

APPROVED
Minnetonka Beach Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
October 23, 2023 – 7 pm

1. Call to Order

Chair Breazeale called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm.

2. Roll Call

Present: Commissioners Blodgett (arrived at 7:04), Breazeale, Finnegan, Steinfeld, Swanson, Wortman and Council Liaison Halverson. Absent: Anderson resigned earlier today.

Staff in attendance: City Administrator Heidi Honey, Zoning Administrator Phil Carlson, City Engineer Alan Offerman, Public Works Superintendent Jason Hilgers

3. Approve Agenda

Chair Breazeale asked to amend Section 6, by inserting Chapter Reorganization before Item 6.1.

(Swanson motion, Steinfeld second to approve the agenda as amended; all ayes.) Motion passed.

4. Approve Minutes - Regular Meeting of September 26, 2023

Swanson noted four small edits (pg. 3 change “2663” to “2669” as it was incorrect, pg. 5 change “he” to “Carlson”, pg. 6 change “precent” to “precedent”, and pg. 8 change “the” to “they”).

(Steinfeld motion, Finnegan second to approve the Regular Meeting Minutes of September 26, 2023 as amended; all ayes) Motion passed.

5. **New Business**

5.1. Public Hearing Conditional Use Permit Application – Water Treatment Plant (WTP). Applicant: City of the Village of Minnetonka Beach

Breazeale stated the Planning Commission went on site and then reviewed the proposed water treatment plant site at their May 15th meeting where some concerns were brought up. Breazeale then reported the discussion to City Council and Offerman brought questions or concerns back to the design team. One question was if there was an alternate location, but the commissioners determined there were no other options. The other concerns from the May meeting were: 1. Remove the minimum trees required for the building, driveway and for the construction process; 2. Replant as much as possible afterwards; 3. Construct a driveway as narrow as possible since it is one-way; 4. Minimize lighting.

Offerman stated the objective is to provide safe drinking water to the community. He said Stantec addressed the Commission’s concerns from the May 15th meeting to the best of their ability while keeping with the project objectives. Offerman then reviewed the concerns:

Location – The WTP as proposed is ideal from a public works perspective. It is already on city owned property, the area for the WTP was identified when the water tower was built, this is the best location because it is in close proximity to both of the city’s wells which minimizes additional infrastructure costs. Offerman then reviewed his report.

- Minimize tree removal for building construction - Proposed location is where there is already a cleared area used for public works storage. Significant consideration was given to the amount of tree removal, and they want to minimize tree removal to the best of their ability. When building, they need areas for material storage. Other options were reviewed for building materials or stock piling but these other areas on Woodbridge cannot handle the additional wear and the road would need to be rebuilt. The area that would need to be cleared for staging/construction material

storage would permanently be used by public works for daily operations (mulch, compost) because the material storage is currently located where the plant is proposed to be built.

- Reduce Driveway Width and Required Tree Clearing – The proposed 20 ft driveway between Woodbridge and Arcola is in an area with minimal grading and tree removal needed. It will facilitate truck access during the building of the plant. Woodbridge is very dangerous when entering 15 so the designated drive into public works is on Woodbridge and exit public works on Arcola where it is much safer to get on to Shoreline Dr. They considered one access point but that would require additional tree removals. Additionally, suppliers of media will need the driveway sized for a full-size semi. The city has no control over what size trucks will be used to deliver media in the future. The driveway was sized within inches of what is required for a large truck to deliver the media. Required tree removals for both temporary and permanent access drives are the same and tree removal was minimized to the greatest extent possible.
- Reforestation Plan – The plan provides for 12 coniferous trees at the driveway entrance and exit for screening on Woodbridge and Arcola. Once utilities are finalized, they can determine the exact location for plantings. They want them to work esthetically and also put them in locations where they will prosper.
- Minimize site lighting – Exterior mounted lighting is required at each access and egress point and light will be directed downward to reduce glare. They illuminate an egress path approximately 20 ft from the building. Lights can be controlled by city staff. Secondary remote emergency lighting will be installed and will only be used during a power outage. Lights are required by the building code and no other lights have been added.

Carlson reviewed his memo in the packet stating the request is for a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) in the R-1 District. Public used – utility related buildings require a CUP. A conditional use is an allowed use that the city can attach reasonable conditions to address issues that may have impact. He stated they are not debating if the plant will be located as proposed or designed, but rather looking at the features the City may wish to consider conditions to add to the permit. Those issues were identified, in Offerman's report he just discussed, and also Carlsons' report in the packet. Carlson stated that everyone wants to make sure the minimum number of trees are removed for the building, driveway, and construction to the plant. He added that the plant itself is proposed for a smaller already cleared area in the wooded area. Carlson referred to a tree inventory in the packet noting the city forester inspected the trees and counted trees three inches or larger, but City code considers six inches or larger as protected. The tree protection ordinance states the goal is to maintain tree density. This site maintains its tree density and would have 2+ times the required density for the property. There will be replacement of trees for year-round screening at the entry and exit points which is important for views and character of surrounding properties. Underbrush can be added around them, which could be a condition for the permit to be reviewed later when the site is better understood. The driveway is the minimum width necessary to accommodate trucks at 20 ft. Engineers provided a graphic showing the space needed for trucks to maneuver the driveway. Site lighting is downcast, minimal lighting similar to what exists there already. The building is smaller than many homes in the city and 250 feet from any other homes, which is about the same as the existing plant is now. His recommendation is that the Planning Commission recommend approval of the Conditional Use Permit for the water treatment plant with the conditions and findings as outlined in his memo: 1. The project engineers review grading, stormwater, water, sewer, and other utility and engineering features that meet all City standards prior to issuing a building permit; 2. Review specifications for light fixtures to make sure they are as promised; 3. The landscape plan be prepared in detail and reviewed as we discussed tonight; 4. Review the tree inventory and make sure it fits with the City's Tree Protection ordinance. Carlson added that because the tree density is met and no heritage trees are proposed to be removed, by code City staff can issue the tree removal permit. Carlson then referred to six findings in his memo.

Chair Breazeale opened the Public Hearing - 7:24pm

Lilla Andrews – 2526 Arcola Lane – Andrews stated that it appears the driveway will be across from her house and near her mailbox. She expressed concerns about the 20 ft width and frequent large truck activity. Offerman explained that during construction there will be delivery of construction material and, once construction is complete, large trucks will deliver media once every 2 to 5 years. A turnaround would have required many more tree removals, and the current driveway cannot be maneuvered by trucks. Andrews asked where public works' stockpiles of materials will move to. It will be relocated adjacent to where it is today. Andrews stated she is disappointed that the driveway access will be near her driveway. Breazeale stated a filter media truck will use the driveway every 2 to 5 years. Chemical delivery will be similar to today with a box truck once a month and Hilgers will use it as he does now.

Carrie Parente – 2601 Arcola Lane – Parente stated this will impact them. She said when this was discussed as a tag on to the new water tower, there were repeated references to how important the Arcola Woods are, and it is important to preserve them. She stated the City's Comprehensive Plan says one of the things Minnetonka Beach wants to do is preserve and enhance landmarks and it specifically identifies the Arcola Woods as one of those landmarks. It also says that within the Arcola Woods, the sugar maples and rare oaks are specifically identified as things that were important to the City for preserving. She said she hears we want to minimize tree loss, but she has not heard how many trees, and what kind of trees they are talking about. She wants to know if their replacement is budgeted with number of trees and costs. There were references to the tree inventory of the area (over 3") in the packet and additionally a graphic that was shown from the May 15 meeting which depicts the same tree removal line as proposed now and shows significant sized trees (over 6"). Parente stated it appears there are a lot of deciduous trees coming down and the only replacements mentioned were evergreens. Carlson stated the suggested plan was for year-round screening at the entrance/exit but there could be additional deciduous trees planted on the interior of the site. Parente stated that one thing that came up with the tree ordinance is that you cannot replace what is being removed. She wants it known that the parks, old trees, houses, and community were the reason they moved here and why they stay here. That is written into what Minnetonka Beach has said is important to them. She said it hurts to see it discarded.

Offerman stated they understand each tree is special, but the location of the plant requires tree removal and they tried to minimize it as much as they can. He added that the forester's findings were that 70% of the larger trees (10" in diameter) trees were in fair to poor condition.

Parente asked about the budget for reforestation. Offerman stated they have not included a significant reforestation plan for the project as budgeted and recommended the plantings take place after the plant is constructed and its use by public works is fully understood.

Breazeale referred to the forester's report in the packet. Of the thirteen trees which are greater than 21" in diameter, only three are in good condition.

Parente asked the additional cost for alternatives. Offerman explained the current buildings on site will stay except the old plant may or may not remain. She said it saddens her because when its gone, its gone. She then referred to the Limitation of Construction Activity in the Comprehensive Plan, stating "Park and open space designs must be oriented to people rather than the success as to how it meets the needs of machines." and what she is hearing is they are doing this based on the needs of machines. She stated it would have been nice to know what other options were evaluated and the associated costs.

There was discussion about whether the existing driveway could be used and then exit via Arcola Lane. It would not be physically possible for trucks, especially semis, to navigate this area. Smaller trucks using the current driveway hit the existing water treatment plant building by the well. There used to be an elm tree near the street by the driveway which was killed by trucks scraping it. Offerman then stated if they

considered a different location for the WTP or combining it with other current buildings, it would cost multi-millions more. It was not a negligible amount.

Carolyn Evans - 2503 Woodbridge – Evans stated this greatly affects her because her property is across from the proposed new driveway entrance and public works. She thanked the commissioners for their volunteerism, stating it is wonderful and they hope to resolve things without much costs. She asked the size of the building, which is approximately 60' x 80'. Its size is required for the additional water treatment. Evans stated for the water tower, people on Woodbridge were very accommodating and the tower was moved toward Woodbridge and 15 extra trees were removed and nobody spoke up. She didn't know if trees needed to be discussed. She expressed concerns about the width of the driveway, stating the width of her car is 6.5 ft, and a standard road is 20 -25 ft wide and 8 ft on either side of the line. She thought a semi needs 13.5 ft to make a turn, but it was determined that was incorrect. Engineers created a diagram on pg 30 in the packet which shows that the rear wheels drag, where the tires of a truck go and that the 20 feet is needed for the semis. The semis should not impact her driveway on Woodbridge and Hilgers stated the City would repair any damage if it occurred to her driveway. Evans discussed permits and Offerman explained that the city is required to get the same permits as other projects.

Patty Rezabek – 2522 Lafayette Rd – email read by Kim Petersen - “I am unable to attend the public hearing tonight and want to share some thought about the WTP planning process. Firstly, I appreciate the efforts and energy gone into the planning process including the recent mapping and tree inventory. I have walked the staked area through the Arcola forest area. The visuals are always good. I hope there is another plan that will accommodate the WTP without the removal of 179 trees of various ages and conditions. How cities design infrastructure projects say a lot about the values of the city, economically and environmentally. What will the cost of reforestation include? Is that cost included in the total cost of the plan. One of the difficult issues of the HC tree grant was getting the trees watered. Have Jason's time for tree watering and maintenance been included in the full project cost. Will his daily work schedule allow for the needed tree tending. I believe we can do better. Let's consider and decide on a different plan that is both economically and environmentally beneficial to the city. Again, appreciations to you all for your time to the community. Patty Rezabek”

Kim Petersen – 2938 Northview Rd – Petersen stated that environmentally reforestation is very costly, and deforestation comes at a huge cost. Without looking at reforestation, they are not looking at the full project cost. She asked how reforestation will be paid for. She stated construction traffic on any road causes damage so not using a portion of the road for staging during construction to prevent damage is not justified. Petersen asked if the City's tree replacement ordinance will be abided by the city. Carlson stated it is one of the conditions of approval. Petersen asked if the City checked with the city of Orono to purchase water. Breazeale stated that it was already explored by City council and they determined a new water treatment plant should be built and that is why this application is being reviewed. Honey stated that the former mayor, city engineer and others had numerous meetings with Orono and that option was thoroughly vetted but it was determined building a new water treatment plant was financially a better option for the city. The city would be responsible for building infrastructure between it and Orono, the city would lose income once the plant is paid off, and the city would not have any control over water rates and fees charges to residents, which are currently higher than Minnetonka Beach. Petersen asked if the south side of the proposed new driveway could be reduced in size or reforested. The area will likely be used by public works for material storage and a portion may be able to be reforested later. Petersen stated it seems like a short-term benefit for long term loss. There was discussion about if that area could be reduced and still allow public works to operate as needed. Petersen asked them to consider costs for reforestation and road repair in cost of the project.

Lilla Andrews asked if the old plant can be remodeled. The costs to rehab the building would be expensive, and the building needs to be much larger and abide by current codes. The existing plant was built in 1958. The new plant is located 50 ft south of the right of way, and 50 ft north of the BMP as required by city code. Its location is also limited by wells, sewer and water setbacks, which are MN Dept of Health regulations.

Mary McCarten – 2554 Arcola – McCarten agreed with what was previously said environmentally and historically. She stated the way the tower was built was to use cranes to work around the trees. She asked them to keep that in mind when building the plant. They saved a number of trees by using different methods.

Breazeale closed the public hearing at 8:05pm

Wortman stated she does not feel she is making an informed decision if its not the true cost of the project, with either repairing the roads or reforestation. She sees 179 trees being removed and planting 12. Any reforestation may not be an option due to public works operations, but if there were, the taxpayers would be absorbing those costs. She stated they need to know the full cost to the community, and they need to know the environmental impact. Offerman stated the project can support some additional tree planting. A significant reforestation was not included in the cost. Wortman then stated the tree ordinance is for minimum standards for a residential lot, but these historical woods should have different standards.

Breazeale asked to review the four areas of concerns:

Width of Driveway –

Breazeale stated the driveway takes up a lot of space for a truck that comes in every few years. Hilgers explained the truck is a tanker semi with a pump system to pump in and remove slurry and may be up to 53 ft long. PFAS is a big concern and when the system fully gets in action with many providers treating it, the city will need to allow for large trucks. There was discussion about the volume of media slurry to be removed. Stantec talked with vendors about what size truck needs to be planned for.

Swanson asked about smaller trucks. Hilgers stated that they have been cautioned that if the road is not wide enough, the trucks will not service the city. An engineering study was done to determine the turning maneuvers needed and the simulation shows the size needed. Breazeale stated tankers are most common for liquid. Wortman asked if they can get a second opinion about the size of the driveway. Breazeale stated they need to accommodate the quantity correctly for the system. Offerman stated the system is sized for the community but did not know the exact gallons the trucks will carry to service the PFAS treatment. Breazeale stated a 20 ft driveway feels like a road instead of a driveway.

Carlson pointed out the pink outline of the construction area, and even if a smaller truck was used, clearing would be the same because they need the area to build the plant.

Finnegan asked if the driveway can be limestone instead of asphalt. Hilgers stated that the media change trucks, and chlorine delivery trucks all need asphalt to support their loads. The city cannot choose what size truck will deliver material. There was discussion that even if the driveway was narrowed, it would only be approximately 4 ft. on the east side.

Offerman to follow up on the gallons for media change for the tanker semis.

Gating -

Commissioners recommended gating the driveway.

Tree Removal -

Breazeale reviewed the diagrams in the packet and from the May Planning meeting showing existing cleared areas and wondered if some trees could be saved to the east of the driveway. There was discussion about the sewer line, the BMP, driveway required setbacks from the building which require some tree removals. The proposed building now incorporates PFAS treatment which was not on the preliminary diagram in May so it is a bit larger and moved north. Hilgers explained movement of any component affects another component of the project. He added there are a handful of trees along the clearing line that they will try to save if they can.

Wortman asked if there is a staging area that can be used on Woodbridge Rd. to save some of the forest, including smaller trees. Woodbridge would need to be rebuilt and that doesn't solve the issue of an area for public works daily operations. Breazeale stated a cleared area exists that is larger than the footprint of the building and clearing wouldn't be needed. He questioned if clearing is needed so far south and east of the clearing. Offerman stated if the city were to consider a constrained site, it would be significantly higher cost. There was discussion about bidding it for working within a constrained site and not a constrained site.

Breazeale discussed the clearing along the driveway and asked about the area to the north of the manholes. Hilgers stated there will be a stockpile of dirt as they excavate the building as well as stockpiling materials. Breazeale said if this building is the size of a house, it seems like they are clearing a much larger area than for a house. Swanson again commented on Wortman's comment of staging on Woodbridge at the west side. Offerman stated there is a potential for the road to be damaged with construction but if staging is close to the construction site, it would minimize damage to the road.

Carlson asked if Offerman can quantify the site needs for excavation and staging. Offerman stated they looked at it extensively and this was the minimal size required to stage construction without causing undue burden to the residents. He added that if the city wants to consider an alternative, it will complicate the bid. Sewer, BMP, and driveway setbacks all need to remain. They could ask for a bid as proposed and an alternate bid to limit the staging area.

Storing materials offsite elsewhere in the city or west of Woodbridge would be inefficient and expensive.

Swanson stated it seems like what is presenting doesn't have room to provide much input. She asked for more consideration for concerns that have been expressed. There was additional discussion about the difference in costs for minimizing tree removal.

Offerman stated that they can look at removing less trees but there will need to be an alternate area for public works daily operations. Steinfeld suggested that they could remove less trees in the area for public works material storage, and if they find public works needs more area to operate, they could remove a few more trees later during reforestation. Staging will take place where the current material storage area is located.

Swanson said it seems wrong to look at the tree ordinance to determine minimum density for woods because it is designed to apply to residential lots.

Breazeale discussed the area to the east of the new sewer line (east of the driveway) and asked why 20 ft on the side of driveway needs to be clear. Offerman explained it is for grading the driveway approximately 6 ft. Breazeale stated that makes sense, that a certain slope is needed and that clearing is needed. Trees can be planted on the slope afterward. Offerman stated the project budget can support 10 to 25 trees but not a significant reforestation plan to replace the 179 trees. Swanson stated she is reluctant to vote in favor of the project unless she is assured that the reforestation is maximized to the extent possible, that it is specified in the plan, and that it is budgeted for either in the project budget or it is a line item elsewhere in the city budget. Breazeale stated when you are reforesting you don't want to pack in a lot of trees so they will grow. They

would need to be spread out more to grow. Swanson agreed they would not be crowded together but spread apart to survive. Offerman stated there are minimum distance guidelines for planting. Carlson and Breazeale discussed planting them, so the canopies don't prevent them from growing. Carlson also stated planting trees with approximately 2.5" diameter have the best chance of survival and many of the trees in the woods are quite small. Planting trees with larger diameters do not have a good chance of survival. The city forester and landscape architects could advise on recommended reforestation/landscape plans. Breazeale stated planting 30 trees would actually be a lot. Offerman again stated the project could support planting 12-25 trees.

Breazeale then summarized the discussion:

- Confirm tanker size to minimize the size of the driveway possibly 4 ft
- Look at options to clear less trees, and determine the effect on the project budget
- Put reforestation in the budget
- Gates needed to prevent people from cutting through

Finnegan and Swanson discussed abiding by the spirit of the tree replacement ordinance because this is the woods, not a residential property. No heritage trees are proposed to be removed so there is no requirement to replace inch per inch, but it is understood with the woods they would like reforestation.

Lighting – The plan as presented is good.

Mayor Pagano referred to the section of the Comprehensive Plan discussed earlier stating on page 45 Arcola Woods (Natural Area) Plan, it says to maintain and enhance natural wooded areas – On-going. It also says the woods shall be maintained and restored to enhance the community character.

There was additional discussion about the trees and inventory from the city forester. Wortman suggested trees marked "fair to poor" could also be in the range toward "good". Honey explained that trees marked "fair to poor" had major structural defects or were a hazard.

Breazeale summarized the four items to include in the motion: install gates, confirm the tanker exchange gallons and weight, options to clear less land, restoration of woods is in Comp Plan and reforestation to the maximum advisable be specified in the project and included in the budget. Wortman expressed concerns that "minimizing what is cleared" is too soft. There was then discussion about the trees west of the driveway and the unlikelihood any of them could be saved, and then trees to the east of the driveway were discussed. Some trees need to be removed for installing a sewer line. Offerman stated it may impact project costs but the triangle between the new sewer manholes and the pink line on pg. 28 in the packet to the east would not have a significant impact on the project for long term public works, grading, or other construction issues. A distance of 20 ft is required east of sewer line and between the manholes, a shorter distance may impact the tree's health. Minimum amount of tree removal to the east of the sewer line and south of the manhole. The recommendation in the bid includes the minimum tree removal to the east of the sewer line. Offerman explained that they would provide a clearing limit for the trees in the bid package and in his opinion 20 ft east of the sewer line would be least detrimental to the project costs. He added if the city is interested in saving more trees, it would impact public works operations. Wortman looked for ways to be more descriptive in which trees to save or a way to save more woods but stated if they try to save everything within 15 ft of the sewer line and have some reforestation budget, that's reasonable. She understands the need for and is support of the project but is trying to save the woods.

(Swanson motion, Steinfeld second to approve conditional use permit subject to the following Conditions of Approval:

- 1. That gates be placed at the north and south ends of the access driveway to prevent non public works use of the driveway.**

2. That the construction seeks to comply to a greater degree with the Minnetonka Beach Comprehensive Plan which states: *Arcola Woods (Natural Area) Plan Design Standards - The woods shall be maintained and restored to enhance the community character, by stipulating that no trees be removed to the east of the sewer unless absolutely essential to project.*
3. That the cost of reforestation and landscaping be included in and specified in the plan and budgeted.
4. The project engineers will submit plans for site grading, stormwater, water, sewer, and other utility and engineering features that meet all City standards before a building permit is issued.
5. Specifications for the exterior light fixtures will be submitted for review and approval by the City Planner and City Engineer before a building permit is issued.
6. City staff will review the inventory prepared by the City Forester of trees to be removed for the project and trees remaining and issue a Tree Removal Permit under the standards of the City's Tree Protection ordinance in Section 6.2 of the Zoning Code.

based on these following Findings of Fact for Approval:

1. The new water treatment plant (WTP) is an essential public utility service for the city.
2. As a public utility-related use the WTP requires a Conditional Use Permit per City code.
3. The location, scale and general layout of the WTP facility has been analyzed in depth by the City Engineer. The proposed site and project area are the only feasible location for the facility.
4. The proposed clearing of trees for the project is the minimum necessary for the building, access drives, and construction staging.
5. The addition of new trees and landscaping to the site after construction is reasonable and adequate to provide screening to the surrounding streets and neighborhood and to restore some of the lost wooded area.
6. The project as proposed with the Conditions of Approval meets the criteria for approving a Conditional Use Permit in Section 3.4.4.D of the Zoning Code.; all ayes.) Motion passed.

6. Old Business

6.1. Zoning Code Chapter Reorganization – (item added when agenda was amended)

Breazeale reviewed his handout showing the reordering of current code of 6 chapters into Chapters 1 through 12. He explained two problems with the current code:

1.the zoning districts are 44 pages; and have the zoning districts have rules mixed in. Breazeale requested to split the zoning districts out (P-1, R-1 and Overlay Districts) and then move development standards for P-1 and R-1 to a separate chapter in following the DNR model ordinance and then move the other overlay districts into separate chapters at end of the code because they do not apply to most properties. He would keep Shoreland District Overlay as Chapter 13, but it will go away as those rules are moved into the base code. It will be reviewed at the next meeting. The Work Group is doing work on these chapters. There would be six chapters from the zoning districts section.

2. Finishing standards include vegetation and land alteration standards but those should be a separate section, so he wants to move the tree ordinance and shoreland out of the finishing standards and into a vegetation and land alteration standard section. There would be two chapters of vegetation and land alteration standards.

This would get them very organized to present their work to Planning, the DNR and City Council.

(Wortman motion, Finnegan second to approve reordered sections as presented.); all ayes.) Motion passed.

6.2. Amendment to City Code Appendix A (Zoning) – Chapters 1 and 3 regarding Shoreland Covered in 6.1.

6.3. Amendment to City Code Appendix A (Zoning) – Remaining Chapters – Reorder Sections Covered in 6.1.

6.4. Amendment to City Code Appendix A (Zoning) – Section 3.4.4.J – Conditional Use Permit Amendments Breazeale stated they would review this at the next meeting.

7. Reports

Halverson reported that the city approved the appeal of the zoning administrator regarding the Lafayette Club fence and the Lafayette Club will need to apply to amend its CUP for the fence. Council discussed creating guidelines on what issues would require the Club to apply for a CUP amendment in the future. Breazeale stated he has ideas of a simple code language amendment to handle that. She added that the water treatment plant estimated costs are coming in the range but at the high end.

Breazeale asked that the November 27 meeting be moved to November 28th.

Meeting changed to November 28th, all ayes. Motion passed.

Planning may have the Lafayette Club CUP amendment at the next meeting. Breazeale stated they may have to have some later meetings to tackle the zoning code amendments. Honey stated that sometimes things come up, such as the CUP discussed tonight, and as long as they keep moving forward Council will understand.

8. Adjournment

(Steinfeld motion, Blodgett second to adjourn; all ayes.) Motion passed.

Chair Breazeale adjourned the meeting at 9:55 p.m.

PUBLIC IN ATTENDANCE – The following individuals signed the sign-in sheet: Carrie Parente, C. Evans, Mary McCarten, Lilla Andrews, Kim Petersen, Bill Whitely

Minutes respectfully submitted by City Administrator Heidi Honey

Heidi Honey, City Administrator