

**INVER GROVE HEIGHTS CITY COUNCIL MEETING  
MONDAY, JANUARY 23, 2012 - 8150 BARBARA AVENUE**

**CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL** The City Council of Inver Grove Heights met in regular session on Monday, January 23, 2012, in the City Council Chambers. Mayor Tourville called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. Present were Council members Grannis, Klein, and Madden; City Administrator Lynch, Assistant City Administrator Teppen, City Attorney Kuntz, Public Works Director Thureen, Parks & Recreation Director Carlson, Community Development Director Link, Fire Chief Thill, and Police Chief Stanger

**3. PRESENTATIONS:**

**A. SSP Area Relay 4 Life**

Jaime Ross and Laura Grevas provided an overview of the eighth annual Relay 4 Life event scheduled on August 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> at Lincoln Center Elementary in South St. Paul. They explained that the overnight event was one of the American Cancer Society's main fundraisers, and displayed a brief video highlighting the event's activities.

Ms. Ross stated over the past seven (7) years the event rose over \$700,000, honored over 800 cancer survivors, and welcomed 3,500 participants. She explained February was designated "Paint our Towns Purple" month, and Relay 4 Life representatives would be out in the community, attending local events to disseminate information about the event in August. She noted that a kickoff event would be held on February 21<sup>st</sup> from 5:30-8:00 p.m. and would be an opportunity to learn more about Relay 4 Life and sign up a team for the event in August.

Mayor Tourville asked staff put a link to the Relay 4 Life website on the City's website. He reiterated that it is an activity for citizens in local communities, including Inver Grove Heights and South St. Paul.

Councilmember Madden commended the Relay 4 Life event for honoring cancer survivors and those who passed away from cancer. He stated it was a nice event that raises awareness and thanked those involved for organizing the program.

**B. Drug Task Force Reimbursement**

Chief Stanger explained that the Dakota County Drug Task Force is a proactive narcotics enforcement team, whose mission is to target mid to high level drug dealers. The task force is a consortium of officers from all police agencies within Dakota County. He stated the task force operates under a joint powers agreement, with a governing board of twelve members. The task force budget, funded via state and federal dollars, forfeiture gains, and other proceeds is established annually by the board members. He explained each year the board examines the task force fund balance to ensure that sufficient funds exist for the next year's operating budget as well as an additional year in case funding sources become unavailable. He noted that if it is determined that a fund surplus exists, board may allow participating agencies to recoup some of the expenses they incurred as a result of having a representative serve on the Drug Task Force. In 2011 a surplus existed due to a high volume of case closures that resulted in a high number of forfeitures and cash seizures. He explained that the board voted to allow up to \$15,000 per officer assigned to the Task Force to be returned to the agency for expenses above and beyond the officer's regular salary. He stated the City received \$13,817.04 for the reimbursement of costs incurred for vehicle and equipment, training, and overtime for having a member on the Drug Task Force.

Councilmember Klein opined that the reimbursement was good news.

Mayor Tourville stated the Drug Task Force was an important group that the City needs to continue to participate on and commented that it was nice to hear that a surplus existed that would help defray some of the costs associated with participation.

**4. CONSENT AGENDA:**

Councilmember Grannis removed Item 4I, Approve Contract with Braun Intertec for Work on the 66<sup>th</sup> St. Project related to the Rock Island Swing Bridge, from the Consent Agenda.

- A. Minutes – January 9, 2012 Regular Council Meeting
- B. **Resolution No. 12-03** Approving Disbursements for Period Ending January 18, 2012
- C. Pay Voucher No. 9 for City Project No. 2008-18, Public Safety Addition/City Hall Renovation – Low Voltage Contractors
- D. Final Compensating Change Order No. 6, Final Pay Voucher No. 7, Engineer’s Final Report, and **Resolution No. 12-04** Accepting Work for City Project No. 2010-09D, South Grove Street Reconstruction – Area 5
- E. Accept Proposal from Bergerson-Caswell, Inc. for Well Pump No. 3 Rehabilitation
- F. Approve the 2012 Labor Agreement between the City of Inver Grove Heights and A.F.S.C.M.E. Council 5, Local 1065
- G. **Resolution No. 12-05** Revoking a Special Assessment Deferral for City Project No. 2010-09D, South Grove Street Reconstruction – Area 5
- H. Award Contract for Purchase and Installation of Emergency Back-up Generator at Fire Station 3 to Prestige Electric
- J. Approve Changes to North Valley Disc Golf Operations Agreement
- K. Accept Annual Report from Inver Grove Heights Police Department
- L. Personnel Actions

**Motion by Madden, second by Klein, to approve the Consent Agenda**

**Ayes: 4**

**Nays: 0      Motion carried.**

- I. Approve Contract with Braun Intertec for Work on the 66<sup>th</sup> St. Project related to the Rock Island Swing Bridge

Councilmember Grannis stated he would not vote in favor of contracting with Braun Intertec due to a mistake that was made during a previous project.

**Motion by Madden, second by Klein, to approve contract with Braun Intertec for work on the 66<sup>th</sup> Street Project related to the Rock Island Swing Bridge**

**Ayes: 3**

**Nays: 1 (Grannis)      Motion carried.**

**5. PUBLIC COMMENT:**

**6. PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

- A. **CITY OF INVER GROVE HEIGHTS;** Consider Resolution Ordering Project, Approving Plans and Specifications, and Authorizing Advertisement for Bids for the 2012 Pavement Management Program, City Project No. 2011-08, 66<sup>th</sup> Street from Concord Boulevard to the Swing Bridge and City Project No. 2011-21, Park Improvements (66<sup>th</sup> Street Parking Lot and Related Trails)

Mr. Kaldunski explained the feasibility study outlined two options for the project and it was determined that Option B would be the most practical approach due to its lower cost and use of existing right-of-way. He stated Option B would entail a roadway mill and overlay, curb and gutter installation, driveway construction, trail construction, drainage improvements, water main improvements, hydrant/valve installation, installation of water main and sanitary sewer on Doffing Avenue, restoration and appurtenances. The proposed project area would include 66<sup>th</sup> Street from Concord Boulevard to Donnelly Avenue and Doffing Avenue from 66<sup>th</sup> Street to 180 feet north.

Mr. Kaldunski explained the second part of the project would involve park improvements including grading of the 66<sup>th</sup> Street parking lot, construction of rain gardens, placing concrete curb and gutter, bituminous

paving, construction of a trail to the pier, installation of new trail lighting, salvaging railroad artifacts, removal of railroad materials abandoned on right-of-way, restoration and appurtenances. He stated the trail construction would occur on 66<sup>th</sup> Street from Donnelly Avenue to the Swing Bridge Pier and on old railroad right-of-way from 66<sup>th</sup> Street to the overview deck near the Swing Bridge Pier and from the overview deck to River Road.

Mr. Kaldunski stated the total estimated project cost is \$921,134, including \$392,332 for the City Project No. 2011-08 road improvements, and \$528,802 for City Project No. 2011-21 park improvements. The total amount proposed to be assessed for the street improvements was \$208,345. He noted that no assessments were proposed to be levied for the park improvements. He reviewed the funding sources for both projects, noting that the park improvements would be funded with County turnback funds and Park funds and grants. He explained construction would start in the spring with a final completion date of June 30, 2012 in order to comply with grant requirements. He noted a neighborhood meeting was held and reviewed the comments received from the affected businesses and residents.

Councilmember Madden questioned why the curb was proposed to be installed on only one side of the street.

Mr. Kaldunski explained the primary function of the curb would be to physically separate the new trail from the existing pavement.

Joe Harms, River Heights Marina, opined that the only reason the project was initiated was to accommodate the park project. He stated he, as a business owner, has never complained about the condition of the road and expressed concern with being assessed for water and sewer that will not affect his property. He opined that the proposed assessments were too expensive and felt it would be unfair to ask the businesses in the area to shoulder a majority of the cost for the improvements. He asked that other funding sources be considered to alleviate some of the cost for the area businesses.

Mr. Kaldunski explained that the road was recently turned back to the City by the County, and in doing so gave the City a specific amount of money to put towards street improvements.

Councilmember Klein questioned why River Heights Marina would be assessed for water and sewer if the business was not connected to City water or sewer service.

Mr. Kaldunski explained that water and sewer lines are proposed to be installed along Donnelly Avenue. He stated Mr. Harms' upper lot could be serviced if he chose to connect to the lines being installed.

Councilmember Klein commented that the value of Mr. Harms' property would increase even if he did not connect to the water and sewer lines being installed.

Mayor Tourville stated the proposed project was City initiated. He noted that the agreement with the County included a provision that the road had to be improved after the turn back was completed.

Mr. Harms explained that one block stretch of road mainly serves his marina and now it seems that it is being improved because it will service the Rock Island Swing Bridge and the additional parking lot for the park facility. He opined that there wouldn't be a need to improve the street if it continued to service only his property.

**Motion by Klein, second by Grannis, to close the public hearing.**

**Ayes: 4**

**Nays: 0          Motion carried.**

Mayor Tourville questioned if

Mr. Carlson stated the concept discussed at the work session was presented by the County to the City late on Friday. He explained staff would further examine the proposed concept plan to determine its merit and feasibility. He noted if staff finds the plan to be feasible, the City would have a window of approximately 40-45 days in which plans could be developed and added to the existing plans that would be bid on for the project. He explained if the City chose to pursue the concept plan presented by the County, all of the

associated costs would be paid for by the County. He noted the newest plan would also need to be brought to the Parks and Recreation Advisory Commission and the City Council for formal review and approval in order to send it out for bid.

Mayor Tourville stated he had no financial gain in the project but would abstain from the vote because his employer was involved with some of the preliminary plans.

Mr. Kuntz indicated that four (4) votes were required for approval because the project was initiated by the Council.

Mayor Tourville explained he was not involved with any of the preliminary plans for the project, he did not own the company, and he did not participate in any discussions regarding the project, other than at the Council level. He questioned if the City Attorney thought there would be a conflict of interest if he were to vote on the project. He stated the timing of the project is critical and delaying the vote would delay the project schedule.

Mr. Kuntz opined that there would not be a conflict of interest if the Mayor voted on the project. He explained because the project was Council initiated, a 4/5 vote of the Council was required by statute in order to approve the project. He referenced an Attorney General's opinion which deals with Minnesota Statute 412.311 and provides in part that no member of a Council can have a direct or indirect interest in any contract made by the Council. He explained that the question of indirect interest arises when a councilmember is an employee of a company that is contracting with the City. He stated the Attorney General opined, and he concurred, that in circumstances where that councilmember is not on the board of directors of the company, does not own any interest in the company, is not the supervising party of the contract, and is not paid any bonus or commission as a result of the contract, that association as employee does not constitute an indirect interest. He concluded that the Mayor did not have a conflict interest and could vote on the matter.

**Motion by Klein, second by Grannis, to adopt Resolution No. 12-06 Ordering Improvements, Approving Plans and Specifications, and Authorizing Advertisement for Bids for 2012 Pavement Management Program, City Project No. 2011-08, 66<sup>th</sup> Street from Concord Boulevard to the Swing Bridge Pier and Resolution No. 12-07 Ordering Improvements, Approving Plans and Specifications, and Authorizing Advertisement for Bids for 2012 Pavement Management Program, City Project No. 2011-21, Park Improvements (66<sup>th</sup> Street Parking Lot and related Trails)**

**Ayes: 4**

**Nays: 0      Motion carried.**

**B. CITY OF INVER GROVE HEIGHTS;** Consider Resolution Ordering Project, Approving Plans and Specifications, and Authorizing Advertisement for Bids for the 2012 Pavement Management Program, City Project No. 2012-09D, Urban Street Reconstruction Project (65<sup>th</sup> Street Neighborhood and Cahill Ct.)

Mr. Kaldunski stated proposed project would be the City's annual reconstruction project. He explained the City has completed a series of reconstruction projects, primarily in the South Grove area, over the last six (6) years. He reviewed a map of the proposed project area, along 65<sup>th</sup> Street spanning from Babcock Trail to Cahill Avenue. The majority of the street improvements would involve full reconstruction. He noted some storm water improvements would also be completed. He stated Cahill Court was also proposed to be reconstructed as part of the project. The total estimated project cost was \$6,767,034, and the amount of state aid funds proposed to be allocated to the project was \$2,734,500. Typically City policy has been to assess approximately 70% of the total project cost, therefore the total amount proposed to be assessed was \$3,391,153, as per the City's Pavement Management Policy. He reviewed the benefit analysis appraisal, stating that for a single family home the recommended assessment cap for parcels located west of T.H. 52 was \$4,000. The recommended assessment cap for those single family properties lying to the east of T.H. 52 was \$5,000. He noted this information was shared with the attendees of an informational meeting. The assessments were proposed to be levied over 10 years at a 5% interest rate. He reviewed the proposed construction schedule and discussed the assessment deferral policy.

Councilmember Klein questioned when Cahill Court was constructed and how much had been spent by the City on maintenance in that time period.

Mr. Kaldunski stated it was built in 1990 and seal coated the year after it was constructed.

Councilmember Klein questioned why no additional maintenance had been done in 21 years.

Councilmember Grannis noted that street improvements are done at the discretion of the Council.

Mayor Tourville commented that for many years prior to the establishment of the Pavement Management Program it was difficult to get Council approval on street improvements. He opined that the easy thing to do would be to never do any street improvements or maintenance. He stated the current Council implemented a Pavement Management Program a number of years ago to protect the City's infrastructure.

Councilmember Madden stated the program makes the infrastructure easier to maintain.

Joyce Deeb, 7577 Cahill Ct., questioned why a full reconstruction was proposed on Cahill Court if the typical maintenance schedule involves a mill and overlay approximately every 20 years.

Mr. Kaldunski stated the decision to do a full reconstruction was based on the recommendation of the geotechnical firm that performed soil testing on the road. He explained the tests showed a lot of expansive clay soils underneath the road. He opined that the road was able to last as long as it did because it had a thicker layer of bituminous than is typically applied. He stated in this instance the black top is thinning out and crumbling, and a mill and overlay would remove the top two inches of the road but would not resolve the deterioration that exists on the bottom. He noted there is as much deterioration on the bottom of the surface as there is on the top, so the structural integrity of the road is compromised.

Ryan Guggisberg, 2590 67<sup>th</sup> Court E., stated his property was proposed to be assessed for drainage improvements only. He explained that with the proposed assessment cap, the benefits received by those properties proposed to be assessed for drainage and road improvements is far greater than the benefit he and his neighbors on 67<sup>th</sup> Court East would receive. He opined that he would receive no benefit because he would be assessed for a storm sewer drain that is located in his front yard. He questioned why he would be assessed at the same rate as those receiving significantly more benefit from the project. He also questioned why the drainage allocation for the bid was less than total proposed drainage assessments.

Mr. Kaldunski reviewed the proposed drainage improvements and stated that in the initial scope of the project 67<sup>th</sup> Court East was not considered for reconstruction. He explained that upon further analysis of the project, staff became more aware of the drainage and contribution areas to the storm sewer system and what the actual drainage issues are in the area. He stated the proposed design would correct those issues.

Mayor Tourville asked if core samples were taken on 67<sup>th</sup> Court East and Bixby Way.

Mr. Kaldunski indicated samples were not taken because neither was included in the original scope of the project and were only added after the drainage issues were discovered. He noted that 67<sup>th</sup> Court East would likely be a candidate for a mill and overlay, but because it was not included in the original scope of the project it was not part of the feasibility study that was used when the Council originally ordered the project.

Mayor Tourville clarified that Council would need to conduct another hearing and have the feasibility study amended in order to include 67<sup>th</sup> Court East and Bixby Way in the project.

Mr. Kaldunski responded in the affirmative. He stated if 67<sup>th</sup> Court East had been included in the street improvement project, the proposed assessments for the benefitting properties would have reached the recommended caps.

Mayor Tourville opined that the residents on 67<sup>th</sup> Court East may be better off having the geotechnical testing done and being included in the street improvements because of the recommended cap and the fact that construction will already be done in the area.

Councilmember Madden noted the work would also be completed at a better contract price.

Mr. Kaldunski reiterated that the main issue is that the affected property owners were not included in the original hearing notice and Council would need to follow proper procedure to add them to the project.

Steve Dodge, Assistant City Engineer, clarified that all property owners on 67<sup>th</sup> Court East were properly notified for the drainage improvement portion of the project.

Mr. Kuntz questioned if staff had a statement on the potential impact of a street improvement on the properties on 67<sup>th</sup> Court East.

Mr. Kaldunski responded in the negative.

Mr. Kuntz explained because a statement of economic impact was not available at the time of the hearing, the Council could not order the project with street improvements on 67<sup>th</sup> Court East included.

Mayor Tourville questioned if the Council could direct staff to move forward with geotechnical testing on 67<sup>th</sup> Court East to determine if a mill and overlay is warranted.

Mr. Kaldunski stated an amendment to the feasibility study would take approximately a month, which would affect the bidding schedule and the projected start of construction.

Mr. Kuntz stated the project could be kept on schedule if the public hearing was continued at the first meeting in April, but the Council authorized the advertisement of bids prior to the hearing.

Maynard McManus, 2168 65<sup>th</sup> Street, stated he wants to know what the cost will be per lot. He opined that there are people on a fixed budget that need to plan for the proposed assessment. He asked the Council to be sympathetic to the homeowner.

Mayor Tourville clarified that the meeting was not an assessment hearing. He explained that exact costs would not be known until bids are received and the project is completed. He noted that the assessment amounts discussed are preliminary, not exact.

Mr. McManus explained he was told that his property would not be assessed like a regular lot because it was larger and could be subdivided into five separate lots. He expressed concern that he would be assessed for five lots that he cannot develop.

Mayor Tourville stated if Mr. McManus were willing to sign an agreement that states he will not subdivide his property, he would be assessed as one lot.

Mr. McManus responded he would be willing to sign such an agreement.

Councilmember Klein questioned if the public hearing would be continued until after an amended feasibility report is received.

Mr. Kuntz advised that would be the recommended protocol.

Gene Mankowski, 2565 67<sup>th</sup> Ct. E., asked that the Council look at how property owners are assessed in terms of the value that is being added to the property based on the improvements that are made.

Ron Schmidt, 7569 Cahill Ct., questioned if any resident on Cahill Court requested that the road be improved or complained about the condition of the road. He stated the street was built in 1990 and other than a crack being filled with asphalt, not another dime was spent on maintenance of the road. He acknowledged that the asphalt was crumbling. He noted that whoever constructed the road did something right because it lasted 20 years. He stated the curb is fine and does not need to be replaced. He stated there is minimal traffic and there have been no drainage problems in the cul-de-sac. He opined that none of the residents want the street to be fully reconstructed. He suggested removing the asphalt and digging down approximately eight (8) inches. He questioned if the residents on Cahill Court could be bid as a separate project so they are not paying for work being done in another area of the project.

Mr. Kaldunski recommended that the curb be replaced because when there is a cut it typically damages the curb and it costs more money to save it than it does to replace it.

Mayor Tourville questioned if Cahill Court would be built to the same standards and specifications as 65<sup>th</sup> Street.

Mr. Kaldunski explained that 65<sup>th</sup> Street would have six (6) inches of bituminous laid, whereas Cahill Court would have four (4) inches of bituminous laid.

Councilmember Klein expressed concern regarding the depth to which Cahill Court would be dug.

Mr. Thureen explained the standards that were established in the early 1990's for residential and collector streets.

Mr. Kaldunski noted that Cahill Court had one of the thickest layers of bituminous on any residential street in the City. He stated the decision was made when it was built to not remove the clay soils underneath and instead to lay a thin layer of sand and gravel fill to stabilize the bituminous black top.

Mr. Schmidt opined that the original contractor did something right because the road lasted twenty years without maintenance.

Mr. Kaldunski stated he did not know if any money would be saved by changing the specifications on Cahill Court.

Ms. Deeb reiterated that it is disturbing that the project on Cahill Court is being grouped in with a much larger project in which water and sewer improvements are also being done. She suggested that the bids and the request for bids be organized in such a way that it is clear what the different classifications of improvements cost. She asked for some assurance that she will not be assessed for the additional work being done as part of the overall project.

Mr. Kaldunski stated Cahill Court could be listed as a separate assessment schedule in the overall bid. He explained there would be a separate bid exclusively for the cost on Cahill Court.

Mayor Tourville suggested that similar streets also be looked at in the same manner.

Mr. Kaldunski stated a series of schedules could be established.

Mr. Thureen explained that the current methodology for assessment calculations factors in the different standards that are being constructed. Collector streets, such as 65<sup>th</sup> Street, are calculated at a different rate than normal residential streets. He noted that the City contributes a greater percentage of the cost for collector streets.

Mayor Tourville agreed and asked that the calculation be shown to the residents being assessed so they understand how their specific assessment amount was determined in relation to other portions of the project.

Mr. Thureen cautioned that parsing out a project in that manner can result in receiving uneven unit price bidding.

Bob Krammer, 6850 Blackhawk Trail, expressed concerns regarding the assessment policy. He stated is proposed to be assessed for two lots even though he has no desire to split his lot. He opined that paying for two parcels would not add value to his property.

Mayor Tourville suggested that Mr. Krammer could resolve the issue by signing an agreement stating he would not subdivide his property.

Jo Teare, 6444 Babcock Trail, expressed concern regarding the proposal to change all the curbing. She stated she did not want to see something replaced if it was not absolutely necessary. She also wanted to ensure that uniform curbing would be installed. She stated there were drainage areas along 65<sup>th</sup> Street that were not included on the project map.

Mr. Kaldunski stated engineering staff would look at the issue to confirm the final drainage areas.

Mr. Thureen stated that the curb was proposed to be replaced because of the reconstruction, not because of a style difference.

Mr. Kuntz stated if additional properties were going to be added to the project for consideration of street improvements, the hearing should be continued until March 26<sup>th</sup>. He suggested that there be a separate motion directing staff to amend the feasibility report to add the specific area.

Mayor Tourville suggested continuing the hearing until April 9<sup>th</sup> to allow enough time for the feasibility study to be amended.

**Motion by Madden, second by Klein, to continue the public hearing to the April 9, 2012 Regular Council Meeting at 7:00 p.m.**

**Ayes: 4**

**Nays: 0          Motion carried.**

**Motion by Klein, second by Madden, to direct staff to update the feasibility study for City Project No. 2012-09D to include 67<sup>th</sup> Ct. E. and Bixby Way, and to identify the subsidization and assessment methodology for the different portions of the project.**

**Ayes: 4**

**Nays: 0          Motion carried.**

The City Council took a 5 minute recess.

## **7. REGULAR AGENDA:**

### **ADMINISTRATION:**

**A. CITY OF INVER GROVE HEIGHTS;** Consider Second Reading of an Ordinance Amending City Code Title 4, Chapter 2, Regarding License Provisions for Pawnbrokers and Precious Metal Dealers and Title 1, Chapter 10 and Title 3, Chapter 2 Eliminating Licenses for Secondhand Goods Dealers

Ms. Teppen stated this is the second reading of the proposed ordinance regarding pawnbrokers' and precious metal dealers' licenses. She explained in response to direction provided by the City Council during the first reading of the ordinance, the City Attorney revised the ordinance to address the number of each type of license that could be issued within the City. She stated pawnbrokers' licenses would be limited to two (2) and precious metal dealers' licenses would be limited to five (5).

Chuck Armstrong, Director of Community Affairs for Pawn America, asked for consideration regarding a change to the hours of operation on Sundays. He explained their stores currently open at 11:00 a.m. on Sundays and close at 6:00 p.m. He noted that it had been a pleasure working with the City and commended staff for their efforts.

Councilmember Klein stated he would support changing the hours of operation on Sundays to begin at 11:00 a.m.

**Motion by Klein, second by Madden, to approve the Second Reading of an Ordinance Amending City Code Title 4, Chapter 2, regarding license provisions for Pawnbrokers and Precious Metal Dealers and Title 1, Chapter 10 and Title 3, Chapter 2 Eliminating Licenses for Secondhand Goods Dealers with the suggested amendment to change the Sunday hours of operation to 11:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.**

**Ayes: 4**

**Nays: 0          Motion carried.**

**B. CITY OF INVER GROVE HEIGHTS;** Approve Agreement with Dascom Systems Group for Purchase and Installation of Stand Alone Digital Signage System

Ms. Teppen explained the next two items on the agenda were related to technology within the building. She noted both items were discussed with the architect and technology consultant during the design phase of the City Hall project and were subsequently neglected when the final design was received. She explained the equipment and fiber for both items was included and installed. She stated the proposed prices were substantially less than what would have been included in the original project bid. She noted the first item was a standalone digital signage system, which was essentially a messaging program that would run on the televisions located throughout the City Hall concourse.

**Motion by Klein, second by Grannis, to approve an agreement with Dascom Systems Group for Purchase and Installation of Stand Alone Digital Signage System**

**Ayes: 4**

**Nays: 0      Motion carried.**

**C. CITY OF INVER GROVE HEIGHTS;** Approve Agreement with Dascom Systems Group for Purchase and Installation of Video Distribution System in the Police Department

Ms. Teppen explained the purchase of the video distribution system was specific to the Police Department and it would provide the opportunity to do a split screen on a number of their video display units.

**Motion by Klein, second by Madden, to approve an Agreement with Dascom Systems Group for Purchase and Installation of Video Distribution System in the Police Department**

**Ayes: 4**

**Nays: 0      Motion carried.**

**PUBLIC WORKS:**

**D. CITY OF INVER GROVE HEIGHTS;** Consider Second Reading of an Ordinance Amending Inver Grove Heights City Code Title 9, Chapter 4 regarding Excavation and Fills

Mr. Kaldunski explained per Council direction the proposed ordinance was sent to local construction contractors for feedback. He stated feedback was received from six (6) contractors including information regarding the concept that a property owner would be allowed to move 100 cubic yards of dirt per acre without a permit. He noted this would make the calculation simple and would provide contractors with a nice “rule of thumb”. He reviewed the exemptions that were incorporated into the proposed ordinance.

**Motion by Klein, second by Grannis, to approve the second reading of an Ordinance amending Inver Grove Heights City Code Title 9, Chapter 4 regarding Excavation and Fills**

**Ayes: 4**

**Nays: 0      Motion carried.**

**E. CITY OF INVER GROVE HEIGHTS;** Consider Resolution Prohibiting Parking on 66<sup>th</sup> Street East from Concord Boulevard to Donnelly Avenue

Mr. Kaldunski explained residents did not have a problem with the no parking on the North side and recommended that the City Council approve the resolution.

Mayor Tourville noted prohibition would not take effect until the project was completed.

**Motion by Madden, second by Klein, to adopt Resolution No. 12-08 Prohibiting Parking on 66<sup>th</sup> Street East from Concord Boulevard to Donnelly Avenue**

**Ayes: 4**

**Nays: 0      Motion carried.**

**8. MAYOR AND COUNCIL COMMENTS:**

Mayor Tourville said there is an EDA meeting on February 6<sup>th</sup> at 6:00 p.m.

**9. ADJOURN:** Motion by Grannis, second by Madden, to adjourn. The meeting was adjourned by a unanimous vote at 9:25 p.m.