

**DEEPHAVEN CITY COUNCIL MEETING  
MONDAY, MAY 4, 2009  
MINUTES**

**1. CALL MEETING TO ORDER:** Mayor Paul Skrede called the meeting to order at 7:07 p.m.

PRESENT: Mayor Paul Skrede, Council members Steve Adams, John Wheaton, Keith Kask and Kim Crockett

STAFF: Police Chief Cory Johnson, Zoning Coordinator Gus Karpas and City Administrator Dana Young

**2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

The Council recited the Pledge of Allegiance.

**3. APPROVE CONSENT AGENDA**

Motion by Councilmember Kask to approve the Consent Agenda, consisting of the following items:

- A. Approve Minutes of April 20, 2009
- B. Approve Verifieds
- C. Approve Additional Engineering Cost on Storm Water Management Plan
- D. Adopt Resolution No. 15-09, Approving Acquisition of Property by the LMCC

Seconded by Councilmember Adams. Motion carried 5-0.

**4. MATTERS FROM THE FLOOR**

Mayor Skrede presented a Proclamation of Appreciation to the LMCC for 25 years of service to its member communities. Motion by Councilmember Kask to approve the Proclamation of Appreciation to the LMCC for 25 years of service. Seconded by Councilmember Adams. Councilmember Crockett opposed. Motion carried 4-1.

Bob Newman, 5230 Meadville Street, Greenwood, was present to state that he was the Chairman of the ADHOC Committee, a committee that has been formed to help disseminate information to provide support for the Southshore Community Center. He stated that he is here this evening to elicit support from the Deephaven City Council on the following position statement:

“We, the City Council of the city of Deephaven, support the use of the facility first and foremost as a Community Center and pledge to seek common ground with the other owner cities to secure a vibrant, active and successful enterprise therein.”

Mayor Skrede provided a brief update on the last Senior Funding Committee meeting. He stated that the Committee reviewed two Requests for Proposals on management services at the Community Center and recommended a final selection. He stated that he also made a request of the city of Shorewood to consider owning the Center and provide the Committee with those conditions that would be necessary if Shorewood were to consider taking ownership. He stated that one condition might be

for each member city to waive the Shorewood Option in which Shorewood would be required to pay each city for their original contribution to the building. He stated that this condition could possibly be waived unless the Center was sold. He stated that this would allow any future contribution to the Center would be left solely to the discretion of each city. He added that he would prefer to wait on taking any action on the proposed position statement until the Senior Funding Committee meets again on May 14<sup>th</sup> to review Shorewood's position on the ownership of the Center.

Bob Newman stated that all the statement of support does is ask for conceptual support of the Center.

Councilmember Crockett stated that the statement of support is innocuous and simply asks the City Council to pledge to seek common ground in support of the Community Center. She stated that Deephaven's financial commitment would have to be clear with a viable business plan for the Center in place. She stated that she doesn't have any objection to supporting the statement as long as these points are made clear.

Councilmember Wheaton asked Mr. Newman about ADHOC's position statement on the development of an oversight panel.

Councilmember Crockett stated that she couldn't support a number of ADHOC's position points at this time.

Bob Newman stated that he is not looking at support of ADHOC's position statements at this time only for action concerning the statement of support.

Mayor Skrede stated that he would prefer to take action on the statement of support on May 18<sup>th</sup> after the Senior Funding Committee had the opportunity to meet again on May 14<sup>th</sup>. He added that there is no disagreement on the Funding Committee with continuing the use of the facility as a community center.

## **5. PLANNING & ZONING REQUESTS**

**A. ORDINANCE AMENDMENT** - To consider the amendment of the Shoreland Management Ordinance No. 13-50, rescinding the recently adopted standards for shoreline conservation, including the provision for maintaining the recreational use of the lake through aquatic plant management.

Mayor Skrede discussed the history and intent of the ordinance. He said the Planning Commission held a public hearing on the ordinance and recommended that the Council not rescind the ordinance at this time.

City Administrator Young reminded the Council that they discussed this item in January and at that time, the Council felt it should be brought back before the Council for discussion due to the meeting staff has had with the DNR since their recent rule changes.

Councilmember Kask presented the Planning Commission report. He said the Commission expressed concern about the DNR's Lake Management Plan and their willingness to work with the city with the ordinance in place. They wanted to see some movement on the plan prior to abandoning the ordinance. He said their willingness to rescind the ordinance is tempered by the DNR's willingness to work on the plan prior to the sunset clause.

Mayor Skrede said he asked the DNR point blank whether the Aquatic Management Plan would be for the entire lake or just Carson's and St. Louis Bays. He was told it was just for the two bays, which are currently exempt from the DNR rules.

Councilmember Crockett noted it's not the issue of legal expenses at this time, rather the Planning Commission wanted to take a wait and see posture.

Councilmember Adams said he doesn't see any leverage for the city by maintaining the ordinance since it's contrary to DNR rules, and quite possibly, State Statutes. He doesn't want to spend any of the City's money to fight a "clear loser." He's in favor of rescinding the ordinance now. Councilmember Wheaton agreed.

Mayor Skrede indicated he didn't have an interest in spending money defending the ordinance.

Councilmember Wheaton said there might be other avenues to help facilitate a dialogue with the DNR, but believes the ordinance only serves to irritate them. Councilmember Adams agreed, stating the ordinance may interfere with useful discussion.

Councilmember Adams moved to rescind Ordinance 13-50, an ordinance establishing standards for shoreline conservation, including the provision for maintaining the recreational use of the lake through aquatic plant management. Seconded by Councilmember Wheaton. Motion carried 3-2. Upon roll call vote on the motion to rescind, Councilmembers Adams, Kask and Wheaton voted aye. Councilmembers Crockett and Skrede voted nay.

**B. VARIANCE – Chris and Diahann Potter, 19685 Lakeview Avenue, (R-3, 20,000)**

variance to demolish the existing non-conforming home and construct a new home on the non-conforming footprint with an additional garage addition onto the south side and a screened porch addition on the north side of the footprint which would exceed the maximum permitted impervious surface area and would encroach into the required front and lake yard setbacks.

Zoning Coordinator Karpas said the applicants are requesting to demolish the existing non-conforming structure and construct a new structure on the non-conforming footprint. In addition, they would like to add a one hundred and seventy-eight square foot garage addition on the north side and a one hundred and seventy-three square foot screened porch addition onto the existing non-conforming footprint. The variances being sought are to continue the existing encroachments into the required front and lake yard setbacks and to exceed the maximum permitted impervious surface area.

Karpas said the existing impervious surface area on the property is 35%. The request would reduce the amount of impervious surface area by approximately 4.5%. He said there is approximately nine hundred square feet of impervious surface on the property that belongs to the Grandview Homeowner's Association and of the proposed 30.5% of impervious surface area; only 25.6% is directly related to the applicant.

He said the proposal would convert the home from a one-story walkout to a story and a half walkout. The overall height of the structure would increase from approximately fifteen feet to twenty-eight feet, four inches.

He said he recommended approval of the variance requests, he felt the lot conditions in terms of dimensions and size, along with the placement of the existing home and the application of the required setbacks hinder the ability to reasonably redevelop or expand the use on the property. The lot area and existence of Association owned impervious surface area on the lot creates a practical difficulty in terms of compliance with the impervious surface requirements.

He added that the homeowner did not cause the circumstances causing the need for the variance since the property was platted and developed prior to the city's current ordinance requirements regulating setbacks and impervious surface. The existing structure exists as a non-conforming structure and the proposed alteration would not expand the existing front setback encroachment, would reduce the existing lake encroachment and reduces the percentage of impervious surface on the property.

The requested variances for front and lake yard encroachments, along with continuance of the footprint within the required bluff setback would not alter the essential character of the locality.

The proposed alteration of the existing non-conforming footprint with the additional garage area to the south and screened porch on the north would have minimal impact on the surrounding character as each addition sets back further than the existing home on the front and lake sides of the property and both comply with their respective side yard setbacks.

Staff feels granting the variance request, which would increase the height of the structure within the required front and lake yard setbacks, would not negatively impact the character of the neighborhood and would enhance the look of the existing structure.

The requested variance to exceed the maximum permitted impervious surface area is in keeping with the spirit and intent of the ordinance. The applicant has taken steps to reduce the impervious surface by 4.5%. There does not appear to be any way the applicant can bring the property into compliance with the ordinances due to the existence of Homeowner Association impervious surfaces on the property which accounts for 4.7% of the 5.5% overage.

Karpas referenced an email submitted by Jim Strampe, 19700 Lakeview Avenue, expressing concerns about the size of the proposed structure and the impact it could have on their home with windows looking down into their home. He indicated he received another email opposed to the request from George Carisch, 19760 Lakeview Avenue.

Councilmember Kask presented the Planning Commission report. He said the Commission recommended on a 5-1 vote that the request be denied. The majority of the Commission felt the applicant has not demonstrated an undue hardship and design alternatives exist that would lessen the impact on the character of the neighborhood.

Kask said the request is to expand the footprint and referenced the developers comments regarding the narrowness of the lot which leads to a higher roof pitch to gain additional living space. He discussed the history of the height requirements in the city, which have gone from an overall measurement to an averaging measurement. He stated that there was a consensus on the Planning Commission that the structure was too high, especially from the driveway side, due to the narrowness of the road, which makes the structure look more massive. He said the city used the more appropriate measurement of overall height when these properties were platted, though he concedes there's not much building area on the site when the required setbacks are applied.

Councilmember Crockett said she'd been asked if the applicant could dig further down in an effort to lower the home. Zoning Coordinator Karpas stated there might be some issues with that due to the home's location in terms of the bluff.

Mayor Skrede asked for clarification on the difference between a bluff and a steep slope and how it pertained to this property. Staff said he would review that portion of the Staff Report and get back to that issue.

Mark Warner, Warner Home Restoration, presented the request. He submitted additional testimony from the applicants addressing the height concerns raised by the Planning Commission and neighbors. He presented an aerial photo of the neighborhood showing the footprint on the subject property is substantially smaller. He said the setback restrictions require the structure to be built up in order to not increase the non-conformities on the property. He noted the neighbor's objections to the lakeside height and distributed photos of other houses in the neighborhood, indicating that the proposal would not be out of character with what currently exists in the neighborhood. He stated that the uniqueness of the property, in terms of being so narrow, makes it difficult to develop.

Councilmember Crockett stated that she understood the concerns about the street side height. Mr. Warner said he tried to break up the roofline with the addition of dormers. In addition, he stated the issues related to lowering the floor area had nothing to do with costs, rather they were trying to work with the existing foundation. He explained the basement floor has three different elevations and they were using the highest one, stating the height could be lowered two feet if the entire floor matched the lowest elevation.

Councilmember Crockett asked about the proposed ceiling heights. Mr. Warren said the height is ten feet, six inches at the highest floor elevation in the basement and eight feet at the lowest point. The main floor would be just over nine feet, with the second story around eight feet.

Jim Strampe, 19700 Lakeview Avenue, said his concerns were not intended to prevent the property owners from developing the lot. He noted the lot is small and contains existing variances. He stated he is concerned about expanding the footprint of the home and adding a second story because it creates a smothering effect on the road. He feels a larger home on the site is unreasonable. He said the mock up to show the height is inaccurate since the main body of the home would be four feet higher. He thinks dropping the home four feet further into the grade would not impact the hill and will bring down the height of the home.

Mr. Warren said there would be additional variances needed to drop the house down.

Councilmember Crockett views Mr. Strampe as the most impacted adjacent property owner. She asked if Mr. Strampe has any concerns about the proposed additions on the north and south sides of the footprint. Mr. Strampe said he has no issue with the house being longer, provided the roof is lowered, though he would prefer no porch on the north side since it will impact his view of the lake on the street side of his home.

Mr. Warren said they discussed placing the porch on the rear of the home, but it would have required a deck similar in size to what exists. He said the plan was to reduce the area of lakeside decking. Mr. Strampe would appreciate relocating the deck, but conceded the property belongs to the applicant and they should be able to use it reasonably.

Mr. Warren said the applicants knew the issues related to this lot going into the process. They knew the lot was non-conforming and took care to keep the proposed second story in compliance with the height requirements.

Jim Beardsley, Jr., 19740 Lakeview Avenue, stated that he is opposed to the request. He said it has generated a lot of conversation in the neighborhood. He noted there have been five major remodels in the neighborhood recently and all were consistent with the character of the neighborhood. He doesn't feel this one is. He said he was surprised this item was on the City Council agenda and thought it would go back to the Planning Commission. He said the overall height of the structure would exceed the allowable height, especially on the lakeside.

Mr. Beardsley said the developer has represented the structure as a story and a half, when in reality the dormers create a full second story. He feels the overall size of the home is out of proportion with the neighborhood.

Mayor Skrede commented on the procedures for a variance application, stating an applicant, even with a negative recommendation from the Planning Commission, are permitted to continue on to the Council.

Councilmember Kask said he is not supportive of the request. He reiterated that when the lot was created the method for measuring height was different which limited the size of homes on lots of this nature. He feels the property currently benefits from the existing variances and he is extremely concerned about any talk of lowering the basement floor elevation to decrease the height of the home. He feels this is contrary to the spirit and intent of the ordinances that protects bluffs and other environmentally sensitive areas. He understands that variances are going to be necessary for this lot, but he's opposed to the plan as submitted. He agrees with the neighbors that the home is large on the lakeside and said it is clear that there are three full stories on the lakeside. He is opposed to digging further into the hill and believes the proposal is out of character with the surrounding properties due to its proposed height.

Councilmember Adams agrees variances will be needed for the property, but notes the request is for an expansion of the non-conforming dwelling. He has concerns about the height of the structure and understands the massing arguments raised by the neighbors, but has reservations since it complies with the city's height requirements. He feels the photos distributed by Mr. Warren were helpful and disagreed with Councilmember Kask's assessment about lakeside height, noting there are a number of homes with three stories on the lakeside.

Councilmember Adams is sensitive to the argument about the massing on the street side of the structure, though he understands the applicant's difficulties with the reasonable expectation based on the ordinances as drafted.

Councilmember Kask said he couldn't speak for the other properties, but knows the subject property has front and lake yard variances which gives the Council the authority to review all structural changes to the non-conforming structure.

Mayor Skrede said the dilemma the city faces is the impact the proposed house has based on its height and its location near the road. The only way to solve that issue would be to push the home further into the bluff or allow the existing home to be lowered further into the ground near the bluff.

Councilmember Wheaton feels the proposal is seeking reasonable alterations in terms of the garage and porch additions, but believes there are options to help reduce the massing impacts. He feels the neighbors have legitimate concerns. He said that due to the fact the applicant is seeking to alter a structure already in variance with the ordinance, the City Council has the authority to review the project as a whole, even the height when it complies with the ordinance requirements. He said he was not prepared to support the request as presented to the Council.

Councilmember Crockett agreed with the comments made by the other Councilmembers and concurred the city has the right to review the totality of the request.

Mayor Skrede commented that it did not appear the proposal would receive a favorable vote and explained the options available to the applicant including withdrawal of the request and the extension of the sixty-day limit to allow for modification or to receive official action from the Council.

Mr. Warren said he didn't feel as though he got a lot of feedback from the Planning Commission and sought options on how to develop the property in the manner sought by his clients. He said there are only limited options available to solve the height concerns.

Councilmember Kask noted it is not the job of the Planning Commission or Council to design the applicant's home. He said it is clear that both bodies are concerned with the height as it is proposed and its impact on the adjacent properties. He said the Council must act on the request tonight to be in compliance with the State Statutes.

Mr. Warren stated for the record that as the official representative of the applicant, he was withdrawing the request for consideration.

**C. VARIANCE – John and Erin Wheaton, 4215 Northern Road, (R-3, 20,000)** variance to construct a partial second story onto an existing non-conforming footprint, which would encroach into the required rear and south side yard setbacks.

Section 1310.02 of the Zoning Ordinance requires a minimum rear yard setback of fifteen feet in the R-3 Residential District. The proposed construction would be setback eight feet, one inch from the rear property line. A variance of six feet, eleven inches is sought of the required rear yard setback.

Section 1310.02 of the Zoning Ordinance requires a minimum south side yard setback of fifteen feet in the R-3 Residential District. The proposed construction would be setback two feet, six inches from the rear property line. A variance of twelve feet, six inches is sought of the required south side yard setback.

Section 1310.02 of the Zoning Ordinance requires a minimum front yard setback of thirty-five feet in the R-3 Residential District. The proposed construction would be setback thirty-four feet, two inches from the rear property line. A variance of ten inches is sought of the required front yard setback.

Councilmember Wheaton excused himself.

John Wheaton presented the request. He said the goal was to add some additional living space in the form of a partial second story addition, which would be contained entirely on top of the existing footprint. He noted his lot is one of the smallest in the city and there is no way the existing home, or addition, can be brought into compliance with the ordinances. He said the plan was developed to have

the most minimal impact on the adjacent properties. He has spoken with both of his neighbors and they are supportive of the request.

Zoning Coordinator Karpas clarified the setback variances that were being requested and indicated that there would be a one-foot cantilever off the rear of the structure.

There were no questions from the Councilmembers of the applicant.

Councilmember Kask moved to approve the variance requests to construct a partial second story onto an existing non-conforming footprint that would encroach ten inches into the required thirty-five foot front yard setback, that would encroach seven feet, four inches into the required ten foot south side yard setback and would encroach eight inches into the required fifteen foot rear yard setback, as shown on the submitted site plan at 4215 Northern Road, as recommended by Staff and the Planning Commission. He made special note of the fact that the applicant's lot is one of the smallest in the city and is also a corner lot, which creates a hardship when attempting improvements on the property. Seconded by Councilmember Adams. Motion carried 4-0-1. Councilmember Wheaton abstained.

## **6. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

### **A. Adopt Resolution No. 12-09, Approving Bid on Sewer Main Cleaning / Televising**

Administrator Young stated that the following bids have been received on the 2009 Sewer Main Cleaning / Televising Project:

<b><u>Bidder</u></b>	<b><u>Total Bid Amount</u></b>
Pipe Services	\$ 28,454.00
Midwest Trenchless Technologies	\$ 38,632.00
Infrastructure Technologies, Inc.	\$ 49,172.00

City Engineer David Martini stated that the original scope of the project had been changed to include the televising of the sanitary sewer main in the northern part of Deephaven's sewer system and the bid was \$3,454.00 above the budgeted project cost of \$25,000.00.

Motion by Councilmember Wheaton to adopt Resolution No. 12-09, A Resolution Approving the Bid submitted by Pipe Services in the amount of \$28,454.00 for the 2009 Sewer Main Cleaning / Televising Project. Seconded by Councilmember Crockett. Motion carried 5-0.

### **B. Adopt Resolution No. 13-09, Approving Bid on Main Beach Project**

City Engineer David Martini stated that the following bids have been received on the 2009 Main Beach Erosion Project:

<b><u>Bidder</u></b>	<b><u>Total Bid Amount</u></b>
Northwest Asphalt, Inc.	\$ 49,262.40
Midwest Asphalt Corp.	\$ 49,952.00
DMJ Corporation	\$ 63,754.00
GMH Asphalt Corp.	\$ 85,190.60

Administrator Young stated that \$45,000.00 has been budgeted from the 2009 Park Improvement Fund and there are sufficient fund reserves to adequately fund all anticipated cost of the \$49,262.00 project.

Mayor Skrede stated that the project is designed to eliminate the constant erosion of the beach due to water runoff problems along the east side of the beach. He stated that the existing asphalt path will be replaced with porous pavers that would not only help to control the runoff but would also remove 1.15 lbs. of phosphorus.

Councilmember Adams asked if the purpose of revising the scope of the project was to reduce phosphorus.

City Engineer Martini stated that the installation of porous pavers and a low-lying area were specifically included within the project to help reduce the amount of phosphorus that ends up in the lake. He stated that the Minnehaha Creek Watershed District has required the city of Deephaven to remove 17 lbs. of phosphorus over the next ten years and these project elements were specifically intended for the reduction of phosphorus.

Councilmember Adams asked what is the incremental cost for the phosphorus reduction?

City Engineer Martini estimated an additional cost of approximately \$15,000 for the installation of porous pavers and the low lying depression area that is directly related to phosphorus reduction.

Councilmember Adams noted that paying an additional \$15,000 in order to remove 1.15 lbs. of phosphorus is an expensive proposition.

City Engineer Martini added that the small quantities in this project also adversely effect the project cost.

Councilmember Crockett exits at 9:04 p.m.

Mayor Skrede stated that he would like to discuss this project with the Minnehaha Creek Watershed District to see if there was a possibility that they would assist in the project cost.

Motion by Councilmember Kask to adopt Resolution No. 13-09, A Resolution Approving the Bid submitted by Northwest Asphalt, Inc. in the amount of \$49,262.40 for the 2009 Main Beach Erosion Project and requested that City Staff and the City Engineer meet with the Minnehaha Creek Watershed District to check whether they would consider assisting with the funding of this project. Seconded by Councilmember Adams. Motion carried 4-0.

**C. Adopt Resolution No. 14-09, Approving Bid on Sewer Main Repair Project**

City Engineer Martini stated that the following bids have been received on the 2009 Sewer Main Repair Project:

<b><u>Bidder</u></b>	<b><u>Total Bid Amount</u></b>
Midwest Trenchless Technologies	\$ 42,935.00
Infrastructure Technologies, Inc.	\$ 52,685.00

Administrator Young stated that \$45,000.00 has been budgeted from the Sewer Fund to adequately fund all anticipated costs of the \$42,935.00 project.

Motion by Councilmember Wheaton to adopt Resolution No. 14-09, A Resolution Approving the Bid submitted by Midwest Trenchless Technologies in the amount of \$42,935.00 for the 2009 Sewer Main Repair Project. Seconded by Councilmember Adams. Motion carried 4-0.

**D. Discuss Japanese Beetle Applications**

Administrator Young stated that at the April 20, 2009 Council meeting, the City Council requested that City Staff obtain information on the costs of treating municipal parks for Japanese Beetles. Staff contacted TruGreen, its current contractor for applying fertilizer and weed killer at Thorpe Park, and were provided with the following information on the management of Japanese Beetles:

- A preventative application is applied to the turf in either liquid or granular form in early June. Only one application is needed for the whole summer. The park is closed to the public for a period of two hours after the application has been applied. TruGreen states that they could apply the application very early in the morning at 6:00 a.m.
- The preventative application will kill the grubs before they emerge from the ground. However, the preventative application will not prevent beetles from flying into the park causing damage to trees or plant material. A separation application could be applied to the trees and plant material once damage or the beetles are observed. A second application would double the estimated treatment costs shown below.
- The cost for either a preventative application or applications to trees or plant material is based on the area treated:

- Up to 7,000 Sq. Ft.	=	\$ 75.00
- 7,001 – 25,000 Sq. Ft.	=	\$110.00
- 25,001 – 43,560 (1 Acre)	=	\$165.00
- Estimated treatment costs for our municipal parks would be as follows:

- Thorpe Park	=	\$1,500.00
- Village Hall Park	=	\$ 110.00
- Children’s Park	=	\$ 110.00
- Shuck Park	=	\$ 165.00
- Hill Park	=	<u>\$ 110.00</u>
Total		\$1,995.00

Councilmember Wheaton noted that any applications at the City Parks would be meaningless unless the treatment was applied everywhere.

Bonne St. James, 18390 Minnetonka Boulevard, stated that how it is applied is important for next year.

Councilmember Wheaton stated that it would be quite an undertaking to get the entire community involved in time for the first recommended application on June 1<sup>st</sup>.

Councilmember Kask stated that he agreed with Councilmember Wheaton that he is really not all that willing to spend more money tonight after approving over \$120,000.00 in capital improvement projects earlier this evening. He stated that the Council might be more interested in participating if there was enough public support for this effort.

Mayor Skrede stated that he would prefer action on this item on May 18<sup>th</sup>, which would give the opportunity for the City to add information on Japanese Beetles on the City webpage and refer the public to a survey.

Bonne St. James thanked the Council for their consideration of this request. She added that she would also like the Council to post a sign for swimmer's itch at the Thorpe Pond due to the number of Chinese Mystery Snails that are located in the pond. Mayor Skrede stated that signs could be posted and the request would be reviewed at this week's Public Works Committee meeting.

## **7. DEPARTMENT REPORTS**

### **A. Police Department**

Police Chief Cory Johnson stated that he has nothing new to report other than over 205 individuals have requested information on the Police Officer position.

### **B. Excelsior Fire District**

Administrator Young stated that the Fire Board has had an initial review of the estimated \$120,000 mandatory Fire Relief contribution and its impact on the 2010 EFD Budget. He stated that current efforts are to incorporate the mandatory contribution within the 2010 Budget and to target a 0% increase in the municipal contribution for 2010.

### **C. Public Works**

Administrator Young provided an update on recent and upcoming public work activities.

### **D. Administration**

Administrator Young provided a brief summary on the following items:

- Summer Hours
- Part-Time Summer Help
- MESB Radio Grant
- Miscellaneous Project Update

Councilmember Wheaton provided a brief review on the tour of the Miracle Field at Bennett Family Park he participated in last Saturday.

## **8. ADJOURNMENT**

Motion to adjourn by Councilmember Kask, seconded by Councilmember Wheaton. Motion carried 4-0. The meeting adjourned at 9:43 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Dana Young, City Administrator