communications the council received mentioned the loss of property value. She asked staff to share their experience and knowledge of what happens when a large commercial property is located next to an R-1 neighborhood. She commented it was her understanding property values in Minnetonka do not decrease. Gordon reported this was always an area of concern for neighbors. He explained redevelopment in Minnetonka often times lead to greater reinvestment and stability in a neighborhood.

Schaepfi indicated he was trying to determine if the proposed location of the building was the best location on the property. He stated he was also struggling with the front versus rear trench. He reported the building had a 50 foot setback and noted the building was touching this setback to the rear. He requested further information on why the building was pushed back as far as possible. Gordon explained the site plan that was proposed came to staff was pretty good and managed the impeding issues on the site. He noted staff had not finessed the location of the building, parking lot or driveway. He indicated the location of the utility easement was the preferred corridor. He stated the corridor could not be located along the front of the building because of its proximity to Highway 7.

Schack explained she could appreciate the conundrum the easement created because there would be no room for a meaningful buffer. She questioned if the city could suggest or require some of the tree replacement take place on the neighboring property. Gordon reported this is a possibility. He indicated once the easement was in place staff would have more direction on where plantings could be located.

Kirk asked what the width of the trench would be and asked if it would push south onto the Hammisch property. Gordon discussed the easement that was needed would be located entirely on the care center property and would not impact the Hammisch property.

Kirk questioned if it would be difficult to get the utilities to the east because of the wetlands and creek. Gordon reported without redevelopment opportunities utility corridors don't happen. He stated this project would create an opportunity to push utilities to the east.

Kirk inquired how the medium density guiding for this property should be treated versus a property that was guided R-1. Gordon explained this property was guided for medium density and was zoned R-1 residential. He stated R-1 could continue to exist at a medium density comp plan guidance.

Wiersum stated the easement was a bit of a sticky wicket for this project. He indicated the easement to the north doesn't exist because a greater power (MNDOT) would preclude the city from pursuing this easement. Gordon reported this was the case. He noted the city has done its due diligence and explained MNDOT would not give the city a permit for an easement to the north. He stated this meant the only option available for the utility easement was for it to run along the south property line.

Wiersum commented MNDOT has been increasingly restrictive regarding access to Highway 7 and a number of access points to Highway 7 have been reduced or eliminated. Gordon reported this was a fair observation. He noted MNDOT has been limiting access to Highway 7 over the years.

Wiersum indicated the biggest challenge of this property has to do with the easement and buffering. He stated with the easement to the south the city's hands were tied. He questioned if consideration could be made to encourage the developer to move the building to the north to help mitigate some of the buffering concerns. Gordon commented this was a very good question. He explained the building could be moved further to the north, but this would mean more trees on the north would be lost in order to plant trees along the south property line. He stated this would be a give and take situation.

Wiersum stated with the easement difficulty, could the council recommend a condition that would require the developer to offer a certain number of trees or budget for trees to the neighboring southern property owners to place along the easement for buffering purposes. Gordon indicated with consent of the developer this would be a reasonable expectation.

Calvert commented there was a development at the corner of Highway 7 and 494. She noted the adjacent residents were concerned about tree loss and having the green buffer removed from the road. She understood that viewshed was not a right, but she suggested berming be considered for this development to help buffer this property both visually and for noise purposes. Gordon indicated this may be something to consider further. He reported the landscaping plan would need to be changed to address the buffer width and overstory trees. He anticipated the final solution would help in better addressing the buffering concerns. He suggested the council add language to the resolution ensuring the neighbors, staff and developer work together on a solution.

Schack stated she supported this suggestion, noting staff has been able to work with neighbors and developers in the past. She encouraged residents to consider what the alternatives would be if this care center were not approved. She explained she was comfortable with the proposed care facility.

Calvert agreed stating she understood this project would be a shock to the neighbors, but if this were not approved what else could be located on the site. She explained she supported adding language to the resolution regarding the landscaping concerns. She noted this was not an easy vote, but reported this project largely fits the needs of the community and does not violate any city ordinances. She indicated the developer was proposing to build a lovely building and she hoped more tree mitigation could be done on the site.

Carter stated she appreciated the comments that have been made regarding if not this then what. However, she also understood that 25% fewer residents would walk through the adjacent homes because it was located adjacent to a care facility and that property values could be reduced by up to \$75,000. She indicated that was real. She commented she would be supporting the proposed request, but she understood this was real and life changing for the adjacent residents. She explained if there was one issue she could find to vote against this project, she would.

Coakley asked if the mass of the building could be addressed by the developer, along with the building height. She anticipated this would help in addressing some of the neighbor's concerns. She encouraged the developer to consider additional buffering as well.

Kirk indicated if this parcel were to develop as a single family home or as townhomes, they would probably be two stories, which would be the same height as the proposed building. He commented on how the proposed care center would impact the neighborhood versus a row of townhomes. He encouraged the developer to move the property to the north, even if it was just five feet to allow for plantings along the southern property line. He explained he was willing to support this project, but recommended additional landscaping and buffers be put in place. He stated he would be willing to table action on this item if required.

Schaeppi commented he liked the project overall. He explained how as on the council because he was frustrated with how a land use application that impacted his property was handled. He discussed how important it was to get the landscaping right. He noted he was leaning towards supporting the request, but understood staff had more work to do with the neighbors and developer on the landscaping plan.

Wiersum stated he was largely in the same boat as the rest of the council. He believed the "if not this, then what" question was very relevant. He indicated this was a good location for this type of nursing home. He noted nursing homes were permitted uses in R-1 zoning districts. He understood there was a level of discomfort with approving something that has inadequate buffering. He commented as a council member he did not need to layout the buffering or landscaping plan. Rather, the council had to approve the plans and provide

direction to staff on how to proceed to ensure the buffering would improve. He questioned how the council should move forward at this time. Gordon recommended the council adopt a motion requiring the applicant to work with the adjacent neighbors and staff to develop and implement a suitable landscaping plan to address south side buffering on or offsite, the value of which shall not exceed what the applicant would have provided as required by ordinance. The applicant is not required to pay for or install landscaping on the neighboring property if the neighboring property does not consent to the installation.

Kirk asked if the proposed motion allows for the approval of the site and building plans, and if the building location could be altered. Gordon suggested the resolution language be amended to allow for slight movement of the building and parking lot to better accommodate buffering on the south side.

Calvert stated she would like to see adequate buffering and screening along the north side of the property as well.

Calvert moved, Schack seconded a motion to adopt Resolution 2020-111 approving the request as amended by the language above. All voted "yes." Motion carried.

Wiersum recessed the city council meeting.

Wiersum reconvened the city council meeting.

B. Items relating to the 2021 operating budget and levies

- 1) **Public consideration of proposed budget and levies**
- 2) **Resolution adopting a budget for the year 2021 and a revised budget for 2020; setting a tax levy for the year 2020, collectible in 2021; amending the 2021-2025 Capital Improvements Plan; and consenting to a special benefit tax levy of the Minnetonka Economic Development Authority**
- 3) **Resolution setting a tax levy for the Bassett Creek Watershed Management Tax District for the year 2020, collectible in 2021**

City Manager Geralyn Barone gave the staff report.

Wiersum thanked staff for the detailed report. He stated he appreciated all the steps the council took to keep expenses low for 2021, given the challenges the economy was facing.

Schack moved, Kirk seconded a motion to receive public comment on proposed budget and levies, and adopt Resolution 2020-112 and Resolution 2020-113. All voted "yes." Motion carried.

15. Appointments and Reappointments: None

16. Adjournment

Calvert moved, Coakley seconded a motion to adjourn the meeting at 10:55 p.m. All voted "yes." Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,


Becky Koosman
City Clerk