CITY OF ST. FRANCIS
ST. FRANCIS MN
ANOKA COUNTY

CITY COUNCIL MINUTES
March 4, 2019

1. **CALL TO ORDER/PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
The regular City Council meeting was called to order at 6:00 pm by Mayor Steve Feldman.

2. **ROLL CALL**
Members present: Mayor Steve Feldman, Councilmembers Kevin Robinson, Joe Muehlbauer, Robert Bauer and Sarah Udvig.

Also present; Assistant City Attorney Dave Schaps (Barna, Guzy & Steffen), City Planners Beth Richmond and Brad Scheib (HKGi Inc.), City Administrator Joe Kohlmann, Community Development Director Kate Thunstrom, Police Chief Todd Schwieger, Liquor Store Manager John Schmidt, and City Clerk Barb Held.

3. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**
MOTION BY BAUER SECOND ROBINSON APPROVING THE REGULAR CITY COUNCIL AGENDA. Motion carried 5-0.

4. **CONSENT AGENDA**
MOTION BY MUEHLBAUER SECOND UDVIG TO APPROVE THE CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS A- D AS FOLLOWS:
   A. City Council Minutes – February 19, 2019
   B. Northern Lighter Pyrotechnics Fireworks Contract – Pioneer Days June 8, 2019
   C. Declaring Surplus Property – Resolution 2019-06 (Extrication Equipment)
   D. Payment of Claims $107,082.16 (Check #'s 75543-75598)

5. **MEETING OPEN TO THE PUBLIC**
None

6. **SPECIAL BUSINESS**
None

7. **PUBLIC HEARING**
None

8. **OLD BUSINESS**
   A. Wastewater Agreement with Oak Grove (Ponds Development)

Mayor Feldman said he would like some discussion on this for the record. Feldman asked City Administrator Joe Kohlmann if he wanted to give any input to this before we start our discussion. Kohlmann stated late this afternoon he spoke with Loren Wickham, Oak Grove's City Administrator. They did want to clarify the profit sharing on the decommission pond was in respond to the negotiation with the city of St. Francis. It had to do with the reduced sewer access charge (SAC) fee. They wanted to come up with more cash for us and that is why they came up with the potential profit sharing from the future sale of the land. They wanted me to share that with you. I believe the biggest sticking point is the rates at this point.

Feldman stated on page 22 of the packet it highlights their seven points of request. I happen to not agree with any of these. These entire requests are totally unreasonable to me. My opinion is we can't give anymore than we have given.

Feldman said we will discuss this with the council but we have talked about this before. $100,000.00 is the amount Oak Grove would pay to have the 222 residents in the Ponds connect to our WWTF. The minute they hook up they owe us $50,000 and at the end of the first year they owe us the balance $50,000.

On page 27 Feldman read from their memo s; *two potential options are an interfund loan from the City or if eligible a low interest loan from the Public Facilities Authority (PFA). We ran assumptions based on a 1% and 1.5% interest rate with a 20-year pay back the actual rate would depend on market rates at the time of borrowing and project eligibility. In order to qualify for PFA funding we may have to wait an additional 1-2 years before becoming eligible for funding to decommission the plant. There is no guarantee our project would score enough points to be funded. Once the current plan is decommissioned the City could potentially sell the approximately 20 acres to a developer to recoup some or all of the costs from the decommissioning and further reduce the amount of debt service required on the monthly bill.* Feldman said here they acknowledge they might not even get prioritized enough to get the loan from the PFA which puts them out on a broader market or wait one to two years. Or they could be hooked up to us pretty quickly, maybe even this summer.

Page 31 it reads; *prior to decommissioning the purchaser may pump effluent from the ponds into the sellers wastewater system.* I don't see anything about dollar amounts, hot loads. There is a section that was written by our public works director, the correct way to do this. Feldman asked Teicher the size of the their pond. Teicher thought about 8 acres. Ours were about 10-12 acres between the three ponds. Teicher stated they would pump it down to six inches and we would then take that last six inches at the time of decommissioning.

Kohlmann stated this too came up in phone call with their city administrator. Teicher changes were inadvertently missed by their attorney. Our language should be included. Feldman said, that is good.

On page 26 of the packet Feldman referenced the proposal rates.
Oak Grove's request to reduce our base rate of $20.82 to $11.76 would cost our city $482,716.80 over twenty years. Because the 222 residents in the Ponds are not new construction and have already paid a sewer applied charge (SAC) to Oak Grove our city charged them $450.45 per resident (222 x $450.45 = $100,000.00). If they would have been new construction homes the SAC charge would be $4,284.00 each (this saves their residents $851,048.10). If Oak Grove does sign up to connect to our WWTF then any new construction homes after the original 222 will be charged the full rate of $4,284.00.

They have charged way too low for way too long. This a problem they have created themselves. I feel some empathy for them but then again I don't because I know what we went through and didn't charge properly and are working it out.

On page 25 of the packet it states a connection fee of $100,000, pipe connection to St. Francis $60,000-$80,000, decommission costs $375,000 - $675,000 with their projection cost to hook up to St. Francis $535,000-$855,000.

Feldman stated with the estimated cost of building their own plant and using their own numbers they would save $700,000 by hooking up to St. Francis. I don't understand. First would like to thank our staff, consultants, and councilmembers for working on this for months and getting nowhere.

This is what I am going to tell Oak Grove. Like to show good faith, leave our proposal on our table while they go through the facility plan and have the MPCA look at it. If they don't get prioritize enough to even get on the PFA list leave our proposal on the table, they can come back on this proposal. If they break ground, the proposal is off.

From now on any city from Bethel, Nowthen that wants to come to us we will negotiate between both cities right from the start. Do I want regionalization yes, but won't give away the farm.

Bauer said looking at their new proposal; I am in disagreement with, like you Mr. Mayor, I can't see reducing the base rate again. Not sure why decommission is part of the agreement. They either hook up to us, pay the base rate we proposed and decommission their own plant at their own cost.

Feldman stated our three ponds were fenced in. To do decommission they have to follow MPCA guidelines. What I do know if they fill in the pond area you can't build on it for a number of years. Annexing has nothing to do with the process. We said will not solicit annexation. Doesn't mean if their people come to us regarding annexation we won't look at it but we will not solicit annexation.

Udvig said coming from where we have been through this whole process, I feel for the residents of Oak Grove. Telling them, they can get a new plant for an extra $5 and a

few cents or more, I don't think they are being realistic with their residents. That is just the cost of the plant, not staffing or anything else. Do not think we should help with the decommissioning. They want us to offer something that won't benefit us. I don't see this as a good business deal. You don't run to break even, need to make a little profit. As I said before if they came back and had other cost changes, I wasn't going to support it. It's still where I stand. I can justify this to the people who put me in office.

Muehlbauer agrees with the rest of you that already have spoken. Keep our offer on the table. Don't want our residents to have to pay more to support their system.

Robinson applauded everyone who has worked on this so far. This is a business deal it is good or it is bad deal. I think I will be far better for saying less it will mean so much more. I believe we have a reasonable deal on the table. You (St. Francis) have gone through your own growing pains the last five to six years. You (St. Francis) dealt with it. Oak Grove can keep your taxes and levy low then there is no money to fix things. Why, because they ran so tight. That is not a bad thing. We started this conversation four months ago. They haven't even raised the rates since they discovered their problem. Cost money to run and do things.

Feldman stated when you are hooked up by Met Council like Andover, Rogers they are a customer. So Oak Grove would be a customer. When our rates go up theirs will go up when ours go down, theirs will go down. That is our goal. Can't promote your city to grow without your wastewater. I don't understand why a city would want to deal with wastewater when you don't have to because we are here. Proposal stands as is. What is on the table is on the table. This is our best foot forward. We will leave the door open during the time to see if you could get a PFA loan. If you put a scoop in the ground it's done. If you would want West Lake George to come on later, it is a whole different deal, which will be negotiated from day one with both councils.

Feldman asked if they needed to make a motion. City Attorney Dave Schaps said no motion is needed. You have conveyed to staff you are not changing anything in your proposed agreement. Feldman thanked everyone for being patient.

9. **NEW BUSINESS**

A. HKGi - 23038 Rum River Blvd – Concept Plan

Planner Beth Richmond reported the applicant; Larry Anderson is seeking a concept plan review of a lot split located at 23038 Rum River Blvd. Because this land has access onto CR 72, staff contacted Anoka County's Highway Department for their preliminary comments. As part of the subdivision process, the County would require additional right-of-way to be dedicated for future improvements to CR 72.

The Planning Commission reviewed this concept plan at their meeting February 20, 2019. Commissioners highlighted the importance of considering the development of this parcel in conjunction with the possible future development of the property to the west, especially concerning access points and roadways. They also discussed the

possibility of moving the parcel's access point to the north onto the County Park access road. This was also discussed as part of the Northern Anoka County River Crossing Study completed by the Council in 2012 and will require further coordination and collaboration with the Anoka County Parks department. The Planning Commission also discussed the need to provide adequate parking facilities to serve the proposed lots. The stormwater/grading easement agreement over a portion of this property was also discussed.

Planner Richmond asked that the council examine the proposed lot split and provide feedback for the applicant's consideration. Applicant, Larry Anderson was in attendance.

Feldman said the driveway access is a concern of his. Asked if applicant had any plans for the site.

Anderson replied he had no plans at this time. I would divide it off and then sell the existing building. Want to show there is space for another building site.

Planner Richmond said parking would depend on the use. Also if County is okay with the driveway off the park road. She said it was their suggestion but it would still go through the process when this is split.

Anderson said Walt Hiller owns the parcel to the west. Good relationship with him and he may want to do something too some time. Driveway off park road makes sense.

Robinson said he sat in at the Planning Commission meeting. My questions were answered at that time.

Muehlbauer said my only question was the driveway access.

Bauer said he does not want to make a decision until we know for sure if they can have driveway access of park drive.

Udvig had same question with the driveway and parking. Not sure until we know what is going there.

Feldman asked Anderson to state his name and address for the record.
Anderson 708-209th Lane Oak Grove stated if this does get divided the area does not qualify for a church to be there. When I spoke with Anoka County regarding access, they don't want to talk to me regarding the access until the split is complete. They would like your preliminary concept approved first.

Planner Richmond said the next step would be for Anderson to see if he wants to proceed with the lot split.

Anderson said you have great people working for you and getting me through this process.

B. HKGi - 2040 Comprehensive Plan – Resolution 2019-07

Community Development Director Kate Thunstrom asked if we could move forward to the ordinances. Brad of HKGi is on his way.

C. Ordinance 245, Second Series - Amendment to City Code Chapter 10 Zoning, Section 10-19-1 General Parking, Loading and Access Requirements (First Reading)

Community Development Director Kate Thunstrom reported over the past couple years staff and engineering has worked with several landowners regarding driveways and existing driveway standards. The codes are not clearly representing what is needed or required. Driveways within the urban area are typically designed based on development standards. Driveways within the rural areas and at lengths over 600 feet are creating difficulties in enforcement and issues with emergency service needs. In light of long driveways going into townships and within the city itself. Great deal of language that moved. Planning Commission held a public hearing and no public input was received either in person or in writing. The Planning Commission also did not request any changes, updates or additions to what staff proposed. This is the first reading with a potential effective date of April 23, 2019.

The council liked the needed changes and clarifications.

MOTION BY BAUER SECOND MUEHLBAUER APPROVING THE FIRST READING OF ORDINANCE 245, SECOND SERIES AENDING THE ST. FRANCIS ZONING ORDINANCE 10-19-1 REGARDING "GENERAL PARKING, LOADING AND ACCESS REQUIREMENTS".

Roll Call: Ayes: Robinson, Muehlbauer, Feldman, Bauer and Udvig.
Nays: None
Motion carried 5-0.

D. Ordinance 246, Second Series - Amendment to City Code Chapter 10 Zoning, Section 10-16-15 Outdoor Storage (First Reading)

Thunstrom reported the council has addressed issues of Code Enforcement and the needs of the City to create a system that supports resident concerns. One of the largest barriers in code enforcement are the differences outlined between "urban" and "rural". We have many residential districts in both areas of the city that struggle with neighbors that have extreme issues including those of junk and debris. Code language that separates the districts makes it difficult for a city to assist some neighborhoods with enforcement. Council requested changes to eliminate the differences between the urban and rural areas. Planning Commission held a public hearing February 20, 2019 on the changes with no public input either in person or in writing was received. This is the first reading with a potential effective date of April 23, 2019.

Feldman liked how it was clarified. Simplification is a good thing,

Udvig, Bauer, Muehlbauer, Robinson all agreed much needed, like clarification.

MOTION BY UDVIG SECOND ROBINSON APPROVING THE FIRST READING OF ORDINANCE 245, SECOND SERIES AMENDING THE ST. FRANCIS ZONING ORDINANCE 10-16-15 REGARDING "OUTDOOR STORAGE".

Roll Call: Ayes: Muehlbauer, Feldman, Bauer, Udvig, Robinson
Motion carried 5-0.

E. Ordinance 247, Second Series – Amendment to City Code Chapter 10 Zoning, Section 18 Accessory Structures (First Reading)

Thunstrom reported that on September 10, 2018 the Council held a Work Session and instructed staff to further review the accessory structure sizes as it relates to the current "urban" district. The current city code outlines the city accessory structure codes in two categories, "urban" and "rural". Staff reviewed numerous cities to take a broad look at various regions, cities with mix of urban and rural style lots, cities nearby and as best practices. Comparisons were provided in the council packet. Currently the code allows for 200 square feet in urban lots and rural lots less than 1 acre is 600 square feet. After reviewing comparisons Staff recommends urban lots be allowed 400 square foot accessory structure at time of review they must meet setbacks and impervious surface requirements. Planning Commission held a public hearing on February 20, 2019 with no public or written comment. This is the first reading with a potential effective date of April 23, 2019.

Feldman said this pertains pretty much to urban areas. We discussed this at a work session. I had heard about our size of accessory structures when I was out campaigning. I like the idea of people containing their property/equipment inside. I would like to throw out the idea of going 250 square feet for ¼ acre and 500 square feet for ½ acre. Having to put an escrow down for a variance they might not want to move ahead. Also only on the buildable portion of the lot. Think that is what it should be based on, buildable area of the lot.

Robinson said I am not on top of the fees for a variance. Thunstrom explained requesting variance process. Robinson said he too heard from people about accessory structures sizes when campaigning but it was more in the rural lots. Robinson feels the escrow cost is a lot if they would not get the variance. He also discussed the rural lots area and the cost of a variance and whether or not the city uses types of mother nature, tree lines etc. when considering accessory structures. Thunstrom stated at a staff level we go by city code.

Feldman said this discussion is for urban lots. I thinks it should go by size of lot not

your water source.

Robinson said if focusing on urban lots I do not have any questions at this time.

Muehlbauer said I think if we are going larger than what we have they shouldn't have a problem with it. But want to take into consideration the impervious area and easements I don't want drainage problems. Are we creating more work if you go by lot size for staff?

Feldman said this is a way to clarify that we are listening and this gives us some control on what they can build. Again, I say size shouldn't be determined on your water supply source.

Muehlbauer likes 400 square footage.

Bauer likes the idea to increase it. Interested in the footprint of a rambler versus a second story percentage of open space. Rear yard space is going to be different. Muehlbauer said I see code compliance issues with that.

Thunstrom said if you go with percentage, you would have to define what we are considering is a rear yard. You would need to look at utility and drainage easements, right of ways, set backs and the impervious surface. That would all apply.

Bauer having a blanket size will be easier for staff. Thunstrom said I think they both have their pros and cons. A set square footage whatever you decide would be easier for staff. Currently anything between 120-200 square feet, under 36" high comes in for a zoning review/permit. Over 200 square feet requires a building permit.

Feldman asked how would 500 square foot building affect the impervious surface. Thunstrom said our code does define what qualifies for impervious.

Bauer what about that lot comes in at .49 acres and their neighbor has .50 acres. That is why I was thinking percentage. I am for increasing the size for sure.

Udvig also in favor of increasing the size. Asked Thunstrom what she thought of the maximum of 400 versus 500 square feet.

Thunstrom said I think either one will work. I used the 400 square foot as a blanket. If you decide to change it to ¼ or ½ we have to restructure the language to represent that. We do have some homeowners who think they bought a ten-acre parcel and the county records say it is 9.9 acres. We go with what the county records show unless they can show us a survey that states differently. There a lot of variables in doing it either way. Right now, our minimum garage size is 440 square feet so you are almost building a single car garage. It is really what you want to see in these neighborhoods. This will set the next step on what you are allowing people to build.

Feldman some of these ½ acres have large back yards. I like when people are thinking of putting their toys in a shed and getting them out of the back yard. Still would like to see 250 on a ¼ acre and 500 square foot on a ½ acre. And myself I would consider .49 a half an acre.

Thunstrom said we go by what Anoka County GIS system acreage states. If they are short they would have to apply for a variance to determine the accessory structure size. Unless they can supply us with a survey to show the County's GIS is off because we go with what the County says.

There was discussion on when a variance might be worth going for. If the language is changed do we have to come back for a first reading with new language.

Kohlmann asked do you want to come back for another first reading or just make the changes tonight.

Attorney Schaps said we would need two motions. The first is a voice vote approving the new language and the second would be approving the first reading of the ordinance with a roll call vote.

MOTION BY MUEHLBAUER SECOND ROBINSON TO CHANGE THE LANGUAGE ON ORDINANCE 247, SECOND SERIES TO ALLOW A 250 SQUARE FOOT ACCESSORY STRUCTRE ON A ¼ ACRE AND A 500 SQUARE FOOT ACCESSORY STRUCTURE ON A ½ ACRE BASED ON BUILDABLE SPACE. Motion carried 5-0.

MOTION BY BAUER SECOND ROBINSON TO APPROVE THE FIRST READING OF ORDINANCE 247, SECOND SERIES AMENDING THE ST. FRANCIS ZONING ORDINANCE 10-18-06 REGARDING "ASSESSORY UILDINGS, STRUCTURES AND USES – AREA, NUMBER AND HEIGHT LIMITATION.

Roll Call: Ayes: Feldman, Bauer, Udvig, Robinson, and Muehlbauer.
Nays: None
Motion carried 5-0.

B. HKGi - 2040 Comprehensive Plan – Resolution 2019-07

Brad Scheib of Hoisington Koegler Group, Inc. (HKGi) who is part of the project team to complete the City's 2040 Comprehensive Plan was present. What we are asking you to do today is consider the resolution authorizing or directing staff to submit the formal comprehensive plan to the Metropolitan Council for their review process. Once they take it through their review process and it comes back from them, that is when the city council will officially adopt the plan. So what you are looking at today is not necessary what you will be adopting but it allows us to keep the process moving. I am going to cover a little about process, changes that have been made

since you last had a presentation, implementation and some of the next steps as we move through the rest of the process.

Planning Commission did hold a public hearing on this, February 20, 2019. No members of the public spoke to the plan at the public meeting. I will try to highlight some of their discussion and invite Councilmember Robinson for input as he was there as well.

Scheib presented a power point presentation to give an overview of the Comprehensive Plan to date.
(Copy of the power point will be included with the minutes)
The following changes were made to the Comprehensive Plan:

- Changes as noted in response to other jurisdictions" comments
- Refinements in the land use chapter as related to the areas outside of the urban service area. This included the definitions, locations, densities, and approaches to flexible residential development in the Agricultural Preserve, Agriculture, Urban Reserve, and Rural Residential classifications.
- Discussion about the Wild and Scenic River rules and the process to vary from those rules to accommodate reasonable and logical growth
- Additional language identifying the need to address dangerous intersections, specifically Pederson Drive and Highway 47

The Planning Commission wanted to add language regarding the relationship between community facilities and economic development and action items to study the opportunities this relationship may present in St. Francis. The Planning Commission comments additions were included in your council packet.

Scheib ended his presentation and opened it up for discussion.

Feldman stated I didn't see much input from other jurisdictions, am I wrong on that?

Scheib said no, and the input we received was very technical, like this road should be labeled this.

Feldman asked for a clarification on page 59 of our packets, Community Facilities, it states insert on page 6-9 (replaces Coordination with Schools sections).

Richmond stated what that means is right now there is a section called Coordination with Schools in the Comprehensive Plan Draft. This language has basically been massaged, rewritten with a little bit more emphasize on what Scheib said was discussed at the Planning Commission to include a signature park or community area. So instead of what is in the Draft currently we would include this new section.

Feldman said I think it is key that we coordinate with St. Francis Area Schools. I like

what HKGi told us in the St. Francis Forward Plan, they are here to stay and we need to work around and with them.

Feldman said another thing he also likes about HKGi is they tone down the populations projections of Met Council. As far as the rest of it, thorough and good job. Looks like there are some good possibilities here. As our slogan says *"A City of Progress, Pride and Possibilities".*

Udvig said it looks good and looking forward on how it all plays out.

Bauer agreed with Udvig, likes the Comprehensive Plan and the forecast, great job.

Muehlbauer liked the changes that were made. Like the forward thinking in the regionalization aspect. Also with the work with Rivers Edge, thank you.

Robinson agreed on a nice job but still want us as a community to not to lose sight to what we are as well. Yes, other agencies have comments but this is a fluid document and don't forget what we have here again public input is really important. They said 1,500 points of input. Was it 6 people or 600? Don't forget who we are. Great to talk about parks and trails but you need to come inside to talk about it. Things can change. I want to ducktail to what the Mayor said, it's about having realistic expectation about growth, we need something to look forward to. I read the St. Francis Forward Plan and at first I thought oh its one of those studies, but it means a lot more to me when I started reading it the second time around; it means a lot. It has a lot of validity to it. Now with the younger parents and community gaining youth, they want these things. I think the St. Francis Forward Plan means a lot. The younger youth want these things. I would like to see them get involved.

Feldman said he wants to commend staff and HKGi, I think the St. Francis Forward Plan was well done. We had a lot of input from many people. Made us get direction on Bridge Street, gives us different ideas. It gives us a good reference point and guiding for the future. I agree we need to keep the identity of rural and urban. People moved out here for the rural effect. But the city is changing, from 1977 with this variance situation in place the city is a lot different than 42 years ago, becoming more urban. We are growing and this gives us some pathway. Thank you again to staff and HKGi.

MOTION BY MUEHLBAUER SECOND UDVIG ADOPT RESOLUTION 2019-07 A RESOLUITON AUTHORIZING THE SUBMITTAL OF THE 2040 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN TO METROPOLITAN COUNCIL AS REQUIRED BY MINNESOTA STATE LAW (METROPOLITAN LAND PLANNING ACT). Motion carried 5-0.

10. **MEETING OPEN TO THE PUBLIC**
None

11. **REPORTS**

A. Councilmember Reports-

Robinson nothing extra to report.

Muehlbauer looking forward to Winning with Cops event, March 22. Good job by our Officers and staff. Thanked public works dealing with the snow removal.

Bauer said he reported this last meeting but it is cold out there bring a survival kit for your vehicles.

Udvig attended the St. Francis Area Schools school board meeting. Good to get Bernice, St. Francis Area Schools Director of Finance back. On March 11 they will be holding a financial forum. I will not be able to attend due to our scheduled work session.

Feldman asked Fire Chief Dave Schmidt how to get right of surplus equipment that has no value. Schmidt said we will probably contact a salvage yard, cut some of it up so it is not reusable and put it in a dumpster. I would not want to put that in any ones else's hands for safety reasons. Feldman said so you will decommission it completely. Feldman said he wants to thank the public works for plowing I know council and staff feel the same way, they have done a great job. I had one resident text me and said where are the plows, that did not stomach me very well. I called that gentleman up right away, be patient. Because we have a great staff and the public works doing a good job plowing the roads, again be patient. We only have so much equipment and staff. These guys are tired. Be careful when you back out of your driveway, those mounds are high.

Hoping to get warmer weather too. Two weeks from Wednesday will be spring on the calendar. A lot of snow this year.

I want to say, in dealing with Oak Grove, Nowthen and the past councils to where the city lays today. This city has done a tremendous turn around, it really has. That is with the help of the councils thinking, now, staff has always been in place but now staff is at the table where we are listening and discussing. What I have always said about how this city has changed we have multiple meetings, discussions we do our due diligence, full research, asked a lot of questions and check things out before we make a decision or vote. We are also flexible where we can be without changing policies and ordinances. I really think that has really made a big change in this city compared to other cities. I feel good about our city right now; we have residents starting to trust us which is a big, big thing and have staff and department heads really positioned well. We have staff that are really good people working for the city that actually care about the city which is huge. And you have a council that is receptive to listening. I have always said you give me five people at a table and one of two things will happen at the end of the day, you will have a solution to your problem or

direction to the solution. We are proving that every day here. First two years were rough and hopefully the next two are a little less rough. We have done some really good things here but we have a lot of work to do but we are working as a team. I have always said this to staff, I may initiated the conversation but it isn't me the mayor or any individual council member that makes it happen it is us starting the conversation putting it on the table and at the end of the day it is the team effort with residents, staff and council working together to make it happen. This city today works on the premise that our forefathers wrote; this is governed for the people by the people and it truly is in this city. We do listen to our residents; we allow and want them to bring their concerns to us. We look into it. We may not be able to give them the answer they want to hear but we will give them a truthful, honest, researched answer as we can, which is the best we can do. We owe it to them; they are the owners of this city. I again want to commend staff it's a pleasure working with you. Example a week or two back during a storm our new truck had a problem with the hydraulics to lift up the plow and Jeremy (Shook, Public Works) during a snow storm drove to a parts supplier brought it back changed it and made the truck work, that's initiative. I don't think any problem is unsolvable as long as we work together. That's the key. We're a team and going in the right direction as long as we work together.

Once again, I want to thank HKGi, the move to have you come on as a planner was a great move for our city. You rounded out our consultants, Hakanson Anderson and Ehlers.

It's been cold out there be safe and be cautious. Thank you

C. Upcoming Events -

Mar 10 Daylight Savings Time Starts
Mar 18 City Council Meeting @ St. Francis Area Schools District Office 6:00 pm
Mar 20 Planning Comm. Meeting @ St. Francis Area Schools District Office 7:00 pm
Mar 22 Winning with Cops movie night @ SF Police Dept 6:00-8:30 pm
Apr 1 City Council Meeting @ St. Francis Area Schools District Office 6:00 pm

12. **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, Mayor Feldman adjourned the regular city council at 7:50 pm.

Barbara I. Held, City Clerk