

## MEDINA CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF JANUARY 5, 2016

The City Council of Medina, Minnesota met in regular session on January 5, 2016 at 7:00 p.m. in the City Hall Chambers. Mayor Mitchell presided.

### **I. ROLL CALL**

**Members present:** Anderson, Cousineau, Pederson, Martin, and Mitchell.

**Members absent:** None.

**Also present:** City Administrator Scott Johnson, City Attorney Ron Batty, City Engineer Tom Kellogg, City Planner Dusty Finke, Planning Consultant Nate Sparks, Public Works Director Steve Scherer, and Public Safety Director Ed Belland.

### **II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE (7:00 p.m.)**

### **III. ADDITIONS TO THE AGENDA (7:00 p.m.)**

Johnson stated that staff received a last minute addition request for a raffle permit for the North Hennepin Area of Commerce. He noted that normally the item would appear on the Consent Agenda but because of the late addition the item should be considered under New Business.

*Moved by Anderson, seconded by Martin, to approve the agenda as amended. **Motion passed unanimously.***

### **IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES (7:01 p.m.)**

#### **A. Approval of the December 15, 2015 Special City Council Meeting Minutes**

It was noted in the third paragraph, regarding the draft vision statement, it should state, "...requested and received..."

*Moved by Anderson, seconded by Pederson, to approve the December 15,, 2015 special City Council meeting minutes as presented. **Motion passed unanimously.***

#### **B. Approval of the December 15, 2015 Regular City Council Meeting Minutes**

It was noted on page two, line nine, it should state, "...~~a willing seller~~ the owner of the property..." On page two, line ten, it should state, "...Tomann Park who may be interested in selling his property to the City..." On page two, line 15, it should state, "...Commission meeting, which included a review of the Bradford Creek Addition ~~which that...~~" On page two, line 23, it should state, "...~~their~~ its..." On page four, line 46, it should state, "...~~conservation easements~~ common areas..." On page four, line 49, it should state, "...~~stated that asked~~ ..." On page four, line 51, it should state, "...on the outlot-?" On page four, line 42, it should state, "...conservation easement..." On page five, line eight, it should state, "...~~that person in~~ a lesser valuation of ~~their~~ a person's property if a conservation easement is ~~contained~~ obtained over that property." On page six, line eight, it should state, "...~~there is~~ the existing contract contains a schedule of equipment..."

*Moved by Anderson, seconded by Cousineau, to approve the December 15, 2015 regular City Council meeting minutes as amended. **Motion passed unanimously.***

**V. CONSENT AGENDA (7:05 p.m.)**

There were no items.

**VI. COMMENTS (7:05 p.m.)**

**A. Comments from Citizens on Items not on the Agenda**

There were none.

**B. Park Commission**

Scherer stated that the Park Commission will meet the third Wednesday in January. He noted that the sliding hill and skating rink in Uptown Hamel have been a great hit and have been well used during the holiday break.

**C. Planning Commission**

Finke reported that the Planning Commission will meet the following week to hold a public hearing for a Conditional Use Permit for an outdoor seating area for a proposed brewery in Uptown Hamel. He stated that it is also likely that the Commission will review the mission statement and goals and visions from the Comprehensive Plan Steering Committee.

**VII. PRESENTATIONS**

**A. Swearing in Ceremony for Medina Police Officer Joshua McKinley  
(7:07 p.m.)**

Belland introduced the newest member of the Medina Police Department, Joshua McKinley. He noted that McKinley has experience with Medina as he previously held the position of Community Service Officer before becoming a Police Officer in Buffalo. He stated that they are excited to have him back in Medina as he is a great employee and has a great work ethic.

Mitchell administered the Oath of Office to new Police Officer Joshua McKinley and welcomed him to the City.

Belland invited McKinley's mother to come forward and pin the badge on to his vest.

Mitchell stated that this is the first Police Officer that he has sworn in and stated that Medina takes the duties of the Police Department seriously and that he has confidence in the Police Department in Medina. He noted that they have not received any complaints on the Medina Police Department and he is proud of the great job they do.

**B. Hennepin County Commissioner Jeff Johnson (7:11 p.m.)**

Jeff Johnson, Hennepin County Commissioner, provided an update from the recent activity of the County. He stated that the organizational meeting was held today and the Chair was unanimously reappointed, noting that he was reappointed as Chair of the Public Safety Committee. He stated that the budget was passed a few weeks ago and noted that he voted against the budget because he felt that further cuts could be made to reduce the impact to property taxes. He noted that he is optimistic that there will be more of an appetite to make those reviews and changes in 2016, such as a pay for performance measure for vendors. He referenced stories from the past year regarding

failures in the area of child protection and stated that there is no excuse for those incidents and believed that significant changes would be made this year in the child protection department that, while they may not be liked, will be necessary.

Martin asked where Commissioner Johnson believes that the most cuts could be made in the budget.

Commissioner Johnson referenced the health and human services area, which is roughly 50 percent of the budget. He noted that there are outdated contracts that could be revised and measures for performance could be enacted to ensure that the right programs are being funded and unnecessary programs could be cut. He stated that he is a member of the Audit Committee and stated that there is a staff of four to five people that are constantly doing audits on vendors but believed more could be done.

Mitchell stated that there was an expose' this past year regarding fraud in the area of human services.

Commissioner Johnson stated that there is a pretty strong fraud unit but noted that it can sometimes be difficult in a county as large as Hennepin County to detect fraud.

Mitchell stated that although increases may only be one or two percent, in a budget of that size it makes a difference over the years.

Commissioner Johnson agreed. He noted that in 2010 and 2011 the property tax was held flat, which was the first time that had been done since the 1980's.

Pederson thanked Commissioner Johnson for his pushback. He stated that government has gotten out of control and thinks that there needs to be more people that are willing to push back.

Anderson thanked Commissioner Johnson for his assistance with the improvement of the 394 bypass.

Cousineau echoed the comments of Pederson as the budget situation is also important to her. She acknowledged that there can be pressure to vote with the group and appreciated that he was willing to speak up.

## **VIII. NEW BUSINESS**

### **A. Bradford Creek Addition – Preliminary/Final Plat and Right-of-Way Vacation – 2872 Ardmore Avenue – Public Hearing (7:21 p.m.)**

Johnson stated that this request would combine together eight substandard lots to create two standard lots and would also include the vacation of right-of-way for Palm Street. He noted that the original platting was done in the 1920's.

Finke stated that the request would replat the eight properties owned by the applicant, which were platted in the 1920's and are now substandard in the Shoreland Overlay district, to create two conforming lots. He noted that the request would also vacate a portion of the right-of-way on Palm Street which would be included in square footage of the lots when they are platted. He stated that historically there was a home that straddled the center of the property but the property is currently vacant. He displayed

the Preliminary Plat which was included in the Council packet for review. He noted that because the right-of-way to be vacated is requested to be included in the platted lots, he would recommend reviewing that request first. He noted that there is no existing street or street improvements in the right-of-way and staff believes that there would be sufficient right-of-way to the north of the vacated area for future needs or uses. He noted that the lots as proposed would meet the requirements of the zoning district and advised that the additional square footage that would be added to the lots with the vacation of the right-of-way would provide additional flexibility for the purchasers of the lots in order to meet the 25 percent hardcover maximum within that district. He reviewed the tree preservation ordinance requirements, noting that notification for future buyers is recommended to be included.

Martin referenced the tree preservation ordinance and noted that there appear to be two different figures used, 15 percent and 20 percent, and asked for clarification.

Finke explained that the tree preservation ordinance actually allows removal for the initial site development, which would be 15 percent, and additional removal for other activities such as building of the home, which would be 20 percent.

Martin referenced the proposed right-of-way vacation and asked why the utility and drainage easement was not being retained fully.

Finke explained that is a common condition depending on the circumstances but in this case staff does not believe there would be a likely use above what is already specified.

Martin stated that since the applicant is getting the benefit of the additional property for no additional charge, she would support keeping a full drainage and utility easement. She stated that with the City owned property to the north, a trail easement could be laid over the drainage and utility easement which would allow the City the ability to install a trail in that location in the future.

Mitchell asked how the path would reach the City property from Palm Street.

Finke identified public right-of-way in the area and stated that the City owned property is not accessible from Palm Street.

Pederson agreed with the comments made by Martin.

Anderson stated that it would not harm the applicant but would provide options for the City.

Mitchell opened the public hearing at 7:37 p.m.

Terry Richmond, 2900 County Road 19, stated that he does not have an opinion on the matter but is looking for additional information. He asked what would happen in the case that an adjacent property owner on Palm Street asked to have their right-of-way vacated, specifically whether that would be possible. He asked if there is an advantage, in addition to the property owner, to any of the other neighbors or the City to vacate the right-of-way.

Martin stated that the tax base would be enhanced as the property is currently not taxable. She stated that another element for consideration would be planning for how that area would be developed, noting that if large road improvements are not planned or desired, then right-of-way could be vacated.

Richmond noted that there is City owned property near his home and asked if he or one of his neighbors would be able to request the vacation of that property.

Martin explained the type of property that can be requested for vacation, such as easements and right-of-way, noting that not all City owned property can be vacated.

Batty stated that the other thing to keep in mind is that the typical rule is that property that is vacated goes back to other properties in the plat, but noted that it is not always split equally as it would return to the original property that dedicated the land in their plat.

Richmond highlighted the two tax forfeited parcels that are City owned that he was speaking in regard to.

Batty explained that tax forfeited property is acquired in a different method than easements and right-of-way and therefore are treated differently.

Mitchell referenced the City owned land north on Palm Street, noting that it is not buildable land, and therefore the vacation of right-of-way could be supported. He confirmed the consensus of the Council.

Mitchell closed the public hearing at 7:46 p.m.

*Moved by Martin, seconded by Anderson, to vacate the portion of Palm Street right-of-way adjacent to the subject property as outlined in the agenda packet, subject to the applicant granting easements to use the same property in favor of the City or public for drainage, utilities, and trails or sidewalks.*

Further discussion: Mitchell asked if Ardmore is an irregular width street and that is why the additional ten feet are being requested.

Finke agreed that is the reasoning for the additional right-of-way for Ardmore.

***Motion passed unanimously.***

*Moved by Martin, seconded by Anderson, to direct staff to prepare resolutions approving the Bradford Creek Addition plat and the requested vacation of Palm Street based upon the findings noted in the staff report and subject to the conditions recommended by the Planning Commission. **Motion passed unanimously.***

**B. Kal Point Site Plan Review and PUD Amendment – 340 Clydesdale Trail  
(7:50 p.m.)**

Johnson stated that this request is in regard to an amendment to a PUD to include a larger building than what was originally requested in the PUD.

Sparks stated that this is a PUD amendment and Site Plan Review for a parcel within Kal Point within the Clydesdale Marketplace. He identified the parcel which is adjacent

to the Wells Fargo site and north of the Goddard School site. He stated that this would be a two story building which would house a restaurant on the ground floor with office space on the second floor. He noted that the building proposed is larger than what was originally included in the PUD, which has an impact on impervious surface and parking. He identified an area proposed to be pervious pavement. He reviewed the parking requirements for the site and the available parking for the site, noting that the applicant is proposing to use the excess Target parking to fulfil their parking requirements. He noted that the site is quite removed from the Target parking lot. He explained that the development agreement requires for each tenant to supply sufficient parking but then also allows for shared parking between tenants. He also reviewed the recommendation from the Planning Commission for a fence to be installed along the retaining wall, and the updated plan from the applicant which shows that fencing. He stated that this PUD requires four sided architecture and noted that the applicant meets the requirements for design. He stated that when the Planning Commission reviewed the request there was not a primary entrance on the front of the building and the Commission had significant discussion around that issue and requested a grand main entrance on the front of the building. He advised that the applicant redesigned the layout of the building in order to accommodate the entrance as requested. He noted that the applicant originally proposed signage for three sides of the building and as requested by the Planning Commission has moved one of the signs to the side requested by the Commission, as to not disturb the adjacent residential area. He provided details on the proposed layout and flow of traffic for the site. He stated that the Planning Commission recommended approval and noted that the applicant has already met some of the conditions recommended by the Commission. He noted that additional documentation and signage would be needed for the shared parking before the resolution for approval would come back before the Council for approval. He stated that the Council should also consider whether the revised front entrance would be sufficient to meet the suggestions of the Planning Commission.

Pederson asked for additional details on the shared parking.

Batty stated that like all shopping centers there is a set of covenants that deals with issues such as access and parking. He stated that the covenants provides for shared parking between the users but noted that in order to be able to utilize that shared parking the tenant must be able to prove that they have enough parking to support their use before qualifying for the shared parking. He stated that he is not convinced that the user has enough parking to support their own use in order to qualify for the shared parking. He stated that the City is looking for the applicant to demonstrate that their shared parking allowed in the covenants would be available through their proposed parking.

Pederson stated that perhaps the applicant could provide valet parking, which would utilize the far spots near target.

Kalyan (Kal) Vempaty, applicant, stated that the upstairs office space will be used as a data center and would have six to seven employees that would use the space from 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. He noted that the office use requires 15 spaces but the office use would only use half of those and would be using those spaces at an alternate time to the restaurant. He advised that they are also working with Wellington to obtain an additional 15 stalls that will be closer to the space.

Anderson asked if Wells Fargo is willing to provide anything in writing.

Kal Vempaty stated that Wells Fargo is not willing to put it into writing and that is when they spoke with Wellington who stated that they would be able to provide the additional parking spaces.

Martin stated that as long as the City knows that the restaurant has the private easements, which could be amended or augmented by Wellington, to support the parking within the development, that would satisfy the parking in her opinion. She noted that could be a lengthy process to obtain the necessary signatures from Target. She did not consider it unlikely that the agreement could be obtained.

Anderson asked where the Wellington parking is located in proximity to the site.

Finke highlighted the parking spaces in discussion.

Mitchell asked if there is a sidewalk that would run from the site to the parking.

Finke stated that there is a trail in existence but noted that staff recommends a continuation of the trail.

Mitchell asked for the division of parking stalls required between the restaurant and office spaces.

Sparks replied that the office space requires 15 stalls and the restaurant requires 40 stalls.

Kal Vempaty provided additional information on the amount of space that will be occupied by the data center.

Mitchell asked if there are different divisions and requirements within the office requirements.

Sparks noted that there is not additional division, simply an office requirement.

Finke stated that there is flexibility for the office requirements for parking but noted that the office use can be transitioning throughout the application.

Martin stated that the Council must consider typical office use as the applicant would be free to lease the office property to other users in the future, and therefore the office use may change.

Cousineau referenced the sidewalk by Caribou and asked whether a pedestrian crossing would be needed if the users were to use that sidewalk.

Finke stated that they are not encouraging use of that parking for this use.

Mitchell stated that although the building may meet the standard, he is not thrilled with the look of the building as it does not appear to be a beautiful building in his opinion.

Greg Dahling, Finn Daniels Architects, stated that they started with the square design and then used the design materials and suggestions in the PUD in order to construct a

building that would blend with the other buildings in the development. He believed there was a good blend of materials proposed.

Martin stated that the texture is perhaps lost in the two dimensional sketch and asked the architect to provide additional details.

Dahling provided additional details and noted that samples of the materials are available and on display at the meeting for the Council to review. He also provided additional details on the entrances. He noted that the majority of the parking is provided along the back of the building and therefore that is why the main entrance was provided in that location. He stated that they did take into account the input of the Planning Commission in order to add a secondary entrance on the front of the building as well, but noted that the main entrance would remain on the back side of the building as that is the most functional and logistical location. He noted that both entrances would be entrances to the restaurant.

Mitchell asked who is responsible for plowing the trail on Clydesdale.

Scherer replied that Clydesdale would be a City trail and therefore would be plowed by the City.

Martin noted that the sidewalks within the development are maintained and plowed by the development.

Mitchell stated that a lot of questions arise when you attempt to squeeze a building twice the size of the original intent into the space. He noted that without the office space the site would almost meet the parking requirements and acknowledged that the office and restaurants will use parking at different times of the day. He asked if the restaurant space would be leased to an outside business.

Kal Vempaty stated that he would own the restaurant and noted that the intent is to model after Applebee's and be open from 11:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m.

Pederson stated that he likes the pervious pavement but noted that there is additional maintenance that is needed for that type of material.

Mitchell stated that there would be an easement from the pervious pavement to the wetland and noted that additional language can be added to the easement agreement that would specify that they must maintain the pavement and if that is not done the City can use the easement to access the pervious pavement and provide the necessary maintenance at a cost that would be assessed to the applicant.

Finke provided additional insight on the shared parking, noting that although the Target parking is not too distant from the site there is closer parking that users may choose to use rather than the Target site.

Mitchell stated that the applicant could be responsible for policing their patron parking. He stated that if the business is very busy they could offer valet parking on weekend nights in order to ensure patrons are parking in the correct locations.

Martin stated that it appears the Council is micromanaging the situation more than necessary as the covenants would specify the shared parking available for the applicant. She noted that it would be up to the applicant whether or not to choose items such as valet parking as the parking demand is not fully known. She stated that she is comfortable with the recommendations from the Planning Commission in regard to parking. She noted that there are some conditions that she would not deem necessary, such as the signage for shared parking as that would be governed under the covenants for the development, and also suggested a condition 16.

Aaron Amick, Medina resident and owner of Goddard School, stated that the signage is important for his business for a few reasons. He referenced the entrance to the restaurant and the entrance to the school, noting that they line up. He explained that while Wellington seems to be flexible with this user, they were not flexible with the school and sharing of parking was not allowed for their site. He stated that for that reason the school is left with the expense of plowing and maintenance for their parking lot. He noted that additional wear and tear would be his responsibility and not of the development.

Martin stated that if there are exclusive rights for his parking then he would most likely have the right to sign that as well, but that would be his responsibility and not the responsibility of the applicant.

Amick stated that he did not see the harm in requiring the signage as the applicant has stated that they are going to be under parked. He noted that there would be a safety element as well with the small children being dropped off and picked up from his location.

Mitchell stated that he would agree with the additional condition suggested by Martin but would also leave in condition 12 in regard to the signage with the additional language that the signage be controlled by the applicant.

Martin stated that perhaps the language state the applicant or owner.

Pederson asked who would be paying for the sidewalk.

Mitchell stated that it most likely would be a part of the shared parking agreement.

Batty believed that this would be paid for by the applicant. He explained that the Council is being asked to direct staff to prepare the PUD amendment, which would include a development agreement, and Site Plan, noting that the item will not come back until the shared parking agreement is detailed. He noted that tonight would not be the final decision.

*Moved by Anderson, seconded by Martin, to direct staff to prepare a resolution approving the Kal Point PUD and Site Plan based upon the findings noted in the staff report and subject to the conditions recommended by the Planning Commission and the additions suggested by Councilmember Martin and Mayor Mitchell. **Motion passed unanimously.***

Mitchell briefly recessed the meeting at 8:48 p.m.

Mitchell reconvened the meeting at 8:55 p.m.

**C. Just for Kix – Rezoning from UH-2 to CH-RR – 45 Highway 55 (8:55 p.m.)**

Johnson stated that this request is for a rezoning from Uptown Hamel 2 to Commercial-Highway Railroad. He noted that the site is split between Medina and Plymouth and therefore a rezoning is being requested in both cities.

Finke stated that this request comes with the anticipation of a future commercial development. He explained that this is a unique situation in which the property is bisected by the municipal line and therefore the rezoning request is going before Plymouth and Medina ahead of the development request. He referenced a similar property near this site that was rezoned 2.5 years ahead of the commercial development that eventually followed and became the adjacent Aldi site. He stated that the applicant, Just for Kix, is a dance studio. He stated that the rezoning request would match the zoning of the neighboring parcels. He stated that the City has a high level of discretion when considering rezoning requests and noted that the Planning Commission held a public hearing and recommended unanimous approval because of the similar zoning for the neighboring parcels.

Pederson asked what would happen if Plymouth did not rezone the parcel within their boundary.

Finke stated that the parcel is already zoned in a commercial holding designation and therefore would be zoned to commercial in Plymouth at some time in the future.

Cousineau asked and received confirmation that if approved the parcel would be rezoned commercial regardless of if the applicant were to step away from the project and any commercial use could use the site. She also asked and received confirmation that staff has recommended that the applicant build solely in Medina to avoid future conflicts by building in two municipalities.

Andy Brandel, ISG, spoke in representation of the applicant and stated that they have been working with staff from both Plymouth and Medina to rezone the parcel. He noted that he will be attending the Plymouth Planning Commission meeting the following night.

Mitchell asked if Plymouth could just give Medina the triangle of space that would be used for parking.

Batty stated that they certainly could do that but thought it unlikely. He stated that there should not be any problems if the building is solely within Medina.

Martin asked if this is related to the petition and waiver for the road improvements.

Batty stated that this is not directly related and provided additional details on the road project. He noted that will be discussed further along in the fall during the assessment discussions for the road improvement project.

*Moved by Pederson, seconded by Anderson, to direct staff to prepare an ordinance rezoning the property at 45 Highway 55 to Commercial-Highway Railroad with the condition recommended by the Planning Commission and staff. **Motion passed unanimously.***

**D. Woodland Hill Preserve Sign Variance – Public Hearing (9:06 p.m.)**

Johnson stated that there was a request from Woodland Hill Preserve for a sign variance.

Sparks stated that this is a variance for the location of the monument sign. He provided additional details noting that typically monument signs must be setback ten feet from the property line but the applicant is proposing to put the sign at the property line. He highlighted the originally proposed location for the sign and advised that for some practical reasons that location did not work and the sign is proposed to be located on the other side of the road. He stated that if the sign were originally shown in that location on the plans there most likely would not have been any concerns. He stated that there are some concerns with the proximity of the sign to the sidewalk and utilities. He stated that the recommendation of staff is to simply move the sign back ten feet to meet the front setback and leave the side setback variance, as that property is an outlot. He noted that the sign would still be visible from that location.

Justin Bannwarth, spoke in representation of the applicant Gonyea Development, stated that there were complications with the original sign location. He noted that there is a large tree that limits the visibility to the monument sign if the sign is setback the additional ten feet from the front. He requested both the front and side yard variances. He noted that the monument sign helps to distinguish the development.

Mitchell opened the public hearing at 9:14 p.m.

No comments made.

Mitchell closed the public hearing at 9:14 p.m.

Finke stated that staff and the Planning Commission oppose the front yard variance as it would interfere with the utilities and there is not strong reasoning. He noted that the sign could just as well be within the outlot.

Martin stated that while she can appreciate the statement that the side yard variance would not have an impact because of the outlot, she did not believe that the variance criteria have been met and therefore did not see that either variance could be approved.

Cousineau stated that was her initial thought as well that the practical difficulties were not proven as it was the planning of the applicant that caused this situation.

Anderson stated that he could also support denying both variances although he would like to help the applicant as well.

Pederson stated that he concurs with the Council comments but also likes the benefit of saving the tree.

*Moved by Anderson, seconded by Cousineau, to direct staff to prepare a resolution denying the variance request because it is not consistent with the variance review criteria. **Motion passed unanimously.***

**E. Resolution 2016-01 Establishing 2016 Appointments and Designations to Various City Services, Authorities, Commissions and Agencies (9:20 p.m.)**

Mitchell stated that the Council appointments would remain the same as those are designated for two year terms.

Johnson noted an update of a reappointment and new appointment to the Planning Commission each for three year terms.

*Moved by Martin, seconded by Anderson, to approve the resolution establishing 2016 appointments and designations to various City services, authorities, Commissions and agencies. **Motion passed unanimously.***

**F. Raffle Permit Request for the North Hennepin Area of Commerce (9:23 p.m.)**

Johnson presented the raffle permit approval, noting that staff received the request earlier today. He stated that there is a 30 day window for the State to approve the permit and therefore staff wanted to move the item along quickly. He noted that staff is also researching whether this could be done administratively in the future.

*Moved by Martin, seconded by Pederson, to approve the raffle permit request from the North Hennepin Area of Commerce for February 5, 2016 at the Medina Golf and Country Club. **Motion passed unanimously.***

**IX. CITY ADMINISTRATOR REPORT (9:24 p.m.)**

Johnson reported that the Medina Comprehensive Plan Steering Committee will be meeting the following night at City Hall at 6:30 p.m. He stated that he is also working with Finke to prepare agreements for the City Hall office improvement project.

**X. MAYOR & CITY COUNCIL REPORTS (9:24 p.m.)**

There were none.

**XI. APPROVAL TO PAY THE BILLS (9:25 p.m.)**

*Moved by Martin, seconded by Cousineau, to approve the bills, EFT 003455E-003480E for \$97,746.54, order check numbers 43760-43835 for \$170,377.45, payroll EFT 506848-506901 for \$94,732.35 and payroll check number 020434 for \$97.14. **Motion passed unanimously.***

**XII. POTENTIAL CLOSED SESSION: PARK LAND ACQUISITION: 4003 APACHE DRIVE**

*Moved by Martin, seconded by Anderson, to adjourn to closed session at 9:27 p.m. to discuss park land acquisition at 4003 Apache Drive. **Motion passed unanimously.***

The meeting reconvened to open session at 9:43 p.m.

**XIII. ADJOURN**

*Moved by Anderson, seconded by Cousineau, to adjourn the meeting at 9:43 p.m. **Motion passed unanimously.***

---

Bob Mitchell, Mayor

Attest:

---

Jodi M. Gallup, City Clerk