

**INVER GROVE HEIGHTS CITY COUNCIL MEETING  
MONDAY, JANUARY 10, 2022 - 6:00 P.M. - 8150 BARBARA AVENUE**

**1. CALL TO ORDER:**

The City Council of Inver Grove Heights met in regular session on Monday, January 10, 2022, in person. Mayor Bartholomew called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

**2. ROLL CALL:**

Present In-Person: Mayor Bartholomew, Council Members: Dietrich, Murphy, and Gliva; City Administrator Wilson, City Attorney McCauley Nason, City Clerk Kiernan, Associate Planner Botten, Community Development Director Rand, Civil Engineer Moser, Police Chief Chiodo, and Parks and Recreation Director Lares.

Absent: Council Member Piekarski Krech

**3. PRESENTATIONS:**

**4. CONSENT AGENDA:**

- A.**
  - i.** Minutes from the November 22, 2021, City Council meeting.
  - ii.** Minutes from the December 6, 2021, City Council Special meeting.
  - iii.** Minutes from the December 6, 2021, City Council Work Session.
- B. Resolution 2022-01** approving disbursements for period ending January 4, 2022.
- C.** Approve personnel actions.
- D.** Designate 2022 official legal publication/newspaper.
- E.** Designate 2022 official depositories.
- F.** Designate 2022 Acting Mayor.
- G.** Designate Council liaison/committee appointments.
- H.** Authorize Electronic Fund Transfers (EFT). **Resolution 2022-02**
- I.** Authorize budget transfer of donated police funds. **Resolution 2022-003**
- J.** Accept updates to IGH Emergency Operations plan. **Resolution 2022-004**
- K.** Appoint deputy weed inspector and city forester.
- L.** Resolutions approving agreements related to new prosecution firm. **Resolutions 2022-005 and 2022-006**
- M. Resolution 2022-007** approving the application for fiscal year 2022 Dakota County Community Development Block Grant funding.
- N. Resolution 2022-008** approving Pathways to Policing grant application.
- O.** Approve encroachment agreement for landowner improvements within city drainage and utility easement for 7755 Boyd Ave.
- P.** Consider Change Order No. 1 for City Project No. 2021-09D - Bryant Lane area improvements.
- Q.** Authorize Issuance of request for proposals for utility rate study.
- R.** Approve Axon contract for tasers/body worn cameras/squad car cameras. **Resolution 2022-009**
- S.** Consider Change Order No. 1 for public works facility project.

**Motion by Dietrich, second by Murphy, to approve the Consent Agenda as presented.**

**Ayes: 4**

**Nays: 0      Motion carried.**

**5. PUBLIC HEARING:**

**6. REGULAR AGENDA:**

**A. Consider the following actions for property located at 5871 Cahill Avenue:**

- 1. A Comprehensive Plan Amendment to change the guided land use from NC, Neighborhood Commercial and LDR, Low Density Residential to LMDR, Low-Medium Density Residential. Resolution 2022-010**
- 2. A Rezoning from R-1C, Single Family Residential and B-3, General Business to R-3B, Multiple Family Residential. Ordinance 1422**

Associate Planner Heather Botten discussed property located south of Upper 55<sup>th</sup> Street on the west side of Cahill Avenue. Cahill Avenue is a designated minor arterial road. The request is for two parcels at a total of 2.24 acres. Current zoning is B-3 General Business on the north lot and R-1C Single Family Residential on the south lot. They are guided in the 2040 Comprehensive Plan as Neighborhood Commercial and Low Density Residential. The Applicant would like to develop the two parcels into a townhome development. In order to do so, a rezoning and Comprehensive Plan Amendment are required to be consistent with the potential development. If the proposed requests are successful, an application for a plat and Conditional Use Permit would be required before any construction or work can be done on site. This subsequent process would require a Public Hearing, at which time comments on site design, setbacks, trees, landscaping, and location of buildings would be done at the next step. The Applicant has stated the potential development would consist of a maximum of 17 townhome units. 17 units on 2.24 acres, the density would be 7.6 units per acre. The density would fall under the LMDR (Low to Medium Density Residential) category. LMDR allows for ranges in the 4-8 units per acre.

She stated the Applicant is also requesting rezoning the parcels to an R-3B, Multiple Family. The R3-B District is for multi-family dwelling units up to 7 units a building and ranging up to 12 units an acre. Infrastructure is in place to accommodate a multi-family development. The surrounding land uses would be single family to the south, single family, and open space to the west, commercial and office to the north, multi-family, and office to the east. Multiple family housing is a typical type of development found along arterial roads. Staff believes the proposed zoning and land use designations do not appear to be out of character for the neighborhood, it would be a good infill transitional use between residential properties and the commercial and office properties. Based on information presented, what is in the Staff report and the Conditions listed in the Resolution, Staff recommends approval of the request. At the Planning Commission's December 21<sup>st</sup>, Public Hearing, they unanimously supported the request with the conditions listed.

Doug Johnson, owner of Blue-Ribbon Builders, stated he has been building since 1997. He built a townhome project similar to this in Coon Rapids which was home ownership, just like what they would be doing here. The property they are proposing putting the buildings on fits the neighborhood. He has been working with his Engineers and Architects and said for density they are actually looking at less than 17 to meet setbacks. The townhomes would be two-story with two car garages. They would work with the city on the open space and parking.

Mayor Bartholomew said he wanted to make sure Mr. Johnson was aware of the setback limitations and does not run into a density issue. Mr. Johnson replied he would not look for a variance, they would scale back the project to fit within the means of the setbacks and Ordinances.

Mayor Bartholomew asked if Mr. Johnson had looked at the recommendation from Staff and if he had questions regarding the conditions. Mr. Johnson responded he did not have questions. He mentioned that Staff did a very good job.

Jenny Finwall, 5905 Cahill Avenue, said her property is located south of the proposed property. Her concern was about the amount of green space they would have if there were kids. She said they are

already having issues with the emergency housing down the street because they do not have any place for the kids to go. They seem to play in everyone's yards to and from McDonald's and Walgreens. She prefers having a privacy fence between. She said there is a heavy spruce tree line there that is going to get cut through. She was concerned about how many trees she would lose depending on the setbacks and number of people next door.

Mayor Bartholomew commented if separation and screening could be discussed at the time of Application. He addressed Ms. Finwall and said her information is on the record. Staff would make sure that is addressed and discussed.

Councilmember Gliva said this area has been looked at for apartments, it is in between a single-family home and Walgreens. She said it seems like home ownership townhomes would fit and seemed like a good transition. She suggested making sure there are barriers to protect the homeowner.

Mayor Bartholomew said he thought this was a good buffer. There is a slope to the west, ownership product, and densities are in the right spot. Green space, privacy, and separation would be addressed at the time of application for construction. He supports the Comprehensive Plan Amendment. He said he would encourage this passing; it is a good buffer.

Councilmember Dietrich said she believes it was a good product for the area. She encouraged the Developer to be very thoughtful about having it be owned and not rented. She appreciated the Developer's indication of that.

Councilmember Murphy agreed with all that has been said.

**Motion by Murphy, second by Dietrich, to approve the following action for property located at 5871 Cahill Avenue:**

- 1. A Comprehensive Plan Amendment to change the guided land use from NC, Neighborhood Commercial and LDR, Low Density Residential to LMDR, Low-Medium Density Residential. Resolution 2022-010**

**Ayes: 4**

**Nays: 0      Motion carried.**

**Motion by Dietrich, second by Gliva, to approve the following actions for property located at 5871 Cahill Avenue:**

- 2. A Rezoning from R-1C, Single Family Residential and B-3, General Business to R-3B, Multiple Family Residential. Ordinance 1422**

**Ayes: 4**

**Nays: 0      Motion carried.**

**B. Consider approval of rental licenses (18).**

Community Development Director Heather Rand said the following is for the approval of license rental properties/homes within the city. Licenses are valid for up to two years. The city has received an additional 18 Applications. Staff has reviewed these and found the Applications to be complete. The Police Department has done background checks. Staff recommends approval of the following 18 Rental Licenses:

- 4819 Bisset Lane - Jeffrey Campbell
- 6975 Archer Court - Har Mattaparti
- 6973 Archer Place - Har Mattaparti
- 8163 Darcy Lane - Jennifer Sobota
- 2111 78<sup>th</sup> Court - Ronald Richins
- 7870 Barbara Avenue - Francis Hickey
- 3816 67<sup>th</sup> Street - Francis Hickey
- 3811 66<sup>th</sup> Street - Francis Hickey
- 7810 Barbara Avenue - Francis Hickey
- 9395 Old Concord Blvd. - Michael Cassidy
- 4927 Bisset lane - Mohammad Yousaf
- 2586 - 49<sup>th</sup> Street - Kathleen Pan
- 4888 Boatman Lane - Robert Stefani
- 3484 Cloman Way - Kyle Corniea
- 4852 Bivens Court - Scott Anderson
- 4877 Bitterman Path - Shailesh Koppikar
- 3220 81<sup>st</sup> Street - Todd Kelm
- 4875 Bryce Avenue - Larry Groppoli

Councilmember Murphy questioned if the Council would be revisiting the Policy around rentals in the future at a Work Session. Community Development Director Rand agreed and said that is intended to take place some time in February as a part of a strategic discussion. Staff will bring information and get input from Council, with possible changes that could be made to improve the process and provide residents with what Staff hopes to be a greater assurance of the safety and security of these rentals.

**Motion by Gliva, second by Dietrich, to approve the 18 Rental Licenses.**

**Ayes: 4**

**Nays: 0      Motion carried.**

**C. Consider Resolution receiving Feasibility Report and scheduling a Public Hearing for City Project No. 2022-09G - Albano Trail and Albright Court rehabilitation. Resolution 2022-011**

Civil Engineer Jacob Moser, gave a presentation asking the Council to consider receiving the Feasibility Report and scheduling the Public Hearing for City Project No. 2022-09G Albano Trail and Albright Court Area Street Rehabilitation.

Project Background:

- North of Highway 3, South Robert Trail, east of Highway 149/Jefferson Trail.
- Single Family Home Development.
  - Platted as Ves Valley Estates
  - 26 homes
  - Includes 1.6 lane-miles of urban street with curb.
    - Constructed in 2002
    - Past maintenance:
      - Sealcoat in 2006
      - 2014 (Albright Court only)
      - Miscellaneous patching, potholes, and pavement issues

Project Progress:

- Initiated by City Council through the Pavement Management Initiative.
- Council authorized a Feasibility Report in October 2021.
  - 1 of 8 Feasibility Reports
  - Once authorized, Staff prioritized the most cost effective and least complex projects that could benefit the most properties and mileage of streets
  - Remaining feasibility reports are scheduled to be completed in early 2022
  - Further fiscal and budget review will be necessary for additional projects
- Staff hosted a virtual and in-person open house to share feasibility findings with residents in December.

A slide of the streets was displayed showing Albano Trail, Albright Court, and the 26 single family lots. There is a non-accessible outlot that is privately owned and encumbered by easement.

Feasibility Recommendation:

- 2" Mill & Overlay.
  - Grind and replace the upper 2" of pavement
- Spot curb replacement.
  - On an as-needed basis to fix major structural deficiencies to maintain drainage in the curb line. Hair line cracks and aesthetic issues would not be included in the rehab project
- Minor utility maintenance
  - Includes storm sewer casting adjustments, storm drains, and curb line
  - This neighborhood does not have sewer and water utilities. All are on well and septic

Project Cost/Budget:

Total Project Costs:

- Streets: \$277,100
- Storm Sewer: \$29,200
- Total: \$306,300

Total Project Funding:

- Pavement Management Fund: \$55,400
- Stormwater Utility Fund: \$5,900
- Special Assessments: \$245,000
- Total: \$306,300

Special Assessments - Single Family:

- Per City Policy for Mill and Overlay projects, 80% of the street and storm costs are assessed to benefitting property owners.
- Single family lots are assessed on a uniform per parcel basis.
- Preliminary Per Policy Assessment: \$9,424
  - Large assessment for a mill and overlay project
  - Larger lots, average 1.5 acres with large frontages
  - Assessments are fair per Policy
- A Special Benefit Analysis was performed by an Independent Appraiser.
  - Provided a \$15,600 Special Benefit Cap per single family residence
- 26 single family lots are included on the preliminary roll.
- Recommended 5-year term on special assessment payments.
  - Approved by the City Council at a later Assessment Hearing

Tentative Project Schedule:

- Receive the Feasibility Report, call for an Improvement Hearing: January 10, 2022.
- If approved, Staff would invite residents to a Virtual Information Meeting: February 2022.
- Council would be requested to hold the Improvement Hearing and order the plans and specifications at the February 28, 2022 City Council Meeting.

- Plans would be prepared and approved: March 2022.
- Bid Opening: April 2022.
- Council would be asked to receive bids and award the project: April 25, 2022.
- Begin Construction: Late May 2022.
- Substantial completion date: August 2022.
- Assessment Hearing Information Meeting held by Staff to present the final proposed assessments to the property owners: September 2022.
- Hold an Assessment Hearing to adopt final assessments: October 2022.

He stated that this was a change from the schedule shared with residents at the December open house. At that time, they had the Assessment Hearing to be held prior to construction. Based on property owner feedback and Staff discussion, the recommendation is to hold the Assessment Hearing after construction. This allows for the possibility of realizing cost savings during construction, those would be reflected in the assessments based on final assessment costs.

Staff Recommendations:

- Adopt Resolution
  - Receive Feasibility Report
  - Schedule Improvement Hearing for February 28, 2022

Mayor Bartholomew asked if Staff had a copy of the Benefit Analysis Report. Civil Engineer Moser responded yes. Mayor Bartholomew requested the Council be given a copy of that via email. Civil Engineer Moser agreed.

Mayor Bartholomew commented he felt it was wise to wait until after construction to hold the Assessment Hearing. It is a lot of money. The rationale was correct due to the size of the lots and frontage, shows a benefit that he believes would be supported by the analysis.

Mayor Bartholomew referred to the Outlot and permanent easement and asked if it was from the HOA, the city, agreement with the city, or the landowners. He asked if that information was known. Civil Engineer Moser responded the outlot is listed as owned by the HOA. In reading the development contracts he knows it was a part of the Development Contract.

Mayor Bartholomew said it was a permanent outlot, there was no way someone could acquire it. Civil Engineer Moser responded that was correct. It has the easements encumbrance on it.

Councilmember Dietrich asked how well attended the in-person and virtual meetings were. Civil Engineer Moser responded the virtual meeting had pretty good attendance with 12 participants. For the in-person meeting there were no residents for this project.

Councilmember Dietrich asked what some of the feedback received was. Civil Engineer Moser responded the general comment received is usually about the cost of the assessments and questioning why taxes do not pay for that. He said Staff explained this was a part of the city Assessment Policy. It is the way it has been determined to fairly pay for local streets in the city. There was no substantial opposition to the project.

Councilmember Dietrich said it was something they were discussing in the Citizen's Task Force, about conversations and getting more awareness out there of how the Policy is put into play. She said hopefully Staff will not have to answer that same question.

**Motion by Murphy, second by Dietrich, to approve Resolution 2022-011 receiving the Feasibility Report and scheduling a Public Hearing for City Project No. 2022-09G - Albano Trail and Albright Court rehabilitation.**

**Ayes: 4**

**Nays: 0      Motion carried.**

**D. Consider First Reading of Small Cell Ordinance.**

City Attorney Bridget McCauley Nason stated she did not have a large presentation to bring forward to the Council regarding this item at the First Reading. She has spoken with Staff and would be working with the incoming Public Works Director. As this moves forward, there may be additional presentation materials including some visuals. This could take place at the next meeting or the meeting after that. She provided background to this item stating in 2017 there were a number of Legislative changes made and FCC Regulation changes that impacted the roll out of small wireless facilities. These are not the big cell facilities noticed on water towers or stand-alone poles. These are smaller facilities that may be attached to light poles or a similar structure. With the Legislative changes came requirements for cities to allow these small wireless facilities within the city right of way as a permitted user within the rights of way. The city is allowed to provide some regulation of these facilities. It cannot be prohibited, dictated where they are going to go, and cannot establish high fees that exceed those established by Statute. The city does have some ability to require, for example, aesthetic standards for certain right of way facilities, that small wireless facilities enter into a Co-location Agreement with the city if they are going to be co-locating their facilities on a city structure such as a city owned light post or a city owned stop light.

She stated in 2017/2018, the city moved forward with the First Reading of an Ordinance adopting the League of Minnesota Cities Model Ordinance for small wireless facilities. The city also adopted aesthetic standards for small wireless facilities. Looking at the Fee Schedule, there are actually fees related to small wireless facilities. She said for whatever reason after the First Reading passed unanimously, it did not come back before the Council for adoption. This is why this item is back before the Council this evening. It is being started at a First Reading standpoint because it is a new Council and the first time, they are seeing it. This would then come before the Council for a Second and Third Reading. She said there would also be some Zoning Ordinance Amendments that come forward along with this. The city is circumscribed from adopting regulations outside of those that it is authorized to do so by Statute and regulation. The city can require a Conditional Use Permit for small wireless facilities to be located in single family residential zoning districts which gives the city some slightly larger modicum of control over the placement of those facilities to ensure they are not too disruptive to those residential neighborhoods. This is probably the broadest discretion the city has with respect to these facilities and placement.

She stated the plan is to bring forward for Council consideration after it goes through Planning Commission, the Zoning Ordinance Amendment which would make small wireless facilities a conditional use within the single-family residential zoning district. The Ordinance itself is adopted from the Leagues Model Ordinance. It has been adopted by many cities within the State of Minnesota. She said there was not any significant changes to this Ordinance from what was brought forward to the Council for a First Reading a few years ago. The request is for Council to consider the First Reading of this Ordinance knowing it would be brought back twice. The goal is to have the final reading coincide with adopting the Zoning Ordinance Amendment, adoption of a standard co-location agreement, and a few other agreements the city can adopt as part of its regulation of these small cell facilities.

Mayor Bartholomew said when this was discussed prior, one of his concerns was with overlay areas, in particular the airport overlay area where there is a height constraint. He said there was a height limitation in the airport area of 35 feet. None of these, if recalling correctly, were over that scale and were well under that with this Ordinance. City Attorney McCauley Nason responded yes, typically. She stated there is some reference to height regulations with respects to facilities. The news has shown that there has been quite a bit of talk and some tension with the FAA and the roll out of the 5G Network and some concerns with respect to potential airport interference that may or may not exist. These are typically the small wireless facilities, they attach to standard light poles, streetlamps, or utility poles. It is not the larger towers that might come into play with the airport or other zones.

Mayor Bartholomew said when he was in Edina, he saw the school baseball field and it looked like every light pole had a tower on it. He asked if a capacity issue could be addressed. City Attorney McCauley Nason responded there is no limitations on the number of these facilities. The city does not have the authority to put a limitation on them. It is up to the wireless providers. The only thing the city has much discretion with is dealing with those facilities in the single-family residential zoning district, and then require a Conditional Use Permit. She advised the Council that they do not have to go that route. Some cities have chosen to not require a Conditional Use Permit. The Council does not have to if they do not want to. It provides the only space where the Council could have some oversight in the placement of these facilities in the single-family residential zoning districts to ensure that they do not interfere as much as possible, with the use of the single-family residential district.

Mayor Bartholomew said it offers a chance for discretion.

Councilmember Murphy wanted clarification if most cities have adopted what the League of Minnesota Cities has helped with. He asked if that was an accurate assessment. City Attorney McCauley Nason responded she did not know if it was most/many but the discussions in the City Attorney universe when this first came to light in 2017 was that most cities did adopt the League's Model Ordinance. The city is limited as to how they can regulate these facilities. The League Ordinance does comply with the Statutory and other regulatory constraints.

Councilmember Murphy asked if the First Reading included the potential of it being a Conditional Use in residential. City Attorney McCauley Nason responded yes.

Councilmember Murphy asked what these do. He questioned if it was cell service. City Attorney McCauley Nason replied when Cellular came out they were big and shot cellular signals from faraway places. Now the way the Network is more distributed, smaller sites are needed to send signals around.

Mayor Bartholomew believed the Council should consider the First Reading and look at the revised work.

**Motion by Gliva, second by Murphy, to accept the First Reading of Small Cell Ordinance.**

**Ayes: 4**

**Nays: 0      Motion carried.**

**7. PUBLIC COMMENT:**

Corey Clarin, 1120 Alaureate Court, addressed road flooding stating he lives just to the south of where the Civil Engineer was discussing the road project on Albano and Albright. Highway 3/Robert Trail runs

east/west in that section. On the south side of Robert Trail there is a pond. He said that part of Highway 3 also had MnDOT's road project for 2018. Prior to that the road had been there for 50 years without a single incidence of flooding. They put in curb and gutter. The whole design was sent to the city for approval by City Engineers. He said they started experiencing road flooding before that project was even done. The water has gone up about 4 feet at its peak. He said Mr. Kaldunski in the Engineering Department could give exact figures. As the water kept rising, they were driving through at least a foot of water at times to get to their homes. Alaureate Trail is the only way in or out of their neighborhood. There are 12 families there that were losing sleep every time it rained wondering if they would be able to get out of the neighborhood. It was the same for garbage trucks, Amazon vehicles, and emergency vehicles. He said he has spent numerous hours talking with MnDOT, their Engineers, our City Engineers, Commissioner Atkins, the Watershed, our State Representative, and Senators. Nobody would help them determine what was going on with the flooding. He said it got to the point where they had to do something so their neighborhood paid to have it raised with gravel three times so they can get in and out. With the drought last summer, the water has receded 18 inches from its peak. They are no longer worried about getting in and out, but spring thaw is coming, and the water is still way higher than it was before the MnDOT project. He said what had reminded him of this was that he just received his Stormwater Utility Fee in the mail and have been paying it without complaints. They have no city sewer, no water, no plowing, no salting, no sanding, they take care of all of that as a neighborhood. They have been paying for 10 years and nobody has offered to help them with the flooding.

He referenced the city website and the Stormwater Facility FAQ where it says, "Why do we have this," it states "The northwest area of Inver Grove Heights is projected to be fully developed in the future requiring construction of new measures to treat and manage stormwater. Since there are no stormwater outlets for these areas, the new measures will include the use of low impact infiltration practices so that the landlocked basins will not become flooded." He said that is not working out for them and nobody is using any of those dollars to help them. He requests the Council consider helping them. He said he talks to Mr. Kaldunski frequently. He mentioned that Barr Engineering was here last summer because the city is discussing what to do with landlocked basins when they flood and how to respond. He said ideas are being floated around about having all of the landowners whose land contributes to a landlocked basin help pay for things like this. He said he would like the city to consider this if and when it comes around. If spring brings more flooding they would be right back where they were and have to raise their road more.

Mayor Bartholomew responded that he appreciates Mr. Clarin's comments. He would task the City Administrator to get his contact information and reach out to him as well as receive input from engineering regarding this situation. He said there is a new Public Works Director coming on board.

Mr. Clarin mentioned after the Barr Engineering meeting the city hosted a follow up meeting a month later for the public to attend, engage in the process, and shape the policy. He was dismayed to find out that the city had actually pumped water from a pond near their area. A gentleman had complained that the water was getting near his shed. He believed this went before a previous City Council, but they agreed and pumped water for three days. He asked Mr. Kaldunski how much that cost and was told it was almost \$70,000 that the city paid to help reduce the pond level so the gentleman's shed would not get wet. He said yet there are people losing sleep because they are worried about whether they can get to and from their house or have their garbage picked up and nobody would do anything to help them.

Mayor Bartholomew said he understands Mr. Clarin's input and has it on record. He would follow up with City Administrator Wilson tomorrow and make sure they get ahead of this.

**8. MAYOR AND COUNCIL COMMENTS:**

Mayor Bartholomew read the following updates from the Inver Grove Heights Police Department:

- There is a Citizen's Policy Academy on Wednesday's from 6:00 to 9:00 beginning April 6<sup>th</sup> through May 11<sup>th</sup> at the Police Department. Must be 18 years or older. Registrations are now open online. Limited space available. Email Police Chief Chiodo with questions.
- There is a 2022 Community Safety Survey from the Inver Grove Heights Police Department available online until February 1<sup>st</sup>. It takes about 5-7 minutes to do. Questions or concerns can be sent to Police Chief Chiodo. Please take part in the survey so Staff and the Council can hear and receive input.

City Administrator Wilson welcomed and introduced the new Parks and Recreation Director Adam Lares.

Parks and Recreation Director Adam Lares introduced himself and said he is very excited to be here this evening. He is officially on Day 6. He said a lot of the opportunities that are presenting itself here in Inver Grove Heights are very exciting, particularly for a Park Professional with the development in the northwest quadrant, and many other areas within the city that have park development or redevelopment opportunities and funding allocations at times. He was very pleasantly surprised with the great welcoming he has had from all city Staff. He gave a shoutout to all Park and Recreation Staff that have really stepped up over the last year with the vacancy of a full time Parks and Recreation Director. He said he knows that Jon Oyanagi and Bob Bierscheid did a great job interim. He knows the department has longed for some leadership and direction, which he hopes he can provide. He looks forward to working with each and every one of the Council Members and hoped to get some time on their calendars to get to know them, have an introductory meeting, hear their priorities, and some of the directions they have for where they would like to see the Parks and Recreation Department.

He said he is a big believer in livability within the Park and Recreation Department that helps support community. He is interested to see where the Council falls within that and where he can make some of those things come to fruition. He is also a big believer in Public Service. He said he is here to listen to the Council's constituents and anybody that is willing to talk about parks and recreation and beyond.

Mayor Bartholomew welcomed Adam. He said his hands will be full. There is great opportunity here and a lot of things to do. They look forward to his energy and input.

Councilmember Dietrich thanked Parks and Recreation Director Lares for staying for six days so far. She thanked him for choosing Inver Grove Heights to work at. They are really excited to have him here.

Parks and Recreation Director Lares said he has been a part of one system for about 18 years. The systems, processes, and language are completely different. If he accidentally calls the Council Commissioner's, it is because he is used to a Board of Commissioner's in the Minneapolis Parks and Recreation Board. There was also a Superintendent. He asked for a little bit of grace and apologized on the front end. He looks forward to working with all.

**9. ADJOURN:**

**Motion by Gliva, second by Murphy, to adjourn the meeting at 6:50 p.m.**

**Ayes: 4**

**Nays: 0      Motion carried.**

Minutes prepared by Recording Clerk Sheri Yourczek