

MEDINA CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF JULY 21, 2020

The City Council of Medina, Minnesota met in regular session on July 21, 2020 at 7:00 p.m. in the City Hall Chambers. Mayor Martin presided.

Martin stated that due to the ongoing pandemic it is unsafe and unwise to hold public meetings in person and provided information on how the public can participate in this virtual meeting.

I. ROLL CALL

Members present: Albers, Anderson, DesLauriers, Martin, and Pederson.

Members absent: None.

Also present: City Administrator Scott Johnson, Assistant City Administrator Jodi Gallup, City Attorney Ron Batty, Finance Director Erin Barnhart, City Engineer Jim Stremel, City Planning Director Dusty Finke, Public Works Director Steve Scherer, and Chief of Police Jason Nelson.

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE (7:06 p.m.)

III. ADDITIONS TO THE AGENDA (7:07 p.m.)

Johnson requested to add an item to the agenda, under Old Business, Item B, Continued Preliminary 2021 Budget Discussion.

Moved by Anderson, seconded by DesLauriers, to approve the agenda as amended.

A roll call vote was performed:

*Pederson aye
Anderson aye
DesLauriers aye
Albers aye
Martin aye*

Motion passed unanimously.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES (7:08 p.m.)

A. Approval of the July 7, 2020 Regular City Council Meeting Minutes

Martin stated that prior to the meeting, proposed changes were distributed from Anderson. She noted the following additional change. On page eight, line five, it should state, "...and therefore much of the right-of-way dedication would happen...."

Moved by Martin, seconded by Anderson, to approve the July 7, 2020 regular City Council meeting minutes as amended.

A roll call vote was performed:

Pederson aye

Anderson aye
DesLauriers aye
Albers aye
Martin aye

Motion passed unanimously.

V. CONSENT AGENDA (7:09 p.m.)

- A. Approve Final Pay Application for the Hickory Drive Street and Utility Improvement Project**
- B. Set Date of Truth in Taxation Meeting for December 1, 2020**
- C. Resolution No. 2020-40 Accepting Donation from Marianne Houlihan of Houlihan Insurance and Financial Services, Inc.**
- D. Approve Agreement for Prosecution Services with Steven Tallen**
- E. Approve Agreement for Assessing Services with Rolf Erickson**

Moved by Martin, seconded by Pederson, to approve the consent agenda.

A roll call vote was performed:

Pederson aye
Anderson aye
DesLauriers aye
Albers aye
Martin aye

Motion passed unanimously.

VI. COMMENTS (7:11 p.m.)

A. Comments from Citizens on Items not on the Agenda

There were none.

B. Park Commission

Scherer reported that the Park Commission met the previous week to discuss the Lennar Meadowview townhomes. He stated that there is no appetite from the Commission for the interior trails to be public. He stated that the Commission discussed the Hunter Lions Park Concept and provided an update on that process.

DesLauriers stated that he is excited to see the sketches for Hunter Lions Park. He asked if pickleball has been considered, due to its growing popularity.

Scherer confirmed that is a desired amenity that was missed in the first concepts provided from the consultant.

C. Planning Commission

Planning Commissioner Galzki reported that the Commission met the previous week to consider a rezoning and preliminary plat for the Lennar townhome development. He noted that there was discussion related to the request along with the Tamarack Drive Study and how the new road could impact existing landowners as well as how the right-of-way would be split. He reported that the Commission recommended approval of the

rezoning and preliminary plat request. He stated that the Commission also discussed setback and other requirements for residential accessory structures, noting that the Commission tabled the item with direction to staff to develop a sliding scale, relating accessory structure size to lot size.

VII. OLD BUSINESS

A. Tamarack Drive Corridor Visioning Study (7:21 p.m.)

Stremel provided an overview of the discussion that occurred at the previous review of the study on May 19th. He noted that Council provided direction on the preferred vision of an undivided roadway with a roundabout for commercial entry. He noted that the final report was included in the packet. He displayed the preferred roadway design, noting that they attempted to minimize the parkway feel as previously directed.

DesLauriers asked if there was feedback from the School District and other landowners on the south side of Highway 55.

Stremel stated that he was not aware of any comments.

Finke stated that staff received an email from Loram, expressing concern with the location of the southern approach and requesting that the approach be moved to the east to limit the amount of land needed from the west.

Stremel stated that the intersection has been slid as far to the east as possible. He stated that they have attempted to balance the right-of-way needs between the eastern and western sides to the extent possible. He reviewed the options that were reviewed for the commercial access, noting that because of the anticipated level of traffic in this corridor, a roundabout was found to be the best option for intersection control. He highlighted some of the benefits of a roundabout in this location compared to traditional intersection controls. He displayed the remainder of the north and south improvements along with a total potential project costs that include all the improvements.

Pederson stated that it was mentioned that the southern portion of the project could not be developed until 2025 and asked why the southern portion cost was included then. He asked if MnDOT would move forward with the intersection without both the northern and southern improvements.

Stremel stated that the intent of including the cost was to include the potential costs for the whole corridor, as that helps to put the scope and cost of improvements into perspective.

Chuck Rickart, WSB, stated that there would not be an issue with building an intersection, the issue will be with the control of that intersection, which would be based on traffic generation. He stated that when reviewing the traffic projections, approximately 3,500 vehicles per day would be needed to trigger consideration of the signal improvement by MnDOT.

Stremel stated that noted within the report, the proposed townhome development would not trigger the signal on its own and would only equate to about one third of that need.

Martin asked if the estimated costs are just hard costs or whether they include acquisition as well.

Stremel replied that no right-of-way costs were included, although some costs were included for wetland mitigation.

Martin asked where the boundaries are for the purposes of the various land uses related to these improvements, specifically whether property and land use boundaries are straddled.

Stremel identified property lines and different land uses.

Martin asked if there would then be a risk that the properties could be sold in two parcels, which would not align the cul-de-sac with the property line.

Stremel stated that with the Lennar development plan submitted, their property would be subdivided, and the proposed split would be identified. He stated that several different iterations were reviewed with different roundabout locations and provided background information on the proposed location for that improvement.

Martin commented that it would seem that would put the City at risk for a huge land acquisition cost.

DesLauriers agreed that if that were moved north closest to the purple line, some of those acquisition costs could be eliminated.

Martin commented that is one of the few commercial/retail pieces left along Highway 55 and taking that much from that property could make that piece undevelopable or less valuable.

Stremel stated that the roundabout could be moved to the north somewhat.

Martin commented that the east/west alignment seems to be equal for the property owners. She stated that her concern is with the west and east legs of the roundabout. She asked for information on land use and tax parcels. She stated that if the property to the west side were all owned by one property owner, perhaps that owner did not care where the roundabout comes into the property. She stated that, from her perspective, there are two parcels on the west side, that if sold separately with the proposed alignment, would create unusable land and acquisition costs.

Pederson stated that he agrees that it should go down the property line to keep the land values at what they should be.

Martin stated that currently the cost estimates do not include land acquisition costs and it appears that the road plans, as presented, could cause the City to incur right-of-way costs.

Stremel reviewed some of the funding considerations, noting that several projects may be completed to accomplish the entire corridor. He stated that many of the improvements would be implemented with adjacent development, along with a potential to implement/fund some of the improvements through special assessments. He stated

that if the Council approves the report, it does not commit the City to spending funds on any of the project elements.

Pederson referenced the south side and asked if there is enough room for the railroad crossing and intersection.

Stremel agreed that it is narrow but is not much different than the Arrowhead crossing. He noted that review was only done for an at grade rail crossing.

Rickart commented that an overpass or underpass in this location would be extremely expensive as the road would need to move and it is physically not possible in this location. He explained how the signal would operate in order to clear an approach prior to a train arriving at the crossing.

Martin referenced the display that shows the proposed Lennar development and again commented on the right-of-way shown for the different properties and curving of the road.

Stremel stated that the curve in the road helps to avoid the wetland as much as possible to prevent additional mitigation costs.

Martin stated that she understands that some of this planning was done based on assumptions of future developments in order to provide a vision for the corridor. She commented that may change as future developments come forward.

Carol Schimnich, representing the Jubert property, stated that there are only two owners, the Juberts on the east and the Cavanaugh's on the west side.

Martin noted that the Council also received the written comments from the Jubert property prior to the meeting. She noted that Johnson delivered a counterproposal to the concept plan from the Cavanaugh's.

Eric Miller, representing the Cavanaugh's, stated in the private development world they desire greater depth on the parcel, which is the highway frontage piece zoned for commercial. He stated that this is a fairly large piece, with both pieces totaling 28 acres. He stated that from their perspective it would make sense to have more depth on the highway frontage side and move the intersection to the north. He stated that will also better align with the property line and provide an opportunity for right-of-way to be shared between the two parcels. He stated that the parcel to the north is a bit of a transitional piece between single-family residential and commercial. He stated that the best commercial developments generate traffic, which requires proper management of that traffic and access. He stated that if there is not proper access to those developments, there would not be good commercial developments. He stated that with thoughtful planning they would move the roundabout north and consider another access to the highway frontage property. He stated that having more depth to the highway frontage property would allow for a variety of commercial uses to develop on that parcel. He stated that they need redundancy in access and roadway in order to provide good access. He referenced the north leg of the roundabout, noting that there was an access from the townhomes going directly to Tamarack Drive. He commented that access will be low volume and therefore they suggest that be redirected to the east leg of the roundabout. He noted that their concept would have minimal impacts to wetlands. He

noted that stormwater improvements will need to be planned for and locations will need to be identified, whether they be regional systems or individual systems. He stated that this design also eliminates the remnant parcels on both sides of the roadway. He stated that their concept also includes phasing for some of the improvements. He noted that a portion of the improvements would need to occur at this time in order to support the Lennar project. He stated that equitable right-of-way allocations are important to all the property owners in the corridor.

Albers referenced the pond proposed in the southeast corner and asked if that could be in the northwest corner instead.

Miller confirmed that stormwater facilities could be placed where they are needed and explained that they simply identified the need for a stormwater facility. He stated that with the drainage patterns, a facility on the east side would be preferable.

Martin appreciated that a lot of retail developers want a full cut access plus a right-in/right-out at minimum. She stated that she also agrees that it would make sense to move the access to the north. She commented that the Cavanaugh plan does not seem to be as beneficial to the Jubert property. She stated that she does like the road alignment.

Miller stated that if he were representing the Juberts, the three quarters access could be a right-in/right-out to the east. He stated that further thought and consideration could be given to the Jubert property in the same way he has provided that to the Cavanaugh's.

Pederson asked how far the roundabout would be from Highway 55.

Miller replied that the roundabout would be about 650 feet from Highway 55.

Joe Cavanaugh stated that their goal is to place their property in the best position for future development. He stated that they have spoken with people in the development world that had the same position Miller expressed. He stated that there are different ownerships between the Cavanaugh parcels, with different ages and timelines.

Finke stated that the City attempted to engage with the property owners and broader community early in the process. He noted that some of this information came through later in the process, along with a pending application, and staff has been working to understand everyone's interest. He stated that the roundabout ended up further south for some of the reasons Miller talked about related to that site which are supported by additional accesses south of the roundabout towards Highway 55. He stated that the legs off the roundabout would be the first access off the Highway and would accommodate the majority of the left bound traffic without implementing additional turn lanes. He stated that the location is also based on leaving a sufficient amount of space between Highway 55 to allow for stacking.

Scherer stated that he agrees with Finke, noting that the whole purpose was to limit the accesses closest to Highway 55. He stated that staff has worked hard to make this the best-case scenario. He stated that this is a clean slate and they do not want to create the same problems that exist on other roadways.

Martin asked if the additional access points are removed with the roundabout as the access point, could that roundabout be moved further north to align with the property line.

Scherer stated that staff spoke today about perhaps slightly moving it and changing the way the westerly finger comes off the roundabout.

Stremel commented that there is only so far you can go to twist the access points clockwise; it will just start to create tighter curves. He noted that there is some flexibility in twisting those fingers.

Rickart referenced the first left turn shown on the Cavanaugh proposal, which would split the commercial property and generate a good amount of the anticipated daily trips. He stated that a left turn into that site would not be long enough to accommodate the anticipated que and therefore would backup in the through lane and potentially to Highway 55. He stated that although it would not be ideal, a right-in/right-out would be better than a three-quarter access. He stated that the only way to accommodate the turn lane would be to widen Tamarack all the way to Highway 55.

Stremel noted that there could also be some time until the roundabout is constructed in a fully developed scenario, under the Cavanaugh proposal.

Miller commented that the speed in a roundabout is significantly lower as that is meant to be a calming device. He agreed that the three quarters access would need to be studied and proper turn lane lengths would need to be found. He recognized that additional right-of-way may be needed. He believed that the development community would support those options. He stated that if there is not proper access, there will not be a successful commercial development. He recognized that there is a certain level of congestion for a commercial development.

Finke stated that part of the thought was to push the roundabout as far south as possible.

Miller commented that it really comes down to depth in order to have flexibility to attract users in the marketplace. He stated that they are attempting to have more depth on the Highway 55 frontage to provide flexibility for development in the future. He stated that pushing that access to the north provides them with that depth.

Finke stated that he has seen situations with lined roundabouts in commercial settings and asked for details on the spacing of those.

Rickart replied that having two roundabouts in this corridor would not line up with the property line. He stated that two roundabouts could fit, but there would be significant impacts to the Lennar property.

Stremel stated that if the roundabout were pushed towards Highway 55, the City would need to show that spacing would not impact the Highway 55 intersection and that queuing would not happen in close proximity to the intersection.

Martin asked how far the roundabout would need to be from Highway 55 to be acceptable to MnDOT.

Rickart stated that it would depend upon the amount of traffic generated from the adjacent properties. He stated that the roundabout could be moved slightly to the south, but not much, perhaps 50 to 75 feet.

Martin referenced the proposed City plan and asked why the cul-de-sac consumes more of the western parcel than the easterly parcel.

Stremel stated that is to help avoid the proposed pond on the Lennar parcel. He stated that they have come close to balancing the right-of-way on the approach to Highway 55. He noted that there is more taken on the east in that location, therefore the additional right-of-way in the roundabout balances that out. He confirmed that more right-of-way is being taken from the Jubert side than the Cavanaugh side.

Paul Tibone, Lennar, stated that he sent Finke an email earlier this week based on the reconfiguration models of the roundabouts proposed by the Cavanaugh's. He stated that Lennar has been working with the Juberts since February or March of this year, as well as working with the City. He reviewed the steps they have followed thus far to incorporate comments from staff, the public, the Commissions and Council. He stated that the configuration from the Cavanaugh's makes the secondary access point for the Lennar site not possible. He stated that with the Cavanaugh proposal they would lose eight to nine units, which would significantly impact their project that has already been through much of the City processes. He stated that as the parcels develop, the City would gain the necessary right-of-way and therefore it would not matter if the Cavanaugh properties are developed at different times. He noted that they have a preliminary plat that has already gone through the Planning Commission and they support the WSB design as it is proposed by staff. He stated that the Cavanaugh design would place almost all the ponding on the east side, which would further encumber the Jubert property and the preliminary plat they have into the City.

Martin asked if Lennar is still in a contingency period.

Tibone replied that they are still within the contingency period.

Martin asked the amount of right-of-way that would be dedicated along the Tamarack corridor.

Tibone replied that they would be dedicating their 40 feet, which would be half the roadway.

Martin thanked everyone for their comments. She stated that the Council is always looking to ensure that its opinion is not slanted towards a proposed development and is instead fair to all the property owners.

Pederson stated that this is a complicated subject and agreed that the right-of-way should be taken equally amongst each property owner and the stormwater ponds should be divided to the best of the engineer's ability. He stated that he finds it difficult to make the left-hand turn coming into that property. He asked if the roundabout would serve as it should or whether a traditional intersection should be considered. He also believed that the Council should be careful of splitting properties and devaluing those properties.

Albers echoed the comments of Pederson that perhaps instead of a roundabout, two intersections should be created. He stated that option may also be more cost effective. He stated that maximizing the developable value of the land is important from a tax perspective and would not want to see infrastructure hinder that ability. He stated that he would prefer to continue to look at the plan and work with all the property owners to find the best option. He stated that this is the opportunity for the City to do this right and more time should be spent on it.

Martin asked if Albers believes that City staff should sit down with the adjacent property owners and their engineers to work on the plan.

Albers confirmed that would be his recommendation.

DesLauriers stated that he believes that additional work would be needed by all parties to come to some type of agreement. He stated that he likes the roundabout and would like to see it shifted to the north. He stated that he understands that commercial development needs a three quarters access, but it would be challenging to have that traffic crossing the road and could cause accidents. He stated that taking away the Tamarack access to Lennar could be a good idea to reduce the potential for a dangerous and congested intersection in the future.

Anderson echoed the comments of the members thus far in that there are not firm development proposals from the commercial property. He encouraged the parties to sit down with their engineers and City staff to try to find a solution.

Martin stated that she would assume that the paramount interest is public safety and a close second would be to preserve and enhance land value. She stated that neighboring cities have sometimes overengineered road improvements. She commented that having the City work with adjacent property owners can provide benefit. She noted that she does not want to leave remnant parcels. She confirmed the consensus of the Council for additional work to be done.

Moved by Anderson, seconded by DesLauriers, to direct staff to work with the property owners with the goal of public safety and enhancing land values.

A roll call vote was performed:

<i>Pederson</i>	<i>aye</i>
<i>Anderson</i>	<i>aye</i>
<i>DesLauriers</i>	<i>aye</i>
<i>Albers</i>	<i>aye</i>
<i>Martin</i>	<i>aye</i>

Motion passed unanimously.

B. Continued Preliminary 2021 Budget Discussion (9:09 p.m.)

Martin recognized a member of the public that desired to make a comment.

Tim Sedabres, 3169 Cyprus Circle S, stated that he attended the public worksession earlier tonight and based on the financials presented in 2018 and 2019 the revenues were above the budgeted projections. He stated that the actual expenses were also

above the budgeted amounts. He stated that the City cannot rely on revenues coming in higher than expected and encouraged the Council to be budget conscious and responsible in its choices throughout the budget process.

Barnhart stated that she would disagree that the past budgets have been shortfalls, explaining transfers that are made during the year. She stated that revenues are due to growth, permits, and interest. She stated that staff will continue discussions related to the roads in the CIP. She provided details of the utility rate study and reviewed the proposed increases to ensure that there would not be an operating loss.

Pederson noted that the water rate appears to be going down a half percent, as it has been a three percent increase for the past few years.

Barnhart confirmed that the rate has been three percent in order to bring that rate to the needed mark. She stated that following the June meeting a request was made for revenue loss scenarios. She stated that three different scenarios were run and noted the available balance in the City's reserve fund. She noted that if shortages were to occur, there would be additional discussions with the Council.

Pederson referenced the reserve fund balance that is currently unassigned and asked for details on how those funds could be used if assigned.

Barnhart explained that the balance in that account is higher than shown because of the funds that have been assigned for different projects or anticipated costs. She noted that those assignments could be changed as well. She stated that the impact of a shortfall would depend upon where the shortfall is coming from, noting that if there was a shortfall in MSA funds, road projects would need to be reviewed and possibly delayed. She noted that the specific situation would be reviewed to determine the appropriate action. She stated that this is a preparedness plan and commented that she does not think it is likely that the City will experience extreme revenue loss.

Anderson asked for details on the difference between short-term and long-term.

Barnhart clarified that short-term would be one or two years, whereas long-term would be a longer period of time or permanent change.

Anderson stated that he shares the concern of Martin related to revenues in 2022. He stated that everyone is living in an economic bubble right now that has been brought about by the stimulus packages that have come from the federal government. He stated that when that ends, there will be very severe recessionary impacts on federal, state, and local governments that he believes will extend into 2022, 2023, and 2024. He stated that in order to make an even more educated assessment of the 2021 budget, he would like to see forecasts for 2022, 2023, and 2024 using the revenue shortfall projections.

Barnhart stated that she would rather not do that. She stated that she does not disagree with the statements made by Anderson and Martin to that point. She stated that when the housing market fell apart, it took two years for the City to feel that but noted that property tax revenue was not lost. She stated that she does not feel it would be fair for her to say what could be pulled from the budget. She stated that while it is good to be

prepared and plan for options, she also believes that they need to see what will happen before they put that amount of staff time into this.

Anderson stated that he believes that the potential COVID recession would make the 2008 recession pale in comparison. He stated that he is not asking staff to show where departments would have to give things up, but to run the revenue numbers for those years with a five, ten and 15 percent loss and the impact that would have on the budgets. He explained that would allow him to better determine what should occur in 2021.

Johnson stated that the problem that Barnhart would have is that they simply do not know what will happen. He stated that during the past recession staff and the Council sat together to make those policy decisions because they cannot be made in a vacuum. He stated that staff continues to review the budget to determine if shortfalls exist, and if there are, then policy decisions will need to be made to address those issues.

Pederson agreed with the forecast of Anderson. He stated that he is aware of a Medina business that has failed due to COVID and thinks additional businesses will fail. He believed that forecasting is good. He stated that what Anderson is asking for is not unreasonable. He believed that this would hit the City much harder and the resident input was correct.

DesLauriers stated that he also agrees with Anderson. He stated that he has spoken with the auditors in the past and asked for a five-year forecast to look at the tax rates for residents. He agreed that 2021, 2022, and 2023 would be helpful in making decisions. He commented that being prepared is a good thing.

Barnhart stated that she has a ten-year forecast prepared and different figures could be plugged in to review those years. She stated that it is based on estimators and escalators.

Anderson stated that taking a budget out to 2024 would make sense in this time and would give the discussions in August and September much more clarity about how to proceed in 2021.

Albers stated that he believes that there is a lower risk in 2021 for revenue loss, but that could be a reality in 2022 or 2023. He explained that if businesses fail or there are more foreclosures, that is when it would begin to hit the City. He agreed that it would make sense to look at the next three or four years for budget purposes.

Barnhart stated that she could put together those revenue loss projection scenarios for the next few years.

Anderson recognized that the City has fixed expenses along with bond payments, which are a fixed expense.

Barnhart stated that she will work on putting together those revenue loss budget projections. She provided additional details on the general fund and the additional revenue that can be captured in 2021 because of growth in the City that is coming onto the books. She asked for direction on how the Council would like to allocate that excess

revenue. She reviewed some options suggested by staff that could be discussed by the Council.

Martin stated that she is hoping that the City will have an overall revenue surplus but was cautious of “counting chickens before they hatch”. She stated that she previously spoke to including the fire costs and police admin position in the budget but would prefer to keep the remainder in reserve.

Anderson stated that he already provided comments on the fire costs but would support the police admin and placing the remainder in reserves.

The Council confirmed consensus with that direction.

Martin stated that she would want to see funds available for fire costs, should the opportunity arise.

Barnhart stated that there is an option that funds could be designated from the reserves for the fire costs if that opportunity arises, rather than having it as a line item.

The Council confirmed consensus with that direction.

Barnhart provided a general overall review of the expenses that would qualify for reimbursement through the CARES Act funding.

Johnson reviewed the information that will be brought back to the next work session discussion in August.

VIII. CITY ADMINISTRATOR REPORT (9:49 p.m.)

A. COVID-19 Discussion on Council Member Request for City Mandate for Mask Wearing

Johnson stated that Anderson requested discussion related to a City mandate requiring masks in public. He stated that Batty put together information from other cities that have put in place similar mandates. He stated that there is a press conference scheduled later this week for the Governor to discuss a statewide mask mandate.

Martin commented that her personal view is that masks should be worn in public places. She asked if there is a sense whether the Governor will enact the statewide mandate. She noted that the statewide mandate would be easier to enforce rather than attempting to defend two different policies.

Johnson stated that he got the impression that the Governor is going to enact the statewide mandate.

Anderson stated that his intent was not to bring a resolution in front of the Council tonight but to understand what the process of issuing a City wide mandate requiring the wearing of a mask would look like. He commented that Batty did a good job of putting that information together. He stated that given the likelihood that a statewide mandate could be enacted, the City should stand down and wait for the Governor.

Pederson agreed with those comments and that the City should wait to see what the Governor does.

Martin asked if the Council would want staff to draft a resolution if the statewide mandate is not enacted.

Albers stated that highest concentration of people congregating is at large retailers, which already require masks. He thought that for the City to put a requirement on them to wear masks would be overkill. He stated that he has spoken with neighboring cities that have had similar discussions and they have made the decision not to enact the mandate in their cities. He stated that he personally wears a mask when entering a business. He asked how this would be policed and if that would be a good allocation of public safety resources.

DesLauriers stated that he agrees with the comments of Albers, especially that he would not want to see the police resources used to police mask issues. He stated that the police department is already struggling to cover vacations and would not want to see the department time spent on enforcement of this issue.

Pederson agreed that it would not be prudent to have the police force used in that manner. He stated that he would hope that people will wear masks if mandated by the Governor but does not believe it should be a police issue.

Anderson stated that he recalls Chief Nelson sending out a letter that the police force would not be used to enforce a mandate and rather there is a department at the state that accepts those complaints.

Johnson confirmed that there was a state department handling those complaints.

Anderson commented that the issue of taxing the police department would then not be an issue.

DesLauriers asked what happens to complaints made at the state level. He stated that he would find it hard to believe that it would not impact the police department as someone would need to respond to complaints.

Nelson stated that the Commission of Public Safety does take the complaints. He stated that the police department does have to respond to mediate the complaints because they turn into arguments and trespassing issues. He stated that creating an ordinance would cause staff time for police and legal. He stated that having a statewide mandate would place the onus on the state rather than Medina.

Martin confirmed the consensus of the Council to not take any action or plan to take any action and instead wait for the Governor's direction. She commented that she has been dismayed that many residents are not wearing masks inside local stores or at local parks, as the masks are meant to protect others. She felt that the citizens of Medina could be doing a better job to help minimize the spread of the virus.

B. Other

Johnson asked Nelson to provide an update on the State Police Reform Legislation that was approved the previous night by the legislature.

Nelson provided an update on the legislation, noting that Medina has already been following some of those mandates on its own and through its own policies. He noted that additional rules and mandates will come that Medina will need to follow.

IX. MAYOR & CITY COUNCIL REPORTS (10:06 p.m.)

No comments.

X. APPROVAL TO PAY THE BILLS (10:06 p.m.)

Moved by Anderson, seconded by DesLauriers, to approve the bills, EFT 005573E-005591EE for \$81,780.43, order check numbers 050409-050467 for \$778,544.62, and payroll EFT 0510348-0510379 for \$51,717.71.

A roll call vote was performed:

*Pederson aye
Anderson aye
DesLauriers aye
Albers aye
Martin aye*

Motion passed unanimously.

XI. CLOSED SESSION: POLICE UNION CONTRACT PURSUANT TO MINN. STAT. 13D.03

Moved by Martin, seconded by Anderson, to adjourn the meeting to closed session for the purpose of discussing police union contract pursuant to Minn. Stat. 13D.03 at 10:09 p.m.

A roll call vote was performed:

*Pederson aye
Anderson aye
DesLauriers aye
Albers aye
Martin aye*

Motion passed unanimously.

The meeting returned to open session at 10:32 p.m.

XII. ADJOURN

Moved by Anderson, seconded by Pederson, to adjourn the meeting at 10:33 p.m.

A roll call vote was performed:

*Pederson aye
Anderson aye
DesLauriers aye
Albers aye
Martin aye*

Motion passed unanimously.

Kathleen Martin, Mayor

Attest:

Jodi M. Gallup, City Clerk