INVER GROVE HEIGHTS CITY COUNCIL MEETING
MONDAY, APRIL 28, 2014 - 8150 BARBARA AVENUE

CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL The City Council of Inver Grove Heights met in regular session on Monday, April 28, 2014, in the City Council Chambers. Mayor Tourville called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. Present were Council members Bartholomew, Madden, Mueller and Piekarski Krech; City Administrator Lynch, Assistant City Administrator Teppen, City Attorney Kuntz, Public Works Director Thureen, Community Development Director Link, Finance Director Smith, Parks and Recreation Director Carlson, Chief Stanger, Chief Thill, and Deputy Clerk Kennedy

3. PRESENTATIONS: None.

4. CONSENT AGENDA:

Citizen Allan Cederberg requested that Item 4A (ii) be removed from the Consent Agenda.

Mayor Tourville noted Item 4D had been pulled by staff prior to the meeting and no action would be taken on the item.

Councilmember Piekarski Krech removed Item 4F from the Consent Agenda.

B. Resolution No. 14-49 Approving Disbursements for Period Ending April 23, 2014

C. Resolution No. 14-50 Receiving Bids and Awarding Contract for the 2014 Pavement Management Program, City Project No. 2014-09A, Cracksealing

E. Approve Soft Drink Supplier Proposal

G. Personnel Actions

Motion by Madden, second by Bartholomew, to approve the Consent Agenda

Ayes: 5
Nays: 0 Motion carried.

Motion by, second by, to reconsider Item 4A (i)

Ayes: 5
Nays: 0 Motion carried.

A. i) Minutes – April 3, 2014 Special City Council Meeting

Councilmember Madden stated he would abstain from the vote because he did not attend the meeting on April 3rd.

Motion by Piekarski Krech, second by Mueller, to approve the Minutes of the April 3, 2014 Special City Council Meeting

Ayes: 4
Nays: 0
Abstain: 1 (Madden) Motion carried.

A. ii) Minutes – April 7, 2014 City Council Work Session

Allan Cederberg, 1162 E. 82nd St., questioned why the minutes for the April 14, 2014 Regular Council meeting were not included on the agenda for approval.

Ms. Kennedy explained the minutes from the April 14th meeting were not completed at the time the agenda for the meeting was published.

Motion by Bartholomew, second by Mueller, to approve the Minutes of the April 7, 2014 City Council Work Session

Ayes: 5
Nays: 0 Motion carried.

F. Approve Tree Replacement Plan

Councilmember Piekarski Krech opined it seemed that staff was creating ways to use the money instead of using the appropriate fund. She stated she did not know how many trees would be purchased or if $2,000 worth of trees needed $1500 worth of mulch. She commented that if trees were being planted in the parks they would not need mulch.

Mr. Carlson stated he was not sure at this time how many trees could be purchased for $2,000. He explained it would depend on the types of trees purchased such as bare root, balled and burlapped, or container trees. He noted it was likely that a combination of each of those options would be purchased. He stated staff regularly uses mulch to retain moisture around the newly planted tree.

Mayor Tourville questioned if staff had an estimate as to the number of trees that would be purchased.

Mr. Carlson stated over the past few years staff had utilized stock out of the City's tree nursery to replace diseased trees that were removed. He noted staff did not know specifically which types of trees would be purchased because they do not know which trees within the system will need to be replaced.

Mayor Tourville questioned how the City was billed for the items.

Councilmember Piekarski Krech stated the City should at least be provided with estimates. She opined $2,000 could be spent on two (2) container trees.

Mr. Carlson explained the $2,000 being requested was not for a specific order at this time. He stated it was a budget request so the department would have the money available throughout the summer and fall to replace trees as needed.

Councilmember Piekarski Krech suggested bringing back the request when it is known what is needed. She stated she would like to have an idea of what the money is being used for. She questioned if the money in the tree preservation fund was finite.

Mr. Carlson stated the tree preservation fund was added to through development activity based on how developers meet the requirements of the tree preservation ordinance. He noted similar requests had been brought forth to the Council on an annual basis for at least eight (8) years.

Mayor Tourville asked Mr. Carlson to provide Council with an estimate of what would be purchased with the money.

Councilmember Madden questioned if the City replaced every tree that was removed.

Mr. Carlson stated a majority of the trees that are removed get replaced because the City was trying to maintain an urban forest within the community.

Councilmember Madden questioned if there was any policy in place to guide such decisions.

Mr. Carlson stated it was left to the discretion of the City Forester and the Parks Superintendent.

Mr. Lynch noted there were several different circumstances involved. He explained trees that exist within the right-of-way were not replaced if they died or became diseased. He stated the City did not want trees in the right-of-way because they created problems in terms of maintenance and replacement.

Mr. Carlson stated he would get more information for the Council and bring it back at the next meeting.

No action was taken on this item.

5. <u>PUBLIC COMMENT:</u>

Allan Cederberg, 1162 E. 82nd St., opined the City had a big problem financially and the general public was not aware of the issue. He suggested that the Council put an article in the Insights newsletter to advise the public of the problem and the solutions that are being discussed.

The City Council indicated they were not aware of the problem referenced by Mr. Cederberg.

Mayor Tourville stated the City had an excellent bond rating and was very financially sound.

The City Council reiterated the City did not have a financial problem and they did not understand what Mr. Cederberg was referring to.

Mr. Cederberg questioned why no public town hall meeting was held this year.

Mayor Tourville stated the City had an excellent bond rating and was very financially sound.

The City Council reiterated the City did not have a financial problem and they did not understand what Mr. Cederberg was referring to.

Mr. Cederberg questioned why no public town hall meeting or state of the city address was held this year.

Mayor Tourville stated the City was trying a different approach in 2014 because of lack of interest and participation in the events held in recent years. He explained this year each department filmed video segments that could be viewed on the City's website either collectively or individually. He stated the department-specific content would relate to current or upcoming City issues that would be of interest to the general public. He noted a business town hall meeting was held earlier in April.

Mr. Cederberg stated he reviewed the minutes of the recent work sessions and it seemed as though a number of problems were being discussed.

Councilmember Bartholomew stated the financial status of the City was posted on the website and available for public review. He explained the report was very thorough and certified by public accountants. He encouraged Mr. Cederberg to review the information because everything related to the City's finances was disclosed. He noted the problems Mr. Cederberg referred to in the work session discussions simply reflected differences of opinion on the ways to solve certain issues. He stated that was why the City had elected officials in place. He reiterated it was wrong to say that all information related to the City's finances was not disclosed.

Mr. Cederberg stated he knew that information was disclosed.

Councilmember Piekarski Krech stated the City was very financially sound.

Mr. Cederberg objected to the three (3) minute time limit.

Mayor Tourville stated that was the typical amount of time afforded to those individuals who want to address the Council on items that were not a part of the regular agenda. He noted Mr. Cederberg was always afforded the opportunity to speak, often beyond the established time limit.

6. PUBLIC HEARINGS:

A. CITY OF INVER GROVE HEIGHTS: Assessment Hearing for 2013 Pavement Management Program, City Project No. 2013-09C, Mill and Overlay

Mr. Kaldunski explained the Council was asked to conduct an assessment hearing for City Project No. 2013-09C, a mill and overlay project on Conroy Way and Cloman Avenue. He reviewed the project area. The project was completed with a total cost of $216,758.37. The total amount proposed to be assessed for the project was $156,086.16. He explained the mill and overlay project added some structural thickness to the pavement on the street. Other miscellaneous repairs, including curb and gutter improvements, were also completed. He noted cracks typically appeared in a reflective manner on any mill and overlay project and they would be sealed as part of the 2014 cracksealing program. The feasibility report on the project included a benefit appraisal analysis that recommended a $4,000 assessment cap for the project. Because of certain savings achieved on the project, the proposed assessments were lower than the recommended cap.

Allan Cederberg, 1162 E. 82nd St., stated the resolution did not reference how the remaining balance of approximately $60,000 would be funded. He insisted that the specific funds and dollar amounts be identified in the resolution.

Mr. Kuntz stated the project was completed and the contractor had already been paid for the work. He explained the funding sources were previously identified in the feasibility report and the resolutions that ordered payment of the contract. When the Council authorized payment of the contractor, it authorized

payment out of the various accounts that were used to fund the project. He stated the project had been paid for and the amount to be collected through assessments would essentially reimburse the City, over a ten (10) year period, for the costs that had already been paid.

Mr. Cederberg stated he did not recall that the amounts or funding sources were identified in the feasibility report.

Mayor Tourville stated the amounts would not be identified in the resolution currently being considered because it related to adoption of the final assessment roll for the project.

Mr. Kuntz stated as the work was done, each contractor payment was brought forth for Council approval. He reiterated the item for consideration tonight only related to the levying of assessments. All other financing for the project had been previously approved by the Council.

Mr. Cederberg stated the resolution did not include anything related to deferment programs for seniors or veterans.

Mr. Thureen stated deferment information was provided with the notice for the assessment hearing.

Motion by Piekarski Krech, second by Madden, to close the public hearing.

Ayes: 5
Nays: 0 Motion carried.

Motion by Madden, second by Mueller, to approve Resolution No. 14-51 adopting the Final Assessment Roll for 2013 Pavement Management Program, City Project No. 2013-09C, Mill and Overlay

Ayes: 5
Nays: 0 Motion carried.

7. <u>REGULAR AGENDA:</u>

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT:

A. JEFF LEYDE: Consider the following actions for property located at Brent Avenue between 49th and 50th Streets:

i) Resolution relating to a Comprehensive Plan Amendment to Change the Land Use Designation from LDR, Low Density Residential to HDR, High Density Residential

ii) Ordinance Amendment to Change the Zoning of the Parcel from R-1A, Single Family Residential to R-3C, Multiple Family Residential

Mr. Link reviewed the location of the property. The request was for a comprehensive plan amendment to change the land use designation from low density to high density and to rezone the parcel from single family residential to multiple family residential. He stated the property was approximately 3.5 acres in size and was platted in the 1880's. He explained the lot has remained undeveloped and the lots that were created at that time do not comply with the current zoning requirements. He noted there were platted right-of-ways that had not been used and they were not buildable due to steep topography. He stated if the applicant received Council approval, he would then submit an application for a conditional use permit. At that time the City would be considering the actual site development. The specific issue to be discussed at this time related to a determination of the appropriate land use for the property. The current designation was a low density use. The rationale for the request was that the property was somewhat difficult because of the old right-of-ways and the steep topography. Storm water ponding would be required to serve both the development and the surrounding neighborhood. The proposal would create a single building with 52 units for senior housing. This would leave the remainder of the property open and there would be less grading and tree removal. He noted there was a need for senior housing in the City and that type of development typically would not create as much noise or traffic as a typical multiple family development. He stated there was other multiple family property located to the west of the site. The rationale against the land use was that the density would be a large departure from that of the surrounding area and would create some land use incompatibilities and conflicts. A single, three-story building would

have a mass and size that would be out of proportion with the single family properties that are located in the neighborhood. The proposed density would also be out of character with the existing density of three to four units per acre. He explained Planning staff recommended denial of the requests because the size of the proposed building would be out of character with the neighborhood and the proposed density would be out of line with the single family residential in the neighborhood and it would be a form of spot zoning. He stated the Planning Commission also recommended denial of the requests.

Councilmember Piekarski Krech clarified the request was for the three-story building plus eleven single family lots.

Mr. Link responded in the affirmative. He explained the proposal included eleven single family lots.

Councilmember Piekarski Krech stated there would be space between the single family lots and the proposed development in the area.

Mr. Link stated there would be some open space that would remain as is because of the steep topography.

Mayor Tourville questioned what the long, narrow space was between the green space and two (2) of the single family lots.

Mr. Link stated it was an easement.

Mr. Kuntz explained the space was an NSP lot that contained a power line.

Councilmember Mueller questioned why the storm water ponding would serve other areas when it was installed on the developer's land.

Mr. Link stated there was a need for storm water ponding both for the development and for the neighborhood.

Councilmember Mueller questioned if staff could foresee any issues with the development moving forward if it received Council approval.

Mr. Link stated the applicant had not prepared any detailed site plans for staff to review. He added staff could not say with any certainty what the site plan issues might be. He noted staff believed the 52 unit building would fit on the site, but details related to stormwater, parking, access, and the type of building had not been reviewed because no site plan had been submitted.

Councilmember Mueller opined that spot zoning had been frequently used in the City and the land use designation could have been changed years ago when the comprehensive plan was updated.

Mr. Link stated the property was never considered for a high density residential use before.

Councilmember Piekarski Krech commented it was not typical to put a high density use in the middle of a residential area.

Councilmember Mueller stated he would like to see the development move forward.

Jaren Johnson, attorney representing the applicant, stated his client sought to develop a property that was otherwise undevelopable. He reiterated that the lot had extremely steep topography and stated the proposed amendment and zoning change would allow the highest and best use for the property. He stated development of the property for single family residential use would result in the complete deforestation of the parcel because 84,000 cubic yards of dirt would need to be brought onto the site. He explained that would involve 4,200 belly dump trucks traveling to the site over a six (6) week period to make the site developable. He stated his client has proposed residential construction on the outlying lots to front the existing streets and then construct the multi-family development through the center of the property to mitigate the steep topography. He noted if the property was developed as single family residential the streets that would have to be constructed would benefit the existing residential properties and may result in special assessments for those property owners. He addressed concerns related to increased traffic in the neighborhood as a result of the proposed use and argued that amount of traffic generated would be less than what would be generated by a single family residential development. He

stated with respect to the affect on property values in the neighborhood, his client engaged the services of a real estate broker who opined that the proposed use would not have a negative impact on the values of the single family residential properties in the area. He referenced the League of Minnesota Cities zoning guide for cities in which the issue of spot zoning is addressed. He stated the League specifically acknowledged that cities would have to potentially exercise their legislative powers to make change zoning designations. He noted not every piece of property will be suited for what it was originally zone for. He reviewed the League's comments related to spot zoning and argued that the only viable use for the center portion of the property was a use similar to what was proposed. He stated it would be nearly impossible to build single family residential homes on 60 foot lots given the amount of dirt that would need to be brought in to grade the site. He opined the proposed use would be far less disturbing to the residents in the area. He also argued that the request was not an issue of spot zoning as the proposed use was simply a higher density version of the same use, residential housing. He stated there were a handful of property owners that would be affected by the proposed use and overall it would be less impactful on the existing neighborhood than a single family residential development.

Councilmember Bartholomew opined that a three-story building would be as out of proportion as an industrial use in a residential neighborhood.

Mr. Johnson responded because of the topography of the site the building would be drastically lower than what may be perceived. He stated the building would not be three (3) stories above street grade.

Bill Dumond, 4922 Boyd Avenue, opined that the applicant's attorney was attempting to scare the City into moving forward with the proposed land use and zoning changes. He stated the property was not undevelopable and it would not be impossible to build single family residential homes on the site. He noted several Planning Commissioners commented that similar property challenges were overcome to make the Argenta Hills development work. He stated he would prefer to deal with six (6) weeks of disruption from construction grading than with a use that is inconsistent with what the property was zoned for when he originally purchased his property. He explained when he purchased his property he researched the adjacent lots and knew that someday they could be developed into single family homes. He stated the only thing he would see from his home would be the three-story building and that would be all a potential buyer would see. He opined that the proposed use would negatively affect property values in the neighborhood because a wooded view would be replaced with a view of a building.

Jason Price, 4816 Boyd Avenue, stated prior to purchasing his property he investigated the zoning of the property in question and found it was zoned for future single family residential development. He explained he did not sign up for a view of a building or a parking lot. He expressed concerns related to the affect of the proposed use on property values in the neighborhood. He asked the Council to protect the residents in the area because they did not support the request.

Chris Solberg, 4938 Boyd Avenue, opposed changing the zoning of the property because it would not be consistent with the existing structures in the neighborhood and the established zoning intentions. He stated the rezoning request would not complement the neighborhood and would allow a structure that would be out of place in the neighborhood. He added that rezoning the property would not be conducive to increasing or preserving the existing property values in the neighborhood. He opined the City should work with homeowners to improve property values and their quality of life.

Richard Kollars, 5027 Bryce Avenue, expressed concerns regarding increased traffic. He stated there was no traffic control in place to regulate the increased volume. He opined that the number of traffic incidents would increase.

Mr. Johnson requested that the City Council table the item for 30 days to allow the applicant time to work through some of the issues raised by the neighborhood and the Planning Commission.

Mr. Kuntz stated the second 60-days would expire on June 21, 2014. If the Council did not deal with the issue on May 27th the applicant would need to request an extension.

Mayor Tourville suggested it would be helpful to see renderings of what the view from the neighborhood would be and the elevation of the building.

Councilmember Piekarski Krech stated it was unlikely that the City would issue a permit to allow 4,000 belly dumps on the city streets in the neighborhood.

Mayor Tourville stated generally when the Council considers rezoning requests there is already a specific project in place.

Mr. Price objected to the request to table. He stated the same issues were raised at the Planning Commission meeting and at the neighborhood meeting and the applicant had not changed anything.

Mayor Tourville stated the applicant had not gone beyond the timeframe allowed to address issues and try to make adjustments.

Mr. Dumond also opposed tabling the item. He asked if the residents could submit questions for the developer to answer. He stated it was unfair to delay the issue further because it did affect the families in the neighborhood.

Mayor Tourville stated residents could submit their issues to City staff.

Motion by Piekarski Krech, second by Madden, to table consideration of the item to May 27, 2014 at the request of the applicant

Ayes: 5
Nays: 0 Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS:

B. CITY OF INVER GROVE HEIGHTS: Consider Approval of the Land Alteration Permit (LAP) No. C-094-14 for Luther Company Limited Partnership at 1470 50th St. E.

Mr. Kaldunski stated applicant currently had a facility on 50th Street that they were looking to expand. He explained the land alteration permit would allow the applicant to grade the site. He reviewed the site and noted it was adjacent to a large wetland depression and ponding area. The developer would construct a large retaining wall that varied in height up to 42 feet tall. He stated the retaining wall would primarily serve to protect a wetland area. The long range plan was to eventually construct a new building in a second phase through a conditional use permit. An extensive storm sewer system would be installed behind the retaining wall to handle drainage. Underground storage for storm water would also be installed under the parking lot. The land alteration permit would include approval of the construction of the retaining wall and mass grading of the site. He noted the applicant would need to obtain a building permit to construct the retaining wall. The storm water management plan met all of the City's criteria and would protect the wetlands. Engineering staff recommended approval of the land alteration permit with the conditions approved by the Environmental Commission and outlined in the resolution.

Councilmember Madden questioned how the retaining wall would be constructed.

Mr. Kaldunski stated it would be a block retaining wall with a geofabric reinforcement behind it and a foundation system at the base. He reiterated the building official would have to issue a permit for construction of the retaining wall and the applicant would be required to have a structural engineer on staff for the design, certification, and inspection of the wall.

Mayor Tourville stated he recalled seeing plans that originally outlined a 28 foot retaining wall and was surprised to see the revised plan with some spots of the retaining wall approaching 40 feet.

Mr. Kaldunski stated the project had evolved over time. He explained the applicant and the City had gone through multiple iterations of the project since 2011. The applicant re-envisioned the project as a result of the great success the business has experienced.

Steve Sabraski, Landform Professional Services, reiterated the project had evolved quite a bit over the course of several years. He stated the retaining wall had grown in size mostly due to the success of the existing business and his client's desire to expand the scope of the project into multiple phases.

Mayor Tourville confirmed the applicant agreed with all of the conditions of approval.

Mr. Sabraski replied in the affirmative.

Motion by Bartholomew, second by Piekarski Krech, to approve Land Alteration Permit (LAP) No. C-094-14 for Luther Company Limited Partnership at 1470 50th St. E.

Ayes: 5
Nays: 0 Motion carried.

ADMINISTRATION

C. CITY OF INVER GROVE HEIGHTS: Consider Approval of Separation Agreement with Golf Course Manager

Mr. Lynch explained City Council previously approved changes in the operations and management of the golf course, including the elimination of the golf course manager position. He stated Council directed staff to attempt to reach an amicable separation agreement with the employee serving as the golf course manager. He explained the individual had reviewed and signed the agreement. He outlined the basic terms of the separation agreement. He stated the individual requested the rights to five (5) instructional videos that he produced and starred in during his tenure at Inver Wood. He noted if the agreement was approved by the City or not the individual would be entitled to the pay out for accrued personal and vacation leave. He explained the agreement would also preclude the individual from making any claims against the City going forward.

Councilmember Bartholomew questioned if there was a policy in place related to rights to material produced by individuals while employed by the City.

Mr. Lynch replied in the negative. He explained the only agreement in place was related to the release of photos or videos containing an employee for use by the City on the website or in publications. He noted this was a unique circumstance that did not routinely occur in other departments.

Councilmember Piekarski Krech suggested a policy should be developed regarding intellectual property developed by employees while working for the City.

Councilmember Mueller suggested allowing the individual to retain copies of the videos.

Councilmember Piekarski Krech opined that the release of five (5) videos was a minor issue.

Motion by Bartholomew, second by Madden, to approve Separation Agreement with Golf Course Manager

Ayes: 5
Nays: 0 Motion carried.

D. CITY OF INVER GROVE HEIGHTS: Consider Resolutions Reflecting the Elimination of the Golf Course Manager Position, the Assignment of Responsibilities to the other Golf Course Staff, and the Modification of the City's Compensation Plan for Non-Union Employees

Mr. Lynch stated the requested actions were related to the preceding action item. Council directed staff to create position changes in order to handle the duties previously performed by the Golf Course Manager. He explained modified job descriptions were provided for the existing positions at the golf course. He noted red line versions were distributed for review earlier in the day. He stated the major changes made were related to reporting requirements to reflect that there would no longer be a golf course manager. Modifications were also made that related to budget preparation responsibilities. He noted compensation changes were also proposed to correspond to the associated changes in job duties and responsibilities.

Councilmember Piekarski Krech stated based on the information provided it did not seem as though the City eliminated or changed the job description for the Golf Course Manager. She opined that it appeared as though only the title of the position had changed. She stated certain duties had been added, but nothing had been removed or significantly changed from the original job description for the Golf Course Manager.

Mr. Lynch stated the Golf Course Manager position title and job description had been eliminated. Staff attempted to outline how the duties and responsibilities contained within the job description for the Golf Course Manager position would be transferred to the existing and remaining positions at the golf course.

Mayor Tourville questioned if there were items missing from the new job description that Council wanted staff to add or if there were items listed on the new job description that Council wanted eliminated.

Councilmember Piekarski Krech stated her understanding was that the position of Golf Course Manager was eliminated and the corresponding job description would no longer exist as a result of that action. The City would then create or change two (2) positions in order to spread out some of the operational duties. She questioned what those positions or job descriptions were before the changes were made. She reiterated it appeared as though the Golf Course Manager position was not eliminated and only the title of the position and the reporting requirements were amended.

Mr. Lynch noted the immediate supervisor portion of the job descriptions had yet to be modified.

Councilmember Piekarski Krech stated based on the job descriptions provided the operations at the golf course had not been significantly changed.

Councilmember Bartholomew noted that in the agenda packet one of the job descriptions provided had a title of Golf Course Clubhouse Superintendent.

Mr. Carlson stated that was correct and the position would be filled by Matt Moynihan.

Councilmember Piekarski Krech questioned if that was the same position as the Golf Course Operations Coordinator.

Mr. Carlson explained prior to recent Council action, Inver Wood had a Golf Course Manager position that was responsible for the entire operation and all employees that worked at the course reported to that position. He noted the position was also responsible for the entire budget, including clubhouse and maintenance operations. When Council directed that the Golf Course Manager position be eliminated the City needed to modify how the golf course was operated. Staff recommended that a position entitled Golf Course Clubhouse Superintendent be created. The new position would be responsible for Clubhouse Operations and would assist with the budget, but would not be completely responsible for the budget. Budget responsibility would be shifted to the Parks and Recreation Director. The duties performed by the former Golf Course Manager position needed to be separated out between the Golf Course Clubhouse Superintendent and the Golf Course Superintendent. He noted the Golf Course Superintendent would be in charge of golf course maintenance operations. The Golf Course Clubhouse Superintendent was proposed to be paid at a grade lower than that of the former Golf Course Manager position to reflect the changes in duties and responsibilities. He stated even though the Golf Course Manager position was eliminated the City still had to run the course and the duties still needed to be performed by the remaining positions.

Councilmember Piekarski Krech stated her problem was that it seemed as though the job description for the Golf Course Manager position was reused and given a different title.

Mr. Carlson stated the job description was modified so the operations at the course could still function and be supervised by the new Golf Course Clubhouse Superintendent position. He reiterated the new position would not be in charge of the entire scope of golf course operations.

Councilmember Piekarski Krech opined the job description did not reflect that.

Mayor Tourville clarified the Golf Course Manager position was solely responsible for the budget.

Mr. Carlson responded in the affirmative.

Mayor Tourville stated the red line version of the job description for the Golf Course Clubhouse Superintendent did not reflect that the change related to budget responsibility was made.

Mr. Lynch reviewed the changes that were made on the red line version of the job description. He explained the main body of the Golf Course Manager position description was used and modified to reflect

the changes in responsibilities related to operations and budget. He stated the most important responsibility of the previous Golf Course Manager position was administration of the golf course budget and that responsibility was modified for the Golf Course Clubhouse Superintendent position. He reiterated the new position would only be responsible for the golf operations at the course and would not oversee maintenance operations.

Mr. Carlson noted only one position, the Golf Course Clubhouse Superintendent, would receive a compensation modification. All other positions would stay at the same compensation level.

Mayor Tourville clarified that both the Golf Course Clubhouse Superintendent and the Golf Course Superintendent would report to the Parks and Recreation Director.

Mr. Carlson replied in the affirmative.

Mayor Tourville suggested staff should provide final drafts of the job descriptions to the Council that were edited and did not have the red line notations.

Councilmember Bartholomew stated there was no reference to liquor license compliance responsibilities in any of the job descriptions provided in the packet. He questioned if the responsibility would be assigned to the Golf Course Clubhouse Superintendent.

Mr. Carlson replied in the affirmative.

Councilmember Piekarski Krech stated there also needed to be some continuity in the final titles for the various positions.

Mr. Lynch suggested that the item be tabled to allow staff to prepare information that would clearly detail the existing position, new position, and the major changes in each job description. He stated the new job descriptions would be further edited into final drafts.

Councilmember Piekarski Krech suggested that the description of the work environment also be modified to reflect the expectation that the Clubhouse Superintendent would also be expected to be outdoors, not just in an office environment.

Mayor Tourville opined the employees are all aware that they may have to take on other duties from time to time to make the operation of the course run efficiently.

Mr. Lynch explained it was an ADA requirement to outline the typical work environment in job descriptions. He noted the phrase “visits work areas outside of the office” was included in the job description to indicate that the person in the position would be expected to be in both indoor and outdoor environments.

Councilmember Mueller questioned why some of the physical requirements were different for each position.

Mr. Lynch stated it was based on the nature of the work expected to be performed by the person in the position.

Mayor Tourville stated the items would come back to Council on May 12th.

Mr. Kuntz requested that the Council take action on the resolution eliminating the Golf Course Manager position.

Motion by Piekarski Krech, second by Bartholomew, to adopt Resolution No. 14-52 Eliminating the Golf Course Manager Position

Ayes: 5
Nays: 0 Motion carried.

The City Council directed staff to bring the remaining items back to the Council for further discussion and review on May 12, 2014.

FINANCE:

E. CITY OF INVER GROVE HEIGHTS: Consider 2014 Budget Amendments

Ms. Smith stated the first portion of the item that referred to issues pertaining to Parks and the Golf Course should be tabled to May 12, 2014 because they related to the compensation changes that were not approved in the previous agenda item.

Councilmember Piekarski Krech questioned why there was an operating transfer out to the Parks Capital Replacement fund.

Ms. Smith explained staff's intent was to attempt to keep the budget balanced in the General Fund. The dollars saved within the Parks Department that resulted from the elimination of the Golf Course Manager position would be transferred out to the Parks Capital Replacement Fund.

Councilmember Piekarski Krech questioned why the savings could not be retained in the General Fund to be put towards another use.

Ms. Smith stated that was an option. Staff recommended that it be transferred out to continue to maintain a balanced budget in the General Fund.

Motion by Piekarski Krech, second by Bartholomew, to table consideration of the budget amendments related to Parks and the Golf Course to May 12, 2014

Ayes: 5
Nays: 0 Motion carried.

Ms. Smith reviewed the remaining amendments. The first related to a vacant park maintenance worker position. The amount reflected assumed that the position would be filled shortly and it was recommended that the savings of approximately $25,200 be transferred to the Parks Capital Replacement Fund. The other amendment was related to a Fire department request for a carryover of funds to continue the fire inspection program for $20,000 and the transfer of $15,000 to project 14-10 for the fire station no. 3 study.

Councilmember Bartholomew questioned where the specific line items were in the resolution.

Ms. Smith stated the resolution would have to be modified because it included the items that were already tabled by the Council.

Motion by Piekarski Krech, second by Bartholomew, to adopt Resolution No. 14-53 amending the 2014 Budget for requests related to the Parks Department and the Fire Department

Ayes: 5
Nays: 0 Motion carried.

8. <u>MAYOR & COUNCIL COMMENTS:</u>

9. <u>ADJOURN:</u> Motion by Mueller, second by Madden, to adjourn. The meeting was adjourned by a unanimous vote at 9:00 pm