

## **MEDINA CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 1, 2015**

The City Council of Medina, Minnesota met in regular session on September 1, 2015 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 Jim Stremel, City Planner Dusty Finke, Finance Director Erin Barnhart, 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.)**

The agenda was approved as presented.

### **IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES (7:00 p.m.)**

#### **A. Approval of the August 18, 2015 Special City Council Meeting Minutes**

*Moved by Pederson, seconded by Martin, to approve the August 18, 2015 special City Council meeting minutes as presented. **Motion passed unanimously.***

#### **B. Approval of the August 18, 2015 Regular City Council Meeting Minutes**

It was noted on page three, line 22, it should state, "similar to other prairie plantings lots..." On page three, line 31, it should state, "...~~60~~ 50 foot right of way..." On page seven, beginning line 38, the following text should be added, "Finke also discussed the possible trail to the south. Staff had concerns with the proposed connection to the Medina Morningside Neighborhood from the August 11<sup>th</sup> plan revision because of the steep slopes. The applicant addressed these concerns through a trail connection to the north with their latest revised plans. However, the possible trail to south would also provide an adventuresome connection for some residents, but would still require maintenance.

Pederson asked if the trail to the south could be closed during the winter months.

Finke stated that the trails could not be plowed, but could be available for cross country skiing or other activities per the direction of the Park Commission and City Council.

Finke reviewed the proposed recommended motion in the staff report."

*Moved by Anderson, seconded by Pederson, to approve the August 18, 2015 regular City Council meeting minutes as amended. **Motion passed unanimously.***

### **V. CONSENT AGENDA (7:03 p.m.)**

#### **A. Approve 2015 Staff Needs Analysis**

- B. **Approve Job Description and Appointment of Full-time Transcriptionist/Finance Clerk Position**
- C. **Approve Assistant City Administrator/City Clerk Job Description and Reclassification**
- D. **Approve Letter in Support of Mediacom Broadband Development Grant Application with DEED**
- E. **Resolution No. 2015-73 Accepting Resignation of Jacquiel Nissen**
- F. **Approve Job Description for Part-time Planning Office Assistant and Authorize Recruitment and Appointment of Position**

Cousineau referenced an organizational chart that was discussed previously and received confirmation that will be provided.

Martin requested and received confirmation that the person next in charge behind Johnson will be a senior Department Head and would also be identified.

*Moved by Anderson, seconded by Cousineau, to approve the consent agenda. **Motion passed unanimously.***

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

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

There were none.

### B. **Park Commission**

Scherer reported that the Park Commission did not meet this month but held an open house the previous week.

Johnson reported that the Fields of Medina Park grand opening occurred the previous Wednesday and a movie in the park was hosted there as well. He stated that there was an excellent turn out and thanked the residents that attended along with the staff and sponsors (Highway 55 Rental and Jimmy's Pizza) that assisted with the event.

### C. **Planning Commission**

Finke stated that the Planning Commission will meet the following week to consider a Conditional Use Permit for Three Rivers Church to operate in an existing office building in Uptown Hamel. He noted that the Commission will also consider an amendment to the Wealshire Site Plan.

## VII. PRESENTATIONS

### A. **2016 Preliminary Budget and Tax Levy (7:08 p.m.)**

Mitchell stated that the Council has reviewed the preliminary 2016 budget and tax levy and there are a number of Resolutions for approval to consider along with the establishment of a public hearing date.

Johnson stated that Barnhart was present at the 6:00 p.m. Council work session earlier this evening to review the budget items in detail and at this meeting will provide a brief overview.

Barnhart stated that this is the preliminary budget and tax levy as the final figures would be adopted at the first meeting in December. She stated that the Council has discussed

major budget issues including the fact that revenues continue to decrease as expenditures continue to increase. She explained that while department budgets have remained stable, contracts and operation costs have increased by three to four percent each year. She stated that the City does not receive local State aid, although municipal State aid was restored in 2013. She highlighted the differences between the 2015 general fund and the proposed budget for 2015 and noted that the tax levy would decrease from 23.58 percent in 2015 to 23.46 percent in 2016. She briefly reviewed changes to the general fund, expenditures and revenue figures. She stated that there will be additional expenditures for the Comprehensive Plan updates that will be necessary and noted that in the future the item will be planned for by setting funds aside each year in order to plan for expenditures such as the Comprehensive Plan and elections. She reviewed the proposed staff changes and title changes. She reviewed the proposed property tax levy and the impact of the Tower Drive improvement project, which was bonded for this year.

Martin asked if the City spent more on roads this year with the Tower Drive project compared to the average year.

Barnhart confirmed that the Tower Drive project was a large project that had been pushed off during the recession and noted the increase to the levy due to the project. However, she noted that the road costs will decrease in the next year. She stated that staff attempts to spread out the funds evenly.

Mitchell stated that Tower Drive is an urban roadway with curb and gutter, noting that rural roadways do not include that aspect and therefore would not be as expensive.

Barnhart provided a comparison of the tax rate for Medina to neighboring communities and also reviewed the taxes payable and tax rate history for Medina from 2007 through 2015. She stated that there were increases but that has leveled off with the completion of the second City facility (the police and public works building). She reviewed the long-term road needs including the upgrades to the Highway 55/CR 116 intersection that will occur in 2017 and the Capital Improvement Plan. She stated that fire will continue to be a long-term need including equipment and facility expansions, noting that those items will continue to be discussed along with renovations to City Hall. She stated that the replacement needs of City equipment will also be considered along with the best method for funding.

Mitchell asked if the City is satisfied that the 20 year financial plan is stable.

Barnhart confirmed that the plan is up to date. She highlighted the utility increase of three percent, which is standard and is in line with the utility analysis.

Mitchell explained that if adopted the preliminary levy could be reduced until the December 1<sup>st</sup> public hearing when the final decision would be made, noting that the preliminary levy cannot be increased during that time.

**1. Resolution No. 2015-74 Approving Proposed Tax Levy for 2016**

*Moved by Martin, seconded by Anderson, to adopt resolution no. 2015-74 approving the 2016 preliminary tax levy. **Motion passed unanimously.***

2. **Resolution No. 2015-75 Approving Proposed General Fund Budget for 2016**

*Moved by Martin, seconded by Anderson, to adopt resolution no. 2015-75 approving the 2016 preliminary general fund budget. Motion passed unanimously.*

3. **Resolution No. 2015-76 Reducing Debt Service Tax Levies for 2016**

*Moved by Martin, seconded by Anderson, to adopt resolution no. 2015-76 reducing debt service tax levies for 2016. Motion passed unanimously.*

4. **Establish Public Discussion Date for Final 2016 Tax Levy and Budget**

*Moved by Martin, seconded by Anderson, to establish the 2016 final tax levy and budget discussion for December 1, 2015 at 7:00 p.m. in City Hall. Motion passed unanimously.*

VIII. **OLD BUSINESS**

A. **Ordinance Regarding Setbacks for Decks from Upland Buffers; Amending Chapter 8 of the City Code (7:27 p.m.)**

Finke stated that the Council requested additional information following their discussion at the last meeting. He stated that three examples were provided as they were the most interested in the process and are all homeowners within The Enclave development. He stated that staff has been working with the most interested homeowners on possible alternatives and believed that they have found a way to accommodate decks that they would be satisfied with, using the average wetland buffers. He stated that the Planning Commission did not recommend action on this item.

Mitchell stated that it appears the pressing need seems to have gone away and noted that if the Council does not want to amend Chapter 8 of the Code a motion could be made to that effect.

Finke stated that the application has been withdrawn and therefore no action is necessary if the Council does not wish to amend Chapter 8 of the City Code.

Mitchell confirmed that the Council would not like to take any action.

B. **Sewer and Water connection Fee Policy Discussion**

Finke stated that during the work session at the last meeting this policy was discussed. He stated that the issue arose due to the fact that the sewer and water connection (SAC) fees are high compared to other communities, which is due to the infrastructure needed to generate water and the small base the City has to recoup those costs. He stated that the Council expressed some interest in looking into ways, which could lessen the blow to smaller business owners as the connection fee does have an impact on those small business owners. He stated that the connection fees are established in the City's fee schedule and noted that the Ordinance is proposed to be amended to include text that would state the City could deviate from the Metropolitan (Met) Council's SAC policy. He noted that the connection fee per unit would be changed but the policy would give credit to the small businesses, to which the fee would be applied. He explained that two credits would be granted to a use moving into a building that has previously paid City fees. He provided examples of how this could apply to recently approved applications. He referenced restaurants and stated that there has been an interest in the city in trying

to locate a restaurant in Medina and noted that the way the fees are based that would be a very significant upfront cost for a restaurant. He stated that staff is suggesting a reduction in the fee for a restaurant use, if the Council is interested in procuring a restaurant in the city. He stated that another example would be bars and coffee shops that use a different calculation and therefore have half of the fee a restaurant would have, and could be a method to ease into the reduction. He noted that further reduction could be made if desired in the future. He asked for discussion and direction from the Council on that type of use.

Mitchell asked what Caribou Coffee did.

Finke replied that Caribou paid the fee based on one unit equaling 23 seats, noting that use has fewer dishes than a restaurant would have and that is possibly why the Met Council calculations come up differently. He stated that in the past staff has felt that the Met Council numbers differ from actual uses. He stated that if the fee is reduced for restaurants it would not be based on actual use but the attempt to incentivize that type of use.

Pederson stated that he feels that it is important to reduce the fee for restaurants in order to attract that type of use and also believed that it would be beneficial to do something similar for commercial and industrial uses as well in order to draw in those uses as well.

Johnson agreed that this could be the first step and industrial and commercial uses could be reviewed next. He stated that staff could work on industrial and commercial uses in the future and bring that back to the Council for further review.

Mitchell asked why SAC charges would come into play if a warehouse was expanding warehouse space but not creating an additional bathroom.

Johnson explained that it would be based on anticipated water use and in essence additional employees would have an additional water use.

Martin asked if the City fees are comparable to other metro cities.

Finke explained that Medina's fees are three to four times higher than other communities are because there is a difficulty getting the water and making it of quality to be used. He stated that there are more wells to get the same amount of water that someone on the sand plains gets, plus the water is not great and needs to be treated. He noted that there is a smaller base of expected growth to support the infrastructure necessary.

Mitchell stated that he liked the concept of issuing credits rather than reducing the fee amount.

Johnson confirmed that industrial and commercial uses could also be explored; noting that restaurants were a starting point and staff can continue the analysis.

Mitchell stated that as the City moves forward on this and a restaurant moves in during 2016, perhaps an analysis could be done in 2018 to determine the amount of usage that the business actually experiences.

Finke stated that it is anticipated that the actual water usage would be more but the credits would help to incentivize uses that the City would like to attract.

Martin referenced the proposed credit of two units for a business moving into an existing space.

Finke stated that staff looked at the option of four credits but that would be a relatively large use and slid that down to two units.

Martin clarified that the credits would be given to businesses moving into a building that has already paid an equal amount of at least two SAC units. She asked how the reduced figure would compare to fees for similar restaurant uses in other communities in this area.

Finke stated that Medina has a higher fee per unit, about three to four times that of other communities, and noted that if reduced by two units the fee would then be in line with neighboring communities.

Martin referenced Item 2A and asked if a restaurant has one more seat, such as 32 instead of 31, would it be required to add another unit.

Finke stated that rounding to the nearest whole number would be used and noted that additional clarifying language could be added.

Martin asked if a full service restaurant should have a greater water allocation charged compared to a coffee shop or wine bar, which would have a more limited use of water.

Mitchell stated that there is faster turnover in a coffee shop or wine bar.

Finke stated that restaurants could be shifted to the figure used for coffee shops and bars and coffee shops and bars could be raised to one unit per 31 seats, or both could be set at the one per 23 seats.

Martin stated that the credit mentioned in 2B should be clarified that it could only be used to the extent of the new use being not greater than the prior use.

Finke provided additional information regarding a multi-tenant retail center and noted that a multiplier could be used to add additional clarification.

Mitchell stated that staff could make the amendments proposed tonight and bring back the revised version for the Council to review at the next meeting.

Martin stated that there is also a broad policy discussion as the fees are set to provide for the infrastructure needed in the future and the decision that will be necessary as to whether the tax payers are willing to make up the difference in order to bring in desired businesses and uses.

*Moved by Anderson, seconded by Martin, to direct staff to amend the proposed ordinance as directed by the Council. **Motion passed unanimously.***

## **IX. NEW BUSINESS**

**A. Willow Manor – Preliminary and Final Plat with Variance – 2782 Willow Drive (and property to east) – Public Hearing (8:01 p.m.)**

Finke presented a request to subdivide a property into one buildable lot and one outlot. He stated that history on the subject property is included in the staff report noting that the property is one parcel that was issued two property identification numbers (PID) because the property lies within two watershed jurisdictions. He stated that at a point the property was conveyed to two different property owners, so the parcel is now owned by two different parties. He stated that the requested subdivision would divide the property based on the ownership lines. He stated that by platting one lot in an outlot that attempts to mimic the City's vision that construction could only occur on one half of the lot. He stated that there was a home on the western half of the property that was demolished in anticipation of building a new home on the property. He stated that the property and surrounding lands are zoned rural residential, noting that the proposed lot includes 3.5 acres of suitable soil which does not meet the minimum of five acres of suitable soils required in the zoning district. He stated that one acre of the lot is currently held in easement and staff has suggested those easements be cleared up to unrestrict further acreage. He stated that the applicant seeks to replace the demolished home. He noted that staff has had a number of conversations with the applicant over the years and suggested that one of the owners buy out the other but that was not agreed upon. He stated that the designation of one lot as an outlot would ensure that area would not be built upon and increase the density of the area. He reviewed the variance and subdivision criteria the Council must consider when reviewing the request. He stated that the Planning Commission had a fair amount of discussion when considering this request last month and were ultimately split three to three in their vote. He stated that the Council should hold a public hearing on the variance request.

Bob Beuhler, 1321 South Street in Wayzata, stated that they did a fair amount of due diligence before purchasing the property in February of 2011 and were satisfied that they would be able to purchase a conforming lot where they could demolish the three existing structures, which totaled 3,000 square feet, and construct a home on the lot. He stated that based on the existence of the PIDs and ongoing discussions with the City they purchased the property along with title insurance. He stated that two years later they discovered through discussion that they only own a portion of a lot and they did not have recourse against the seller or agent and that the title insurance would not assist either. He stated that they have not found any financially viable options to purchase additional land. He stated that he has no complaints on the recommended conditions included in the staff report and noted that the owner of the outlot has also signed off on the application and supports the request. He stated that the Planning Commission was worried that this would create a precedent but did not believe that would be a risk because there are probably not many other lots in the City that have two separate owners. He stated that they are not asking for any other variances to setbacks or anything of that nature. He asked for the help of the Council as he feels that they have exhausted all other options.

Mitchell opened the public hearing at 8:13 p.m.

No comments made.

Mitchell closed the public hearing at 8:13 p.m.

Mitchell received confirmation that Beuhler owns lot one and the name of the resident that owns the outlot portion of the lot. He asked for clarification on the driveway easement.

Finke stated that there is a shared driveway and an easement could be placed on that, removing the easement that goes across lot one.

Batty stated that there are multiple residents that use the shared driveway and explained that the purpose would be to move the easement to the used shared driveway and remove the easement that is not of use across lot one.

Martin referenced the driveway and asked when the existing easement was granted.

Finke believed that occurred in 1980 or 1981.

Mitchell asked and received confirmation that the new home would be in the same place as the previous home.

Cousineau asked if the home would be the same size.

Beuhler stated that he was unsure but noted that the home would be smaller than the 3,000 square feet occupied by the three previous buildings on the site.

Martin clarified that 3,000 square feet of foundation is not the same as a 3,000 square foot home as a 3,000 square foot foundation often creates a home much larger in size because of the multiple levels and garage.

Mitchell stated that because Beuhler does not own outlot A, what authority would the City have to assign that as an outlot.

Batty explained that both property owners were required to sign the application and plat. He stated that the language states that the outlot is not currently a buildable lot.

Mitchell asked for identification of the drainage easement.

Finke identified the easement, which is extensive and covers a large portion of the outlot.

Mitchell provided another example that occurred in the City, where the City considered the lot to be one and the County considered the lot to be two parcels.

Batty stated that this case has a lot of messy history and the County accepted deeds that it should not have accepted. He noted that he and Finke had spoken about this parcel multiple times over the years and this may be the best method to resolve a messy situation. He was not worried about setting precedent.

Anderson stated that it is rare for government to have a chance to clean up errors of the past and therefore would support the variance request.

Cousineau agreed that she did not see a reason to punish the current property owner for the mistakes of past owners.

Martin stated that this is not an issue that the applicant created and creating a home on the property would leave the property in the rural residential zoning district that would be harmonious with the surrounding uses. She stated that this would also be in harmony with the intent of the Comprehensive Plan, there are practical difficulties that have been demonstrated, and the property would be used in a reasonable manner. She appreciated the comments of the applicant regarding title insurance, noting that she would be hard pressed to think that many title examiners would have caught this issue.

*Moved by Martin, seconded by Anderson, to grant the variance request based upon the findings of the Council as previously discussed.*

*Further discussion: Pederson asked for additional information regarding the driveway and easement.*

*Batty stated that would be an issue for the parties to work out and would be an element of Plat approval.*

*Mitchell stated that there are two applicants and the Council assumes that they are both aware of the conditions and agree upon those conditions, as the Plat would not move forward without acceptance of the conditions.*

*Batty stated that the variance could be conditioned upon the Plat.*

*Mitchell confirmed that the maker and seconder of the motion were amenable to the amendment to the motion that the variance be conditioned upon the Plat.*

***Motion passed unanimously.***

Mitchell received confirmation that the identification of the other parcel as an outlot would ensure that it is not buildable.

Batty stated that it is not correct to say that there will not be two parcels, but Outlot A would not be a buildable parcel on its own.

*Moved by Martin, seconded by Pederson, to direct staff to prepare a resolution approving the variance and plat subject to the conditions noted in the staff report and discussed by the Council tonight. **Motion passed unanimously.***

**B. Brian Etzel – Setback Variance – 2942 Lakeshore Avenue – Public Hearing (8:33 p.m.)**

Finke presented a request for a variance from the required front yard setback from Balsam Street for expansion of an existing deck. He noted that the property as exists is nonconforming to a number of the zoning district requirements. He stated that the existing deck fronts Balsam Street and the proposed extension would appear on the west side of the home and wrap around to tie in with the existing deck along the Balsam Street side. He stated that the proposed deck would meet setback requirements from Lakeshore Avenue but would require a variance for the setback to Balsam Street. He stated that the existing right-of-way for Balsam Street is fairly large compared to other streets within the Independence Beach neighborhood and noted that the street sits further north as there is unutilized right-of-way in front of the home. He stated that the

deck would still be 30 feet from the driving surface of the roadway. He reviewed the criteria for considering a variance request and noted that findings of fact were included in the staff report. He stated that the Planning Commission reviewed the request and endorsed the findings of fact, recommending approval of the request at their meeting last month. He stated that the applicant has taken measures to reduce the amount of hardcover on the property in anticipation for the deck expansion.

Brian Etzel, 2942 Lakeshore Avenue, stated that he is present to answer any questions. He stated that his existing deck needs a new face and he would like to wrap the deck around to take advantage of the lake view. He stated that there are trees he has planted around the boundary of his property over the years and therefore did not see that there would be any impact aesthetically.

Mitchell opened the public hearing at 8:38 p.m.

No comments made.

Mitchell closed the public hearing at 8:38 p.m.

Cousineau asked and received confirmation that the new deck would not be any closer than the existing deck to Balsam Street.

*Moved by Anderson, seconded by Pederson, to direct staff to prepare a resolution approving the variance based upon the findings noted in the staff report and subject to conditions recommended by the Planning Commission. **Motion passed unanimously.***

**C. Comprehensive Plan Timelines (8:39 p.m.)**

Finke stated that staff is seeking direction related to the 2040 Comprehensive Plan update process. He stated that the Met Council is about to release system statements to the metro cities which will require that the decennial updates of the cities be submitted by 2018. He stated through discussions on the staging and growth plans the previous year there was direction that staff aggressively pursue updates once the system statements are available. He stated that staff has proposed an aggressive schedule which would make the draft version of the updated Comprehensive Plan for comment in one year. He stated that the expedited process means that the City needs to be strategic on the opportunities for public comment and review, noting that additional public meetings can be added but that would delay the schedule. He stated that staff intends to work with the planning wing of WSB regarding public participation aspects. He stated that staff will also focus on online public participation, noting that WSB will be able to provide input and assistance in that area and can solicit better input through that type of participation. He stated that staff also recommends a Steering Committee that can provide additional assistance.

Mitchell stated that there was so much work done last year and the thought process was to build upon that momentum.

Martin referenced the detailed schedule and asked for clarification.

Finke noted that is the online portal that would be used for online public participation. He stated that the content and delivery method would be flexible.

Cousineau questioned how WSB would come into that process.

Finke stated that he would coordinate the process and the WSB consultant would assist with the public participation and online participation aspects. He noted that he would coordinate the various pieces.

Mitchell asked if there is a change to the MUSA line.

Finke did not anticipate a change to the MUSA line.

Martin referenced the Steering Committee and believed that with the process being condensed it would be important to have a group of individuals that are interested in the City but are not expressing only their personal interest. She stated that she would like to see an application process and would prefer people that have been through the process or have a background in planning. She stated that perhaps the at large positions on the group should have some sort of municipal or planning experience. She acknowledged that it may seem like a drawn out process but she wants to ensure that the people understand the ordinances and Comprehensive Plan process.

Johnson stated that the Council could appoint two Councilmembers that could, along with staff, go through an application process for the open seats, and the full Council could then ratify the selections.

Mitchell confirmed that there would be two Council members, two members of the Planning Commission, one Park Commissioner and two at large positions.

Martin received confirmation that you could only have two members from any group, such as City Council or Planning Commission without having a quorum.

Batty noted that the meeting would be noticed but agreed that if more than two members from any other group are included a meeting for that group would also need to be noticed. He noted that staff suggested this makeup because if you add too many people scheduling can become difficult.

Cousineau stated that it is nice to have experience and would like to see different quadrants of the City represented as well.

Anderson stated that he would be interested in being a member of the Steering Committee.

*Moved by Anderson, seconded by Cousineau, to approve the proposed process and schedule to update the Comprehensive Plan as described in the memorandum. **Motion passed unanimously.***

Finke stated that the makeup of the Committee can be adjusted dependent upon the applications the City receives but can use the suggested makeup as a guideline. He stated that he would prefer the two members of the Council that would like to be involved to assist in reviewing applications. He noted that the first meeting of the Steering Committee is scheduled for October.

Mitchell stated that publication of the notice soliciting members of the Steering Committee could begin immediately in order to keep on schedule.

Pederson stated that businesses should be represented in some format.

Martin stated that staff and the desired Council members could solicit input from the Commissions to determine their interested members.

Finke stated that if the Steering Committee is going to have at large members, the public solicitation process can begin even without knowing the exact makeup of the group. He stated that there can be a discussion on the Council members that will join at the September 15<sup>th</sup> work session.

#### **X. CITY ADMINISTRATOR REPORT (8:58 p.m.)**

Mario Fabrizio, Hamel Fire Department, provided a brief update on the self-contained breathing apparatus (SCBAs) grant to replace outdated equipment and advised that they did receive a grant for that purchase. He stated that does not solve the entire problem but will make a dent in that issue.

Stremel stated that the weekly construction meeting for Tower Drive occurred today and the contractor is working on utilities. He stated that the utilities should be completed this week and the roadway work will continue with gravel and improved access to the businesses along Tower Drive will occur. He noted that the weather and rain have caused delays. He stated that the curb and boulevard restoration will then occur along with sod installation. He noted that sidewalk work will occur after that and believed that significant progress towards completion should be made in the next two to four weeks with the project to be completed in the next four to six weeks.

Anderson asked for input regarding the impact to the businesses.

Scherer stated that it has been difficult, especially in regard to deliveries as the clay is not drying with the rainfall. He stated that the property owners have been very patient and cooperative.

#### **XI. MAYOR & CITY COUNCIL REPORTS (9:03 p.m.)**

Pederson reported that he attended the Fields of Medina grand opening, which was well attended and was a very fun event.

Cousineau stated that she also attended.

#### **XII. APPROVAL TO PAY THE BILLS (9:04 p.m.)**

*Moved by Martin, seconded by Pederson, to approve the bills, EFT 003293E-003307E for \$39,836.19, order check numbers 43262-43310 for \$295,408.02, and payroll EFT 506614-506638 for \$44,196.89. **Motion passed unanimously.***

#### **XIII. CLOSED SESSION: UNION CONTRACT NEGOTIATIONS**

The meeting adjourned to closed session at 9:05 to discuss contract negotiations.

*Moved by Martin, seconded by Anderson, to move to close session to discuss contract negotiations at 9:05 p.m. **Motion passed unanimously.***

The Council returned to open session at 9:41 p.m.

**XIV. ADJOURN**

*Moved by Anderson, seconded by Cousineau, to adjourn the meeting at 9:42 p.m.*

***Motion passed unanimously.***

---

Bob Mitchell, Mayor

Attest:

---

Scott Johnson, City Administrator