

**INVER GROVE HEIGHTS CITY COUNCIL MEETING  
MONDAY, JANUARY 25, 2016 - 8150 BARBARA AVENUE**

**1. CALL TO ORDER and 2. ROLL CALL**

The City Council of Inver Grove Heights met in regular session on Monday, January 25, 2016, in the City Council Chambers. Mayor Tourville called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. Present were Council members Bartholomew, Hark, Mueller and Piekarski Krech; City Administrator Lynch, City Attorney Kuntz, Community Development Director Link, City Clerk Tesser, Parks and Recreation Director Carlson, Finance Director Smith, Public Works Director Thureen, Police Chief Stanger and Fire Chief Thill.

**3. PRESENTATIONS:** None.

**4. CONSENT AGENDA:**

- A. i. Minutes of December 14, 2015 City Council Meeting Minutes
- ii. Minutes of January 4, 2016 City Council Work Session Minutes
- B. **Resolution 16-03** Approving Disbursements for Period Ending January 19, 2016
- C. Consider Approval of Therapeutic Massage License for Beth Henning
- D. Consider Approval of Sentence to Service Contract
- E. Consider Change Order No. 5 and Pay Voucher No. 7 for City Project No. 2015-09E – 47th Street Area Reconstruction and City Project No. 2015-14 – 47th Street Area Water and Sewer Improvements and Rehabilitation
- F. Appointment of Board Member to the Eagan-Inver Grove Heights Watershed Management Organization (E-IGHWMO)
- G. Consider **Resolution 16-04** Adopting the Special Assessment Policy
- H. Approve Purchase of Capital Equipment
- I. Offsite Easements of Blackstone Vista Plat **Resolution 16-05**
- J. Personnel Actions

**Motion by Mueller, second by Bartholomew, to approve the Consent Agenda 4.A- 4.J, 4G was pulled.**

**Ayes: 5**

**Nays: 0          Motion carried.**

Item 4G was pulled by Kelly Kayser, 1953 59<sup>th</sup> Court E. she asked the Council about the Assessment Policy relating to the service life of the streets. She stated her sewer and storm water utilities are 30 years old. She asked how those utilities come into play as future projects come up.

Mr. Thureen, Public Works Director replied that the service life and years are closely aligned with assessment terms and not the expected service life. He stated it's not based on the expected life of the street improvement.

Ms. Kaiser asked about water main breaks and replacing sewer lines. She asked if they will be assessed for that. Mr. Thureen stated if it's an isolated incident the city repairs that break and makes the necessary street improvements. Normally, what is done as part of the feasibility report is both sewer lines and water lines are looked at during the street improvement process.

**Motion by Bartholomew, second by Hark, to approve item 4G.**

**Ayes: 5**

**Nays: 0          Motion carried.**

**5. PUBLIC COMMENT:**

Allan Cederberg, 1162 East 82<sup>nd</sup> St commented on professional football. He then commented on item 4F- the open seat of the Inver Grove Heights Watershed Management Organization (E-IGHWMO). Mr. Thureen stated there was 1 open seat. The terms are staggered. A reappointment of the Vice Chair was made.

**6. PUBLIC HEARINGS:****A. Consider Resolution Ordering Project, Approving Plans and Specifications, Authorizing Advertisement for Bids, and Authorizing City Attorney to Complete Easement Negotiations for the 2016 Pavement Management Program, City Project No. 2016-09D – 60th Street Area Reconstruction and the 2016 Improvement Program, City Project No. 2016-10 – 60th Street Area Utility Improvements.**

The Public Hearing opened at 7:10PM. Mr. Thureen opened up the meeting and summarized the item. Consultant of Kimley-Horn Associates, Mr. Eric Fosmo was present and summarized the projects in front of the Council for approval. Mr. Fosmo stated that the projects are standard utility updates, including water main improvements along with a full street reconstruction to match standard streets at 43 feet wide. The design team presented the 60<sup>th</sup> Street Area Street Construction full vs. Partial Reconstruction. A life cycle analysis and feasibility study was completed. Mr. Fosmo showed the powerpoint that outlined the cost and explained why a mill and overlay is not recommended. He stated specifically with 60<sup>th</sup> Street and Asher that the sub grade layers are not in good condition which would mean the pavement would get beat up quickly. He further stated the other streets are also not recommended for mill and overlay. Further, he stated that curb and gutter was looked at in the field by staff and is nearing the end of its useful life. He went over the values and estimated percentage of curb and gutter replacement per the powerpoint slide. He stated that the slide showed what could be saved if curb and gutter remained.

Mr. Fosmo stated that also included in the project is the Asher Avenue Extension. 60<sup>th</sup> Street and Asher is a dead-end road with a sub standard cul-de-sac at the end of it. The extension would be land from the school district to the north. The cul-de-sac does not meet the standards for City emergency and requires three easements on three different properties. Mr. Fosmo declared the total cost for city project 2016-10 the utility cost improvement is \$244,000. The city project 2016-09D street reconstruction project cost is \$2,308,000. The finance plan is the sanitary sewer and water main utility funds. The finance plan for the 2016-09D project is a combination of PMP Funds and Special Assessments as Mr. Fosmo outline in the powerpoint slide. There are no state aid funds available for these projects. The special benefit appraisal is \$9,000 per home. The assessment map was discussed. There are 52 properties and assessment is higher than \$9,000. Total assessments equals to 22% of total project costs. The assessment rolls are capped at \$9,000. An Assessor confirmed the \$9,000 benefit. The schedule was discussed, including final design, bid opening, informational meeting. Staff is asking to approve the proposed projects.

Councilmember Hark asked what the thickness of the pavement should be. Mr. Fosmo stated that the payment thickness must generally be 4 inches before you can do a 2 inch overlay. 60<sup>th</sup> Street and Asher were less than 4 inches in a lot of areas. The cul-de-sacs were 4-5 inches existing. Councilmember Bartholomew asked if 59<sup>th</sup> Court is 4-5 inches. Mr. Fosmo stated in the affirmative. The geotechnical experts showed stripping in the asphalt. The stripping in the bottom layer of the payment core. Mill and overlay wouldn't be recommended. Mayor Tourville stated that the other piece is having a good base. Mr. Fosmo stated in the affirmative, the other piece is having a good base but in these cases the base is highly frost assessable meaning that water would just sit in the base and frost will cut that up fairly quickly with a mill and overlay the cracks would show through within 2-3 years.

Councilmember Piekarski Krech asked about the layering of the pavement. Mr. Fosmo stated the cracks will come through the payment section in a matter of a couple of years. Public Works Director, Mr. Thureen stated when doing mill and overlay if you're cracked in the pavement those will reflect through the

1<sup>st</sup> or 2<sup>nd</sup> winter season. He discussed the crack and seal and why its important to do crack sealing to keep the water out of the sub grade.

Councilmember Hark the layer underneath the pavement that is substandard. Is it because of age or how the streets were built back then. Mr. Fosmo stated specifically to 59<sup>th</sup> Court it is the function of the environment. The geo technology doesn't have a solid pavement layer to pave on top of.

Councilmember Mueller asked why number 18 and 51 is not assessed. Mr. Thureen stated number 18 is a pond. And number 51 is a piece of city property. Mr. Fosmo stated that 51/52 are city properties and will be assessed per policy.

Kelly Kayser, 1953 59<sup>th</sup> Crt E. commented on the full street reconstruction and assessment of 59<sup>th</sup> Court and indicated opposition of the cost of the assessment. She also discussed her discontent with the process.

Mayor Tourville stated in response that 59<sup>th</sup> Court bituminous and condition of the soil and aggregate is below quality according to the analysis and that it's not a candidate for a mill and overlay. He asked if it would have been qualified five years ago.

Mr. Thureen summarized the entire street system, he stated the city has 140 miles of street. 40 miles are reaching to the point of life expectancy and are candidates for construction. In a three year cycle we revisit everything in the city. Mr. Thureen stated we look at everything including original construction plans. Once it gets to a certain point the road will deteriorate expeditiously. The challenge is the large percentage of the city and how to package the street projects. The new data is a rerun of the condition. We are trying to package the projects for the best efficiency and cost reduction. Mr. Thureen stated we look at the neighborhood approach for the impact of the project and we look at the underground utility. He commented that the storm sewer work is an odd alignment in Asher Ave.

Daniel Burke, 5851 Asher Avenue identified his property as 1 and 2 on the map of Asher Avenue. Mr. Burke requested no easement of property 1. Mr. Burke discussed how this would affect his family and quality of life. He mentioned that if the extension didn't occur how this would save money on the project. He also discussed utilities. Consultant, Mr. Fosmo clarified that the service utilities do serve the properties. The road access is one buildable lot. Based on that reason the property is assessed, city utilities do run to the property. Mr. Burke responded and stated that the slope and grading would make it to high of a cost to build a property on that lot. None of the property touches the road. You would need to go through the property 2 to go through the property 1. Further he commented on safety. In 30 years, there have been no safety issues.

Jim Stickler, 5866 Asher Ave. opposed the extension of the cul-de-sac. He mentioned there is limited amount of safety issues. He discussed how this would affect the neighborhood.

Valerie LaMaster, 5850 Asher Ave. opposed the cul-de-sac.

Marc Patton, 1887 59<sup>th</sup> Court East commented on his disagreement of the assessment cost and expressed his view that the curb is in good shape.

Jorin Tix, 1735 60<sup>th</sup> St E. commented on the benefit analysis assessment cost.

Nicole Taylor, 1909 59<sup>th</sup> Court East commented on her disagreement of the assessment cost and the process.

Karen Tennis, 1878 59<sup>th</sup> Court East opposed to curb replacement and the assessment cost.

Steve LaMaster, 5850 Asher asked council to look into cost benefits of the cul-de-sac and lack of emergency vehicles .

Lynn Tischler, 1921 59<sup>th</sup> Court East opposed cost of assessment and commented on the overall maintenance.

Monica Gossett, 5924 Asher Ave is extended the extended cul-de-sac. And she commented on the cost of the assessment and lack of overall maintenance.

Mayor Tourville stated that staff was gathering information and comments from the neighborhood. He stated the council is listening.

Jim Stickler, 5866 Asher Ave. discussed the 47<sup>th</sup> Ave and they were assessed \$6,000.

Terry Nelson 1948 59<sup>th</sup> Court East. He is located right by the main drain. He is opposed to the two more main drains. There have been no issues with the main drain.

Kelly Kayser, 1953 59<sup>th</sup> Crt E. commented on how great staff has been in presenting the specifics of the projects. She asked specifically about the estimate change since the beginning of the process. Mr. Thureen stated those estimates were high number average costs but once the feasibility study occurred then the numbers are more specific. She asked about uniformity vs. neighborhood preference.

Mayor Tourville stated that the public hearing will remain open. He stated for staff to go over the public comments. We need it to be a 429 project, if we do in by piecemeal the cost would increase. One example of assessment roll is the way the property tax structure states that \$9,000 increase on the property value. But he stated that neighborhoods over the last seven years saw some of the lowest property values. Further, Mayor Tourville stated that the value of the \$9,000 would increase your property value. He clarified to a previous resident comment that the pumper trucks don't go out on medical calls unless there was a special circumstance. He directed staff to look into the curbs.

Councilmember Hark asked for the opinion from the Fire Chief on the cul-de-sac. Mr. Fosmo stated that the recommendation came from public works and streets staff as well which includes snow plows, garbage trucks and fire trucks. Councilmember Mueller asked what the cost of the cul-de-sac extension is. Daniel Burke, 5851 Asher Avenue answered that the cost is \$134,000 and with the \$39,000, we could go down on a \$7,000 assessment.

Mr. Thureen commented on values and the economic downturn. He summarized past practices and continuing to use 429 but that the percentages are decreasing. He commented on the Pavement Management Plan and how to keep the streets in good shape. The appraisers looked at housing stock and lot size. He stated we are looking at the funding options, cost benefits and 429. They look at the assessment amount and asked the assessor to take a harder look. Mr. Thureen stated we are looking to see if we are going to fund a project then what is going to be the threshold for sustainability for assessment.

Mayor Tourville commented that the comparison being used is in 2015 to 2016 assessment was \$3,000 less in one year. He stated that staff should look at the project to see if they can bring down the \$9,000 estimated assessment.

Councilmember Bartholomew asked a follow-up question. He asked about the process of review for the mill and overlay option of 59<sup>th</sup> Court. Mr. Fosmo stated it's what happens if you look at the project differently. For example, if 59<sup>th</sup> was removed from this project. Would there be a cost benefit? When reviewed they found there would be very little cost benefit without 59<sup>th</sup> Court.

Mayor Tourville stated so if 59<sup>th</sup> Court was on their own, the cost would go up on a per unit bases. Mr. Fosmo stated that the lot size and property in comparison with the other streets in the project are similar.

Councilmember Mueller asked about the schedule of Upper 55<sup>th</sup> Avenue.

Mr. Thureen answered that this project will have a feasibility study done this year. 2017 has funding for plans and specifications but no current construction date.

Councilmember Mueller asked if we should package Upper 55<sup>th</sup> Ave. with the street projects. Councilmember Piekarski Krech stated no, it makes it worse the longer you wait on the assessment cost.

Councilmember Piekarski Krech stated that she doesn't mind keeping the public hearing open but if we don't get assessment bids in on time during the construction season than it could cost the city more money.

Councilmember Hark asked when it will go back onto the calendar.

Mayor Tourville stated that we can keep it open and reanalyze whether or not to keep the curbs and cul-de-sac.

Mr. Thureen stated these numbers are an educated guess based on the feasibility study it's a soft cost estimate but it can vary. The next meeting would be the second month in February.

Councilmember Piekarski Krech can we do alternates in the bids or do we have to advertise as is? Mr. Thureen stated we can put specs and bids but it could affect the bids.

Daniel Burke, 5851 Asher Avenue opposed the extension of the cul-de-sac.

City Attorney, Mr. Kuntz stated we need to ask Mr. Fosmo if the parcel 1 is assessed even if the cul-de-sac is not extended. Mr. Fosmo stated that he will bring the answer to this question back to the next hearing.

City Attorney, Mr. Kuntz summarized the discussion. If we would return on February 22, 2016, the council would like to hear that the cul-de-sac has a better estimate of the cost and who recommends that the extension of the cul-de-sac be extended for emergency vehicles. Also, for more information on the curbs and whether there will be some savings or not. Councilmember Piekarski Krech stated that the question before staff is what the cost for insurmountable curbs is. The neighborhood wants unisurmountable curbs. Also the third item residents asked about was the cost benefit of not adding an additional sewer drains on 59<sup>th</sup> Court East.

City Attorney, Mr. Kuntz read the MN State Statute 429.031, other steps improvement hearing, preparation of plans and specifications to design if its feasibility. He stated in the affirmative, you can go out for bids. The city has not done that in the past and the bidders will know that.

Karen Tennis, 1878 59<sup>th</sup> Court East asked why the costs are not lower than 60<sup>th</sup> Street and Asher Avenue. Why is it disproportionate? She questioned the assessor's estimate of the increase of property value.

Mayor Tourville is a judgment call by county assessors. Its not a formula, its an estimate that was done.

Kelly Kayser 1953 59<sup>th</sup> Crt E. why are comps looked at from 2010? Could we look at more update comparables and would that change the assessment.

Steve LaMaster, 5850 Asher Avenue commented that there's only one trash hauler.

Councilmember Piekarski Krech concerned on the bid dates lateness.

City Attorney, Mr. Kuntz stated to the audience and viewers that the motion is to keep open the hearing until Feb 22, 2016, there will not be written or public notice to that hearing. If you want to participate you will need to be back here.

**Motion by Muller second Bartholomew to keep the public hearing open until Feb 22, 2016 at 7:00PM.**

**Ayes: 5**

**Nays: 0            Motion carried.**

**B. Assessment Hearing for City Project No. 2009-01 – T.H. 3 and 80th Street/County Road 28 Intersection Improvements Resolution 16-06**

The Public Hearing was previously opened. The Public Hearing continuation started at 9:00PM.

Mr. Thureen introduced the item and reviewed the project from the public hearing. Staff was directed by Council to have another meeting with the residents regarding the assessment. Mr. Thureen showed the assessment area to the Council. The parcels on the west side are to be covered by an assessment agreement in the amount of \$400,000 for a term of five years with a recommended interest rate at 4.8%. Today, the 18 parcels on the east side of Hwy 3 are in front of you. The original assessment was \$381,600 with a term of 10 years at 4.8% and allowing deferment. The combination was the parcel area and trip generation on future land use based on Comp plan. At the first meeting Council asked staff to look at a different calculation. Staff returned with a reduced assessment amount of \$234,000. The proposal is \$147,800. Staff revised assessment role is strictly on area and was not calculated by trip generation. It's strictly calculated on the parcels involved. The term is 10 years with an interest rate at 4.8%. It was recommended that the city include deferment.

As discussed prior to the events that would follow the events or dates which would begin the deferment as follows:

1. The property is platted and a final plat is recorded.
2. The property is subdivided with the meaning of Minn. Statute §462.352, Subd. 12. Staff added the transfers during the life of the current owner to any family members of the current owner.
3. Lastly, that there is a fixed date of January 1, 2040.

In cases of deferment being reached it will accrue interest at the rate of 4.8%. It shall be due and payable with real estate taxes over five calendar years.

The informational meeting was on January 14, 2016, two property owners attended. Their emails are included in the Council packet. They are requesting the revised proposed assessments be reduced further from \$18,000 to \$6,000 for parcel 20-000800-53-010 and from \$30,000 to \$6,000 for parcel 20-00800-50-010. Another rejection letter was received earlier in November rejecting the original assessment but the amount has changed to now being \$6,300.

Councilmember Bartholomew asked if we acknowledge the rejection letter. City Attorney Kuntz stated no we don't think we have a rejection letter.

Mr. Thureen stated that with the changes staff asks the council to approve the resolution with the revised proposed assessment role for a total of \$547,741.52. \$400,000 of that is from the west side of the highway.

Mayor Tourville confirmed that the assessment role is on acreage, not on trips. Thureen stated in the affirmative, there is a fixed amount proposed.

Councilmember Mueller asked how an assessment is calculated. Mr. Thureen stated you look at how the property could be developed. Mr. Thureen stated he found the means on how to fund the street improvement. If you consider that amount to what this could develop into and what it's used in the amount of a fixed acreage of units. Mayor Tourville commented that the city didn't foresee the state not having to pay any amount of the highway improvement.

Mayor Tourville offered an opportunity for public comment:

Kurt Rechtzigel, 1407 80<sup>th</sup> Street E commented on that the assessment should be looked at as a whole instead of the west side.

Christine O'Shaughnessy, commented on the lack of benefit. She handed out an email from Denny Honsa of MSA Professional Services. She discussed the land mass topography and the assessment is grossly stated. She also discussed the highest commercial assessment of \$6,000.

Jeanne Abbott, 1401 80<sup>th</sup> Street commented on poor planning by the city and abuse of power.

Allan Cederburg, 1162 East 82<sup>nd</sup> St commented on a 2008 Assessment Hearing. Mayor Tourville replied that the use of the MSA funds to help offset the cost savings this project by \$234,000. Mayor Tourville and Cederburg discussed a new 80<sup>th</sup> Street.

**Motion by Bartholomew second Hark to close the public hearing at 9:34 PM of City Project No. 2009-01 -T.H. 3 and 80<sup>th</sup> Street.**

**Ayes: 5**

**Nays: 0            Motion carried.**

The Public Hearing closed at 9:34PM. Councilmember Bartholomew stated the need to practice other alternatives in the future but today we need to approve the assessment roll. As stewards, we need to approve the roll but other alternatives should have been explored in the past.

Councilmember Piekarski Krech commented that in hindsight it was in 2008 we didn't foresee the economic downturn and connections that should have happened didn't happen. But we did what we could at the time.

**Motion by Bartholomew second Hark to approve final assessment of the resolution of City Project No. 2009-01 – Truck Highway 3 and 80<sup>th</sup> Street/Amana Trail/County Road 28 Intersection Improvements.**

**Ayes: 5**

**Nays: 0            Motion carried.**

Mr. Kuntz stated that the Council needs to make a decision on the deferment resolution.

Mr. Thureen stated per the Resolution in the Council request for Council action to memorialize the deferment of special assessment. Two parcels that are city owned. They are not included in the deferment. Two owned by the county. Parcel 8 is being deferred by Target. It's reflected in the resolution of the assessment.

Allan Cederburg, 1162 East 82<sup>nd</sup> St asked if the resolutions need to be rescinded. City Attorney Kuntz stated in the negative, that no deferments were adopted.

Two parcels are city owned 15 and 12 we proposed that they are not included in deferment and parcel 7 that is a county road but is for the realignment of future roads. The parcel will be used for the right of way. We mentioned parcel 8 as a current use but the intensity of the use is the same as the Comp Plan but that will be deferred. City Attorney stated Mr. Kuntz stated that there are 19 parcels on the assessment role. 15 parcels will be in deferment and 4 parcels not being deferred (7, 12, 14 and 15; two by the County, one by the city and one by Target.) The City prepared 15 separate deferment resolutions. The deferment terms are in the deferment resolution.

**Motion by Piekarski Krech second Mueller to approve Resolution of deferment of special assessment. Resolutions 16-07 Gordon, 16-13 Inver Grove Land, LLC 16-14 Wistl, 16-15 Wistl, 16-16 Malensek, 16-17 Rechtzigel, 16-18 Si LLC, 16-19 Abbott, 136-20 Sure Lock Holdings, 16-21 Willenbring, 16-22 Willenbring, 16-23 Hanson, 16-24 Corniea, 16-25 O’Shaughnessy, 16-26 Bonin.**

**Ayes: 5**  
**Nays: 0**      **Motion carried.**

**7. REGULAR AGENDA:**

**COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT:**

**A. BLACKSTONE HIGHLANDS; Consider the following requests for property located south of 70th Street, just east of Blackstone Vista;**

- a) A Resolution 16-08 relating to a Comprehensive Plan Amendment to change the land use designation from MDR, Medium Density Residential to LDR-NWAPUD, Low Density Residential Northwest Area PUD.**
- b) A Rezoning of the property from A, Agricultural to R-1C/PUD, Single Family Residential District. Resolution 16-09**
- c) A Resolution 16-10 relating to a Preliminary Plat and Preliminary PUD Development Plan for Blackstone Highlands.**

Mr. Hunting, City Planner introduced the item and pointed to the area on the map shown. It’s a 15 acre parcel into a 40 lot single family development to be known as Blackstone Highlands. The Comprehensive Plan would go from a MDR density to an LDR density. This is consistent with prior developments. The rezoning would be consistent with the proposed comprehensive plan designation for the property. The preliminary plat consists of 40 single family lots and three outlots. Two of the outlots are storm water purposes. Outlot C has the potential for future development along with parcel to the north abutting 70<sup>th</sup>. The project meets the performance standards. The flex of the opening space is less than 20% because of the open space. The parcel is disturbed and farmed. There are no regional basins found. It doesn’t have a regional basin which has been a large part of the open space. To maximum lot size staff is comfortable with the flexibility. Planning Commission and Staff is approving the project as presented.

Mayor Tourville stated this was a lot of conversation in regards to this properties request.

Jim Deanovic was presented and stated his name.

City Attorney Kuntz stated 4/5 votes are required with the Comprehensive Plan change.

**Motion by Piekarski Krech second Mueller to approve A, B and C. of the resolution.**

**Ayes: 5**

**Nays: 0          Motion carried.**

**B. ETERNITY HOMES, LLC; Consider a Resolution 16-11 relating to the Preliminary Plat of Crosby Heights. Property located between 64th and 65th Streets at Craig Avenue.**

Mr. Hunting introduced the item and showed the area on the map. The applicant is proposing to develop a 5.5 acre parcel into a 23 lot single family development to be known as Crosby Heights. The developer would construct Crosby Avenue between 64<sup>th</sup> and 65<sup>th</sup> Streets and Craig Avenue. The lots are of a similar size to the surrounding neighborhood. The zoning and comp plan does not need to be changed. The developer is changing Crosby Ave. The lots would access off of Crosby Ave and Craig Ave. There is no variance to be requested. No corner back or lot size issues. The lots meet the 70% rule and the design addresses storm water needs with the pond occurring on the outlot. There were 40 foot lots but now they are updated to today's standards. Planning Commission and Staff is approving the project as presented.

Councilmember Hark what are the cost of the properties?

John Anderson, Eternity Homes commented that price point is \$275-\$375,000 probably low \$330,000.

**Motion by Mueller second Bartholomew to approve the resolution relating to the Preliminary Plat of Crosby Heights.**

**Ayes: 5**

**Nays: 0          Motion carried.**

**C. CITY OF INVER GROVE HEIGHTS; Consider the Third and Final Reading of an Ordinance 1308 Amendment to the Regulations of Parking of Vehicles and Recreational Vehicles in the Front Yard by Removing One of the Temporary Exceptions.**

Mr. Link outlined the item as the third and final reading of the ordinance of the regulations of parking vehicles in the front yard. It will remove the seven day temporary exception. The City Council approved the reading at its January 11, 2016 meeting. There were no changes made at that time. Planning Commission and Staff are approving the ordinance.

Councilmember Mueller asked where the map is. Mr. Link stated the map will be amended.

Mayor Tourville directed staff on revising the map to help clear things up. Mr. Link stated in the affirmative.

**Motion by Piekarski Krech second Hark to approve the third and final reading of ordinance 1308 Regulations of Parking of Vehicles and Recreational Vehicles in the Front Yard.**

**Ayes: 5**

**Nays: 0          Motion carried.**

**D. CITY OF INVER GROVE HEIGHTS; Community Development Block Grant Applications- Fiscal Year 2016. Resolution 16-12**

Community Development Director, Tom Link presented the item. He stated that this is a routine application. In 2016, CDBG through the Community Development Agency stated its for low to moderate funding. In the past, we have split the amount of the Housing Rehabilitation fund and the Doffing Ave Acquisition Program by 50%.

This year staff recommends a change the amount allocated from the Doffing Avenue Acquisition. The last acquisition was three years ago. Mr. Link stated we don't have the need for the program. The second reason is the agency has been tacking on more federal regulations onto the program. The new regulations have to be used in 1.5 years. We would like to find a different use for it. We are asking for the Comp Fund to be allocated for the use of the funds. And to update the ADA construction fund with the remaining funds of \$56,000. The other cost would be the ADA improvements such as pedestrian crossing at city streets. City matching funds are not required. Usually the cost is paid for by the general fund, pavement management or municipal state aid. Mr. Link concluded that staff recommended that the Housing Rehabilitation Program be \$57,000. Comprehensive Plan update be \$28,000 and the American Disabilities Act (ADA) Construction be \$28,000.

Councilmember Piekarski Krech stated that we should put more money in the Housing Rehabilitation program. Mr. Link replied that the county (CDA) did not feel that was needed. He stated that the county has to match those funds. Between the funds, we usually have enough in the fund. Councilmember Piekarski Krech suggested 60% in Housing Rehabilitation program and 25% in American Disabilities Act Construction. She asked staff to advertise the program more.

Mayor Tourville stated we are directing staff to include in the grant 60% in Housing Rehabilitation program and 25% in American Disabilities Act Construction.

**Motion by Piekarski Krech second Mueller with said changes to the 2016 CDBG application.**

**Ayes: 5**

**Nays: 0      Motion carried.**

**8. MAYOR & COUNCIL COMMENTS****9. EXECUTIVE SESSION:**

Executive Session Pursuant to Minn. Stat. § 13D.05, Subd. 3. Discussion of Property Acquisition of the Leyde Property.

**10. ADJOURN:** Motion by Piekarski Krech, second by Bartholomew to adjourn. The meeting was adjourned by a unanimous vote at 10:40p.m.