

**Monday, March 11, 2024 6:00 PM**  
**CITY OF MINNETONKA BEACH**  
**REGULAR CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES**

**Roll Call:** Mayor Joe Pagano; Council Members: Tracey Breazeale, Chris Dovolis, Jennifer Halverson, and Jason Mohr and Treasurer Chris Zinn. Absent: none

**Staff Present:** City Administrator Heidi Honey, City Clerk Jane Burgess, Public Works Superintendent Jason Hilgers, City Engineer Alan Offerman, City Zoning Administrator Phil Carlson

**Guests:** Brian Noma, MN Department of Health; Brian Rivers, MN Dept of Health

1. **Call to Order** - Mayor Pagano called the meeting to order at 6:00 pm.
2. **Pledge of Allegiance** – Led by Clerk Burgess
3. **Approve Agenda for the March 11, 2024 City Council Meeting.**

**Breazeale motion, Mohr second to approve the agenda. All ayes, motion carried.**

4. **Approve Minutes** –
  - 4.1. Regular Meeting of February 12, 2024

**Halverson motion, Mohr second to approve the February 12, 2024 Regular City Council meeting minutes. All ayes, the motion carried.**

**5. Planning and Zoning**

5.1. **Resolution 2024 – 13** – Variance Request at 3 Crescent Street – Front Yard Setback  
Zoning Administrator Carlson stated that the variance request is for a front yard setback. Crescent Street is a long “driveway” and different from other City streets. The property owner would like to add a small, front, covered porch addition to the house with a three-foot overhang which is one foot more than the Zoning code allows. He added that the Planning Commission reviewed the request and recommended approval. Breazeale and Halverson stated they felt that the variance request is reasonable with Halverson adding that the addition will add value to the property.

**Mohr motion, Breazeale second to adopt Resolution 2024-13 Approving Variances to the Front Yard Setback for a Home Addition and Remodeling at 3 Crescent Street. All ayes, the motion carried.**

5.2. Shoreland Rules and Code Compliance Amendments – Table 3.2.1. Preliminary Review  
Planning Chair Breazeale stated that the Planning Commission clarified amendments for CUPs are required and streamlined processes. Table 3.2.1 states who is responsible for what. They are recommending adding a row to Table 3.2.1 stating that the Zoning Administrator is responsible for determining when permits, variances, conditional use permit amendments, interim use permits, or amendment thereto are required. Zoning Administrator Carlson stated that he is in agreement with the amendment. J. Breazeale stated that this is not a change from the current process, and if council gives preliminary approval, then it will go to a public hearing and to the DNR for approval.

**Breazeale motion, Halverson second to give preliminary approval for the addition to Table 3.2.1 that the decision maker for the requirement for all permits including a variance, conditional use permit, interim use permit or amendment thereto that the decision maker be designated as the zoning administrator and proceed to DNR approval as presented. All ayes, the motion carried.**

5.3. Ord. No. 149, 2<sup>nd</sup> Series – Amending City Code Appendix A – Zoning Ordinance, Section 3.4.4.J Conditional Use Amendments, Final Approval

Chair Breazeale stated that the question came up as to what changes require a CUP amendment. If the Club wanted to do things such as removing trash cans or repaving a parking lot, that would not require amendments to a Conditional Use Permit. Changes in “use” would require Conditional Use Permit amendments. Carlson confirmed this and noted that this change in the Zoning code affects future changes and does not impact the Club’s existing CUP.

**Halverson motion, Mohr second to Adopt Ordinance No. 149, 2<sup>nd</sup> Series Amending City Code Appendix A - Zoning Ordinance, Section 3.4.4.J. Conditional Use Permits as presented by Chair Breazeale. All ayes, the motion carried.**

5.4. Conditional Use Permit Amendment Application Update – Lafayette Club Fence Near Hole #7  
Pagano presented a general update of the February 26<sup>th</sup> Planning Commission meeting. The property owner of 2669 Woodbridge Rd. requested the opportunity to reopen negotiations with the Club, so the City extended the deadline for final resolution to June 8<sup>th</sup>. They looked at two action scenarios with a timeline in the packet with due dates and the responsible party identified. The first scenario is an agreement to modify the fence or provide a new application and the second scenario is that there is no agreement proposed to modify the fence. The due date schedule allows the Council to meet the extended deadline of June 8, 2024. The applicant can agree to a further extension of time beyond June 8 if they are unable to meet this timeline.

Pagano stated that the third option is that the Club could withdraw their CUP amendment application and remove the fence.

**6. Old Business–**

**6.1. Water Treatment Plant Funding Update (PFAS)**

Mayor Pagano announced that Administrator Honey received notification from Senator Tina Smith’s office that \$959,000 in funding is being awarded to Minnetonka Beach. This award was signed by the president in the Appropriations Bill. He added that former Mayor Lindstrom began this federal funding process four years ago. 49 residents sent letters of support for this funding request to Congressman Dean Phillips office. This was a successful joint effort with many involved including various Stantec staff. Pagano stated that the next step is that the City will be assigned to a government agency and will learn what the funding requirements are and all pertinent details.

**6.2. Water Treatment Plant Update, PFAS Information – Noma, MDH**

District Engineer for Hennepin and Anoka Counties, Brian Noma, presented Minnesota Department of Health (MDH) Based Guidance Values (HBVs) for PFAS (Forever Chemicals) information as it pertains to the City’s new water treatment plant project. He has worked for the Minnesota Department of Health for 37 years now doing field work after reviewing construction plans for water treatment plants and water towers for many years.

Noma provided a recap of the water treatment plant project that began in 2018. A March 2018 inspection report listed a lot of things in Minnetonka Beach including the age of the existing plant. There were several things apparent, most importantly, the age of the plant and useful service life of it. Most plants are utilized for 40-50 years and the plant in Minnetonka Beach is now 66 years old as it was built in 1958 so it is very old and antiquated. He added that the Rules of Design have changed since the plant was built as well. Based on the plant’s condition, and the way standards are set up today, along with contaminants, he stated that it is wise to build a new water treatment plant.

Brian Rivers, who is a Contaminates of Emerging Concern Engineer with the Department of Health was present as well. Mona stated that existing plants are not designed to remove these chemicals.

Minnetonka Beach appeared on the radar as a fish sample from Lake Minnetonka contained PFAS chemicals. That led to the MDH testing water at all Lake Minnetonka cities who requested it. Minnetonka Beach water was monitored for four or five quarters. The contaminant numbers in Minnetonka Beach are higher than neighboring cities. Noma added that some of the maximum contaminant levels for PFAS in Minnetonka Beach are very close to the EPA standard levels, although their levels have not been set in stone yet.

Noma stated that the discussion of building a new plant has been going on for several years and construction costs have gone up along with the labor shortage and continued supply chain problems. He does not expect that costs will come down and most projects are coming in 20-25% higher than estimated. He stated that the PFAS filtration component is a difficult decision and the monitoring of PFAS compounds is evolving.

Noma explained the numbers as they related to health guidelines and the MDH Health Based Guidance Values for PFAS is .0079 parts per trillion. Minnetonka Beach is way above this at 3.2 parts per trillion. He added that these numbers are determined by toxicologists and the City is above the threshold. PFAS are carcinogens and given that information, Noma stated that if the City does not build for PFAS filtration in the new plant then residents may question why it wasn't.

Noma stated that at a minimum, if the City builds the PFAS filtration shell, and install the equipment later, it will be ahead of the game. Additions later never go well and are not cost effective. He added that when the EPA releases its numbers there will be a mad rush nationwide for equipment, filter media which will be hard to find, and scarce supplies with big price increases and long lead times.

Pagano stated that economic numbers are compelling, but resident safety for generations to come is more important. He added that if the City doesn't build for PFAS filtration the effects could be huge as the City is on the high end with sampling contaminant numbers. Long-term health is a number one concern for him as mayor and for city council.

Zinn asked what the theory is as to why Minnetonka Beach, a town in the middle of lake, is experiencing high contaminant levels. He asked if a certain kind of treatment is recommended by the MDH. Noma responded that they do not know why Minnetonka Beach popped up on radar. He added that no one knows, and it may be an unknown source or bad luck.

Breazeale asked if other numbers were off when tested other than PFAS and if the City's drinking water is less safe, would it qualify for funding? Rivers stated they tested 29 compounds and only six have standards in place at this time. Noma stated that there are 12,000 compounds in the PFAS family, and they are testing what the scientific community is looking at. Most are not under regulatory requirements or scientific modeling. They may have picked those compounds that have more common with higher health risks. Noma stated that the other change is that chemicals were measured in parts per million and now it's parts per quadrillion. The last time the City put in infrastructure for a water treatment plant was 66 years ago. Minnetonka Beach will not have to build another plant for another 50-70 years, Noma added. As more contaminants become regulated, the City will know how to treat them, but this cannot happen today with the existing plant.

Noma stated that the City will work with Stantec to select the best type of PFAS filtration treatment technology. GAC is one of them and most recognized. The other is recently developed ion exchange media that is proven it can be used for this.

Halverson asked about testing for lithium and what would be the treatment for that. Noma stated that he does not know. He thinks that lithium is coming from people's pharmaceuticals. He doesn't know if GAC would work for lithium, but it is a really good way to treat the other contaminants.

Pagano asked Noma and Rivers if they could create a chart showing where Minnetonka Beach is in the chart. Rivers stated that six compounds are state tested and two additional ones are federally tested. Breazeale asked if surrounding communities' information can be shared. Noma stated that they didn't bring that information with them, but they can get it to us.

Noma stated that there is funding for communities for emerging concern, but our levels are not quite there yet. But that could change. The can't receive funding for projects already under construction.

While discussing funding options and how communities with high contaminant levels have a higher need, Zinn stated that the new plant in Minnetonka Beach will cost about \$10M and there are only roughly 230 homes who will pay for it which is very expensive for residents.

PFAS is not the only contaminant of emerging concern as manganese is of concern too. The Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act has \$26M over the next five years guaranteed annually for the entire state, and opens up access for grants paying for up to 50% of projects. The communities with the greatest financial need and high levels of contaminants get served first.

Pagano asked Hilgers for his opinion about building for PFAS filtration and he stated that surrounding cities each have their own battles, but PFAS contaminants are forever chemicals that cause cancer and the City's levels are above the standard. The City should build the PFAS annex with the new plant and clean our water.

### **6.3. Water Treatment Plant Design Update – Alan Offerman**

Offerman congratulated the City on the grant award, and he thanked Noma for his timely presentation. The Stantec design team has completed all major components of the design for the new water treatment plant. Drawings and specifications have been submitted to the MDH and the DOLI submission will follow. The final design incorporated the option for PFAS treatment in the form of bidding alternates. These alternates will provide flexibility to the City moving forward into construction as final decisions are being made by MDH in regard to maximum contaminate levels and health-based guidelines.

He added that the PFAS filtration annex is one cost, and other is the cost of the equipment for it. The treatment for PFAS designed for Minnetonka Beach is GAC and these vessels are sized for GAC and ion exchange both. This allows for flexibility to change treatment if necessary. The infrastructure would already be in place and can accommodate both types of treatment.

Stantec recommends building the annex to filter PFAS and look at treatment component vessels.

Offerman stated that since the City received funding, the path forward is eligible to receive that funding. Stantec will reapply again using a grant coordinator. The original grant was for facility and treatment and now it would be modified just for treatment. If federal funding is received and accepted by the City, additional environmental reviews will be required and have a strong possibility to delay the award of the project from the original proposed bidding timeline.

He asked if the City wants to include the building as an alternate when bidding and if so, when? This would be a separate project and be a separate grant. The goal is a secondary bid package federal project. There would be significantly less government red tape if this is done.

Breazeale asked if the City could lose all the funding, but Offerman stated that there is no risk as Stantec would know ahead of time. The Grant Coordinator would guide them through the process. Honey stated that the City could justify it as we asked for \$2.4M initially, but the City is getting \$959k so only the annex can be built with no equipment. There would be a separate grant specific to PFAS treatment, Zinn confirmed.

Breazeale asked when will the bidding process begin and Offerman stated hopefully in May, but it is a council decision.

Pagano stated that they are now in position to get answers to two or three questions in order to move forward with the news received about the funding award.

Mohr stated that if the City builds a certain way to allow for a change in PFAS treatment down the road, how is the plant designed to accommodate chemicals that aren't on the radar yet? Although Offerman does not know that answer he said that GAC filtration is used for a lot of compounds, and it may be enough. If there are new PFAS chemicals 20 years from now, then the City will decide how to treat them. What is known at this time is what can be treated but we need to allow for future treatment vessels as PFAS contaminants will continue to change and be ongoing.

Pagano stated that the City's existing plant is on borrowed time as it takes 1.5 years to build new.

Offerman concluded that consideration should be made to the information coming in next month so a decision can be made at the April council meeting.

#### **6.4. Northview Wall West Proposal – Alan Offerman**

Offerman presented Stantec's proposal for replacement of the main portion of the Northview retaining wall at 3040 Northview Rd. The wall has sustained significant damage over the years and is in poor condition and it is beginning to fall into the roadway. Part of the problem stems from the materials used and the close proximity to road as it keeps getting hit. The replacement plan is to use a manufactured big block concrete that will last the test of time with no maintenance. The wall will be moved a few feet closer to the Dakota Trail which will allow more space. Local contractors will quote this project or staff can choose the vendor too. There will be wall drainage improvements made too.

**Halverson motion, Breazeale second to approve the Stantec proposal for the Northview Wall west replacement project not to exceed a total of \$10,800 for construction and administration services for the project. All ayes, the motion carried.**

#### **6.5. HR 1525 Police Opposition to Fair Act**

Mohr explained that we only had one side of the story at a previous council meeting, but he now feels educated about it and is ready to support law enforcement with this effort.

**Mohr motion, Halverson second to support Hennepin County Law Enforcement's letter of opposition to HR 1525 Police Opposition to Fair Act. All ayes, the motion carried.**

#### **6.6. Coyote Concerns**

Mohr stated that he requested that the City take a position on coyotes in the City. The City discussed this matter with Three Rivers Park and the Orono Police Department. The DNR publicly posted that they do not have a policy in making efforts to manage the coyote population. Mohr added that he would like to see messaging in the weekly SPLASH! eblast and Beachcomber that Minnetonka Beach does not intend to take action to trap, remove, or otherwise relocate coyotes in the City.

Breazeale requested to add to that message that the City has no means to do this, but the City shares the community's concerns. Residents should be informed as to what they should do and not do regarding coyotes. Mohr will add more to this message and review with Burgess for communication to the community.

## 7. Finance

### 7.1. Summary Report of City Finance

Zinn stated he had a call with Ehler's, the City's investment advisor firm that manages the City's money market funds and CD's. Together they are going to develop a strategy to maintain those higher rates as long as possible with longer term 6 month and 12 month investments in Treasuries. This will keep City rates up if the Federal Government begins lowering rates which will affect shorter term investments.

Ehler's advised Zinn that 10% of the 2023A Bond proceeds need to be spent by June 6, 2024, because the City is earning more than the bond payments. Zinn will give Honey his notes and make sure that the City is billed by Stantec for water treatment plant expenses clearly and before the deadline.

Zinn stated that continuing forward toward the new water treatment plant and the news today of the \$959k funding award is great news. He added that the City may issue another \$5M this fall.

## 8. Consent Agenda

- 8.1. Police Report – February
- 8.2. Fire Report – February
- 8.3. **Resolution 2024 – 14** – 2024 Dock Applications
- 8.4. **Resolution 2024 - 15** – 2024 Dock Variances
- 8.5. **Ord. No. 148, 2<sup>nd</sup> Series** – Repealing and Replacing City Code Appendix A – Zoning Ordinance and **Resolution 2024 – 16** – Authorizing Summary Publication of Ord. No. 148, 2<sup>nd</sup> Series
- 8.6. 2107 Hill Road Indemnification Agreement
- 8.7. Approve Checks: March 2024

**Breazeale motion, Halverson second to approve the Consent Agenda. All ayes, the motion carried.**

**9. Open Forum** opened at 7:31 and closed at 7:31 with no discussion.

## 10. Staff Reports

### 10.1. Administrator's Report

Honey stated that City Hall basement was tested for radon twice and the results were 3.3 and 3.7. The EPA recommends mitigation for levels over 2.0. Hilgers obtained preliminary quotes which include sealing the floor cracks and foundation seams and additional electrical to power the pump. Pagano stated that radon is the second biggest cause of cancer. Although this is not budgeted, Honey asked for permission to mitigate the radon.

**Mohr motion, Breazeale second to approve up to \$5,500 to mitigate radon at City Hall. All ayes, motion carried.**

Honey stated that council members and the City have received calls expressing concerns about a potential project at 2424 Lafayette Rd. The general idea is that the property owner wants to work with a neighbor to access their property. There is speculation that they may request trees to be removed and possibly City trees. They are proposing to mitigate stormwater from their home build

and also build a pickleball court and possibly a shed. She again stated that she has not seen a plan, has no specific details and does not yet understand what they will be proposing.

Pagano stated there is indication that there may be more residents requesting to access their property via the undeveloped Northwoods Rd. He stated it would benefit the community if the City had a position on this under the tree ordinance or other ordinances. Trees bordering City property may be impacted. The City should establish a policy on how it wants to deal with future requests. Honey stated that in the past, Zoning Administrator Carlson requested that the City look at all of the underdeveloped areas. Pagano suggested researching the tree ordinance, and other history on previous requests. If the City had a policy, it would be easier for residents instead of dealing with them individually.

Breazeale stated that is a great starting point. and added there was a lot of discussion about the Pinto/Zinn driveway access from Northwood after it was approved. New access made sense but there was a lot of community discussion on the impact on the park. She added there are other areas in the community with some right of way with unplatted roads. She recalled council discussed it and did not think it would come up in other locations to vacate roads. She thought it may be helpful for all of them to understand what transpired and what decisions were made. They then could determine what the City can do to be proactive that might be being used as parkland or viewed as parkland by the community. She added that many residents may not be aware that some of these areas are potentially unplatted roads. Honey stated she can look back and see what was discussed. There may be legal work involved because she is unsure if easements and unplatted roads or right of ways are treated differently. Zinn thought there may also be a difference if you have access both front and back. Breazeale wants to avoid being in a reactionary position and have it established before a resident spends a lot of money on planning and design, thinking they are allowed to do something and find out they can't. She also does not want the City to scramble to find a solution because it is not what the City wants, and it could have been handled earlier in the process.

Halverson recalled there may have been a moratorium and then there was a decision to not vacate roads. It may have been put on to the Planning Commission list of something to review in the future, but they had other priorities.

Zinn said his experience could have gone smoother but since Zoning Administrator Krier retired, the City has had two different zoning administrators, and the City knowledge was lost. Zinn thinks there is a better understanding now, but the knowledge needs to be formalized. There was discussion about ownership to the center of easements and what can be done on that land depends on who owns it. He supported exploration and diligence, so everyone knows what to expect. Breazeale stated Zoning Administrator Carlson may or may not know all of this. Zinn said we should know what the rule is and then everyone will know. Honey stated Carlson has asked that this work be done by the City. Zinn stated they should get ahead of this. There was speculation if this is a legal or zoning administrator conversation. Honey stated it may be a little of both. Honey offered to do preliminary research on what was discussed in the past, and Batty and Carlson can also provide past experience or opinion.

Pagano asked the timing to do this. Pagano stated they want a global perspective of all areas in the City. Honey suggested she may be able to start with an opinion from Batty on what is allowed depending on the type of land (park, right of way, fire lane) but it may be more complicated than that. She could report back in May.

Brezeale asked if they want to consider another moratorium on development or wait and see what comes back. Pagano supported that because individual requests may come in and it would be better to take a pause, with having a global policy to address everything. That would eliminate one person

being able to do something and the next person cannot. He added they don't want to unnecessarily start action by residents. Honey stated in the past the City was cautioned that moratoriums require a specific problem the City has identified, is researching, and wants to solve.

Pagano stated this was on the list of things to take care of in the past, but the City and Planning Commission had to work on DNR compliance. Now this issue needs to be addressed. Honey asked if they want to refer this to Planning on March 18<sup>th</sup>, Carlson can explain to them what a moratorium is, and they can make a recommendation with the understanding they will be working on this project. A resolution is required for moratoriums so they could not do it at this council meeting. Honey will speak with Carlson and Batty so there is information for the commissioners on when moratoriums are appropriate.

Breazeale stated if they decide to do a moratorium, the purpose is to make sure they are coming up with a comprehensive, cohesive way of looking at this across the community, and not approaching these piece by piece. Now that Planning has some capacity, they will be able to take this on. Pagano stated this should be the directive to Planning because it is the reason why they are doing this and why they are looking for a recommendation.

Breazeale restated the reasoning behind a moratorium is because if Planning decides they now have the capacity to take this project on, and that the City wants to develop a cohesive and comprehensive approach for the entire community making guidelines clear for different scenarios in which we have unplatted roads. Then residents will not waste their time and money.

Pagano stated that Zinn's process was more difficult without this in place. Zinn stated there are more clear-cut paths the City can implement with the advice of Stantec and Council that are fair to all residents.

**Breazeale motion, Halverson second for the use of unplatted roads and underdeveloped right of ways to be referred to the Planning Commission. Honey to bring the referral to Planning at the March 18, 2024 meeting. Carlson to explain appropriate use of a moratorium, and the council directive to Planning is that the reason for this referral is because if Planning decides they now have the capacity to take this project on, and that the city wants to develop a cohesive and comprehensive approach for the entire community and make the guidelines clear for different scenarios involving unplatted roads so residents are not wasting time and money. All ayes, the motion carried.**

Mohr asked if they are asking Planning if they recommend another moratorium. Honey thought they were asking two things. The first is if they recommend a moratorium for one year or less so they can research this topic and make a recommendation to council on use of unplatted roads or related property and the city would not be able to accept any applications related to that use. Mohr asked if that would thwart the project of 2424 Lafayette. If an application is in process, it would go through the regular review process. Pagano thought they were asking Planning for a recommendation on approach. Honey thought that was the second thing is how Planning would approach how they would study a holistic approach to treating unplatted roads and related land. Breazeale stated it may come back the city already had a moratorium on this and they cannot have another one, they should still go down the path of evaluating and coming up with a comprehensive plan. Halverson stated Planning could discuss in April and then Council would discuss it in May.

Resident Bridget Wortman spoke up and stated an application would come to the City before the moratorium decision would be made. Zinn stated the application would go through the Planning Commission and then on to City Council. The applicant can't just go ahead and build. Breazeale added that the process would begin to be in place for the evaluation of potential requests. She added that a potential request highlights the need for the plan for the whole community even if it does not



have direct impact on this particular request. Breazeale added that the goal of a moratorium is not to target one homeowner's project, nor should it be. It is to look at what is best for the entire community going forward.

Honey spoke about the Capital Asset Financing Policy and her discussion with Ehler's. They recommended amendments be made to update the policy stating that the City must retain the same debt issuance and repayment calculations that other MN cities do. She will bring an updated policy to the April council meeting.

She stated that the PFAS litigation suit submission is due sometime between April and June and she is awaiting due date confirmation. She will have Stantec or the MN Department of Health review the test data results prior to submission.

Honey talked to Three Rivers Park District about permitting required to move the Lafayette Club's cart path over the trail. They are working with Zoning Administrator Carlson on that.

She stated that Burgess did a fantastic job on the Presidential Primary Election on March 5, 2024. She stated that the election was organized, efficient, secure and heavily attended.

#### **10.2. Clerk's Report**

Burgess provided the PNP Election results stating that 104 or 25% of residents voted which is not unusual for a PNP. 86 voted in person at City Hall on election day, and 17 voted absentee/early. 72% voted Republican, 29% voted Democrat, and 0 voted for the Legal Marijuana Now party.

Having completed the first round of City Dock Slip rentals for 2024, 55 residents renewed their slip from last year and their applications, registration and payments were processed. She noted that according to the LMCD, 12 inches of rain is needed to bring the lake back up after three years of drought and very little snow this past winter.

Burgess stated building projects are very busy and the City has issued \$2.136M in project valuations with more coming.

#### **10.3. Public Works Superintendent's Report**

Hilgers reported that the homes in the Lafayette Ridge Homeowner's Association are on Orono water. In the 1970's or so, there was not enough water pressure for the homes that were in existence at that time (most are newer than the 70's), so they went on Orono water. He wants to bring them back to Minnetonka Beach water and only three valves will turn them back onto Minnetonka Beach water as long as Orono and the City agree. This needs to be finalized. Mohr asked how the switching back would be dealt with as then these homeowners will be charged the quarterly \$160 fee for the new water treatment plant and water usage. In light of the water quality issues discussed at this meeting this could be a hard sell as which City has better quality water. Hilgers stated that Orono does not have a PFAS problem. Pagano stated that there is manganese in Orono's water.

Zinn suggested that when the new water treatment plant with good, clean water is in place then LRHA homes could switch to Minnetonka Beach water. Breazeale stated that the City should get information on Orono's water quality and what is cost difference if they switch or not. The usage of water will help pay for the water treatment plant and LRHA homes' property taxes are going towards the new plant, but they are not paying the quarterly fee.

Mohr stated that the four homes on Old Beach Rd in Minnetonka Beach are on Orono water but pay Minnetonka Beach property taxes. They can never use Minnetonka Beach water as too far away from it.

Hilgers stated that he can meet with Orono and find out what they think about it. He also spoke with Darrell of Stantec and on April 29<sup>th</sup> KLM will inspect the water tower due to sweating on tower. This should be a warranty repair.

## **11. Council Reports**

### **11.1. Liaison Reports**

**Breazeale** – She stated that Parks meets tomorrow, and they are progressing on the new 5YP. Civic had a meeting recently and gave huge thanks to Hilgers for keeping the ice rink going for the February 4<sup>th</sup> skating party. They had good discussions about looking at existing Civic events and are looking at new opportunities and new, innovative ways to bring the community together. They decided not to have a Newcomers Party this year as home turnover has been low. No Progressive Party this fall as the event is on an 18 month schedule now.

**Dovolis** – no report

**Halverson** – She will attend a Fire meeting tomorrow and Planning Commission meeting on Monday.

**Mohr** – no report

### **11.2. Mayor's Report**

Pagano reported that he attended the Drug Task Force Appreciation lunch. That group is very dedicated, and Police Chief Farniok reported that the drug problem is much bigger than realized. On average, there are 10 deaths each week in Hennepin County and 7.2 of them are from Fentanyl.

Pagano also attended the LMCC meeting and the plan for Rockvam Boatyards buying their building is suspended. The LMCC was already making plans to move to the Long Lake Public Works facility. He stated that the Hanssen's, who are residents, made an offer on 2669 Woodbridge Rd – the Birkholz's lot, but have not closed on it yet.

## **12. Adjourn**

**Halverson motion, Breazeale second to adjourn the March 11, 2024 City Council meeting. All ayes the motion carried.**

**The meeting adjourned at 8:20 pm.**

**PUBLIC IN ATTENDANCE** – Bridget Wortmann, Steve Doyle, Thomas Flint, Jake Saufley, Amy Lamparske

**Respectfully submitted,**

---

**Jane Burgess, City Clerk**