



**MINUTES  
CITY COUNCIL MEETING  
October 4, 2016**

**CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 6:30 pm.

**Present:** Mayor: Donny Chillstrom; Council: Kurt Kaminski, Jahn Dyvik, Marty Schneider, and Liz Olson

**Staff Present:** City Administrator: Scott Weske; City Attorney: John Thames; Planning Consultant: Addison Lewis; Fire Chief: James Van Eyll; Wayzata Police Chief: Mike Risvold; and City Clerk: Jeanette Moeller

**Absent:** None

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**LONG LAKE NEWS UPDATE AND WORK SESSION MEETING REVIEW**

Mayor Chillstrom offered the following updates:

- In a work session meeting prior to the regular meeting, the City Council received an update from CSAH 112 project representatives regarding both Phase 1 and Phase 2 improvements; and received a report from Ehlers & Associates regarding the City's investments.
- Mayor Chillstrom thanked all those who participated in making the Community Block Party a success, and noted it was a great event.
- The portion of Highway 12 known locally as the bypass will be closing on October 17 for construction of a median barrier to divide the highway. Traffic will be detoured through Long Lake and the project is expected to take approximately three weeks to complete.

**APPROVE AGENDA**

*A motion was made by Dyvik, seconded by Kaminski, to approve the Agenda as presented. Ayes: all.*

**CONSENT AGENDA**

The Consent Agenda consisted of:

- A. Approve Minutes of September 20, 2016 City Council Meeting
- B. Receive Unofficial Draft Minutes of September 27, 2016 Park Board Meeting
- C. Receive Unofficial Draft Minutes of September 27, 2016 Planning Commission Meeting
- D. Approve Vendor Claims and Payroll
- E. Adopt Resolution No. 2016-44 Accepting to Execute a Grant Agreement Between the City of Long Lake and the Metropolitan Council of Environmental Services for the Improvement of Publicly Owned Infrastructure
- F. Adopt Resolution No. 2016-45 Approving Issuance of Special Event Permit #S2016-10 for Gear Western Country Half Marathon and 5K to be Held October 15, 2016; Approve Noise Variance Permit

- G. Approve Ordinance No. 2016-08 Amending Section 17B: Floodplain Management Overlay District to be Consistent with Requirements of the National Flood Insurance Program Regulations

Council member Dyvik questioned whether Economic Development Authority (EDA) meeting minutes were normally included as a Consent Agenda item for the Council to receive. City Clerk Moeller replied that EDA meeting minutes do appear on the Consent Agenda for the Council's meeting on the third Tuesday of each month.

*A motion was made by Olson, seconded by Dyvik, to approve the Consent Agenda as presented. Ayes: all.*

## **OPEN CORRESPONDENCE**

**Christy Erickson, President of the Long Lake Area Chamber of Commerce** – Ms. Erickson appeared to thank all those who participated in or donated towards the Community Block Party event. She also thanked Mayor Chillstrom for his time served in the dunk tank; and thanked Council member Schneider for his role in organizing the car show.

## **BUSINESS ITEMS**

### **Appointment of New Firefighter to the Long Lake Fire Department**

Fire Chief Van Eyll also expressed appreciation to all those who played a role in the Community Block Party, highlighting the efforts of the Orono Lions Club for their beverage services; the firefighters; and the girls Orono Soccer group who helped with cleanup.

Moving forward, Van Eyll indicated that with an application process and interview completed, staff is recommending that a conditional job offer for the position of paid on call firefighter be made to applicant Bryan Frank. The conditions of the offer are that each new firefighter passes a physical exam, physiological exam, agility test and probationary period. The interview panel consisted of Fire Lieutenants, District Captain and Assistant Chief. Mr. Frank will be a responder to Station 1.

*A motion was made by Schneider, seconded by Kaminski, to adopt Resolution No. 2016-43 conditionally appointing the following candidate to the position of paid on-call Firefighter for the City of Long Lake Fire Department: Bryan Frank. Ayes: all.*

### **Hearing to Review and Consider Action Regarding Liquor Licenses Issued to El Parian II Mexican Restaurant, Inc. (Aldo Escoto) dba El Parian Mexican Restaurant**

City Attorney Thames introduced this agenda item and indicated that El Parian II Mexican Restaurant, Inc. dba El Parian Mexican Restaurant received approval in December 2015 to continue holding both On Sale Intoxicating and On Sale Intoxicating – Sunday Sales liquor licenses. Mr. Aldo Escoto is the sole corporate owner of record for El Parian II Mexican Restaurant, Inc. Police Chief Risvold had learned that Mr. Escoto was federally indicted and charged with 46 counts. The indictment asserts that he used all three of his restaurants to launder money and employ illegal aliens. Mr. Escoto currently a fugitive at this time. Thames sent a letter to Mr. Escoto's business and home addresses notifying him that the Council would be reviewing the status of the liquor licenses. Tonight, the Council may choose to open a hearing to be held pursuant to the Administrative Procedures Act, and can table the hearing if the Council so chooses. The legal standard in taking action would be to find that it is more likely than not that Mr. Escoto committed violations. Options for Council action upon holding the hearing include issuing a fine, suspension of the licenses for a period up to 60 days, revocation of licenses, or taking no action. Thames noted that an application is pending for new liquor licenses for the restaurant. Two applications were filed,

however the second application was withdrawn and Police Chief Risvold is continuing to investigate the remaining applicant. The withdrawal of the second application though now requires that amended documents with updated purchase information be filed for the remaining applicant, as the documentation submitted with the original applications indicated two corporate owners sharing ownership of the corporation applying for licensure. While the investigation is in the works, it will likely still yet take some time as ownership information is updated and submitted. It is yet unknown whether the remaining applicant would be a sole corporate owner or whether an additional partner may be added, also requiring investigation. Thames distributed a memo to Council members from Police Chief Risvold dated September 28, 2016 providing an update as to the status of the background investigation, and circulated copies of the Secretary of State corporate filing. He stated that at this time, it would be the Council's decision whether to proceed with or table the hearing.

Mayor, Council and Attorney Thames extensively discussed the status of the current license application in progress; whether it was known what action the other two impacted cities were considering, if any; whether the City has any potential liability in allowing the restaurant to continue to serve alcoholic beverages under the current licensure; concerns about the survival of the business; and whether to table or proceed with the hearing.

Police Chief Risvold spoke to the status of the current application for licensure and indicated that on the previous Thursday, staff had received a letter of withdrawal from one of the applicants from the corporation applying for new liquor licenses. As part of the liquor license application package, documentation is required to show ownership. For investigation purposes, with the withdrawal of one corporate owner, the application under investigation is now incomplete. Staff now needs new answers to the financial and ownership questions – information which tells staff who is responsible for the license. At this time under the current licensure, if something were to happen at that restaurant, there is nobody who can be held responsible for any action with Mr. Escoto's absence. As Police Chief that is of concern, but it is ultimately the Council's choice. The two initial applicants for new licensure had not lived in the state for an extended period of time, warranting that a national check be conducted with application to the BCA. The necessity to submit to the BCA does mean that the Police investigation is held up while waiting for the state to respond with their information. Police Chief Risvold anticipates having and deciphering those results shortly, and then with submittal of updated documentation, could have the investigation completed within weeks. He noted though that those remain weeks a business would be serving alcohol with no responsible party involved. Police Chiefs and cities are responsible for liquor licenses and investigations. If a license holder (Aldo Escoto) won't respond to a 30 day notice, that gives him cause for concern. The City has legal counsel to represent them, but Police Chief Risvold would like to be on record stating that as one of the signatures on the liquor license, he is uncomfortable with the current situation.

Council members discussed whether they desired to open or table the hearing, and the procedures for both scenarios. City Attorney Thames noted that while the issue at hand is licensure held by Aldo Escoto, the new applicant was in attendance at the meeting.

Felipe Villapando, Jr., son of remaining applicant Felipe Villapando, stated that he understands the Council's need for a hearing is the consequence of having no one available to be at fault for violations at this time, and that they understand this is a delicate situation. He said that he does not think the restaurant could function within liquor sales, as a large portion of the restaurant sales are margaritas and beer sales. The restaurant is a family operation and they are hoping for a little more time. On behalf of his father, he expressed his thanks to the Council for their consideration.

Felipe Villapando added that he had just learned of his partner's withdrawal today. They are optimistic that they will be able to retain another partner.

Mayor Chillstrom opened the administrative hearing at 7:15 pm.

Attorney Thames restated that Aldo Escoto is the current President and CEO of El Parian II Mexican Restaurant, Inc., and therefore the sole applicant who could represent the entity. The purpose of the hearing is to consider enforcement of various City Code provisions that would pertain to the sale of alcohol. Thames recalled that the Council is aware that Mr. Escoto is the subject of a federal indictment, and distributed copies of the indictment to the Council at the bench. He reviewed the counts highlighting those that may pertain particularly to the Long Lake location, and other counts alleged to apply to the three restaurant locations. The indictment is unclear as to exactly which crime or conspiracy occurred at which location. With that indictment, he called Police Chief Risvold to offer testimony.

City Clerk Moeller administered an oath to Michael Risvold, Chief of Police, in preparation for his testimony.

Police Chief Risvold was asked to identify memos he had prepared, copies of which were distributed to the City Council at the bench upon his identification. Attorney Thames asked Police Chief Risvold if he could expand on his knowledge of the indictment under oath.

Police Chief Risvold indicated that he had learned the Department of Homeland Security had investigated Mr. Escoto for several years. He was indicted in August on 46 felony counts, issued a court date, failed to appear, and is currently a fugitive from justice. The 46 count indictment references three restaurants, and it is not entirely clear which activity took place at which location. In speaking with Heidi Whereatt of the Department of Homeland Security, she referenced a few activities specific to the Long Lake location. The first one was harboring of illegal aliens at a residence owned by him in Long Lake. Wayzata Police had assisted in the search warrant, five illegal aliens were taken from the residence into federal custody, and those individuals were learned to be employees of El Parian and required as part of their employment to live there. Within about a month of that, Aldo Escoto and the restaurant were put on notice that illegal alien activity needed to cease. About a month later, another individual was encountered and identified to be an illegal alien. When discussing the narcotics and drug trafficking counts, Ms. Whereatt's words to Risvold were that they did not have specific information that drugs were coming into the Long Lake restaurant, but through their surveillance and activities, they could ascertain that the Long Lake location was used for the purpose of discussing and planning drug trafficking. They had received information that Mr. Escoto was using drug trafficking money to open restaurants, and the information was received by Homeland Security around the time that he opened the Long Lake location.

In response to questioning by Attorney Thames, Risvold further confirmed Mr. Escoto is a fugitive from justice at this time. He had been advised that Mr. Escoto had asked for an extension on his initial court appearance, and left in the timeframe before the court appearance.

City Attorney Thames also distributed copies of applicable sections of City Code and administrative rule proceeding information to Council members at the bench. He advised that the Council is within their rights to accept the evidence provided as true and undisputed.

Police Chief Risvold also confirmed that the restaurant had committed one violation of an underage sale in 2015.

Council members discussed their options for action at length, including a possible fine, and collectively indicated they were struggling to balance doing what is right for the City with what is right for a business trying to continue to do business.

Moeller noted that renewal paperwork will be sent out in short order to licensees for 2017 licensure applications.

Upon further discussion, Council members reached a consensus to continue the hearing for 30 days in hopes that the current application under consideration can be completed and a recommendation for license issuance made before the Council.

*A motion was made by Chillstrom, seconded by Dyvik, to continue the administrative hearing to the City Council's first meeting in November, to be held November 1, 2016. Ayes: all.*

**Public Hearing and Consideration of Adopting an Ordinance Amending Chapter 10, Businesses, Adding Article VI. Massage Services to City Code of Ordinances**

Moeller reported that for a number of years, staff and Council have periodically noted that while the majority of area cities have regulations and licensing in place for massage businesses and massage therapists, Long Lake had not yet implemented a massage services ordinance. This year, the City Council directed staff to pursue development of a massage services ordinance for the Council's consideration.

The City Attorney reviewed massage services ordinances successfully implemented by a number of cities, including the ordinance used by the City of Wayzata, and with input from city staff developed draft massage services ordinance language that was distributed to Council members for feedback at their September 6, 2016 regular meeting. Staff continued to work with the ordinance and prepared a revised draft in city ordinance format that was presented to the City Council at their September 20, 2016 meeting.

The proposed ordinance would license both massage businesses as an enterprise, and require that individual massage practitioners be licensed. State licensed massage therapists and massage therapists working under the direction of a licensed medical practitioner, such as a chiropractor, would be exempt from licensing requirements. The ordinance would establish criteria that must be met by massage businesses and practitioners including hours of operation, residency and age of licensed practitioners, health and sanitation standards, and addresses background investigations of applicants.

Licenses would be voided by any massage therapist changing employment; or if a business license, would be voided by any change in ownership, relocation or substantial alteration of the premises, or name change of the business.

The Wayzata Police Department has been in favor of Long Lake adopting a massage services ordinance for some time, as having an ordinance in place is key for protecting businesses operating legitimate enterprises, protecting the health and welfare of the community, and for prevention of criminal activity. A massage services ordinance also is important to allow inspection and compliance checks, and to address violations by any massage business.

On Wednesday, September 28, staff hand delivered copies of the proposed ordinance, public hearing notice, and the City Clerk's business card to the three businesses staff is aware would be required to apply for licensure.

Following the public hearing, should the Council vote to adopt the proposed ordinance, staff will be bringing forth a resolution to adopt a fee schedule for the new massage licenses for the Council's consideration at the following meeting. Pending Council approval, staff's intended timeframe would be to have application packets delivered to impacted businesses by the end of

October. As is standard practice when implementing new permitting related requirements of this substantive nature, staff would recommend businesses would be given a full 30 days to submit their first application packets for investigation and review.

Council member Dyvik commented that while certification of massage training completed is required of applicants, the draft ordinance does not require proof of certification to be submitted along with an application.

Council member Olson commented that the ordinance and requirement for 500 training hours may be excessively extensive and questioned the necessity of the restrictive nature of the draft ordinance.

Moeller responded that staff can continue to look at other city ordinances and prepare a draft based on a less restrictive model.

Attorney Thames added that if the Council were not comfortable with the 500 hours of training requirement, it could be adjusted for a revised draft or removed if the Council wishes to consider adoption of the draft ordinance with amendments. The intent of the requirement is focused on legitimizing the seriousness of the training for those individuals practicing massage therapy.

Council member Schneider reflected that he thinks the City does need an ordinance, but that further research may be warranted regarding the training and other requirements. The focus should be on having an ordinance in place that protects the City and thereby protects the people. The notion that no specific massage business has been at issue thus far does not speak to the future potential for concern. He provided an example that a person needs a license from the state to simply cut his hair.

Attorney Thames added that the state has left the regulation of massage services to the local cities, as opposed to the salon industry which is licensed by the state. There are a handful of businesses out there that exploit that knowledge and will operate in cities where massage services are not regulated.

Srey Pellett, Hair Envy Salon and Spa, stated that she had been in business in Long Lake for the past 7 years, and has been licensed by the state to provide salon services for over 20 years. Though she provides massage services and has the longstanding knowledge for topical work, she could not meet the certification requirement as listed in the ordinance. She also expressed concern that having to take time to obtain certification would be time away from her business that can't be afforded. She reviewed the financial impact of massage services to her business operations, and indicated that while she understands and agrees that an ordinance is warranted to assure every massage business is legitimate and doing the right thing as required by law, she can't afford to hire a massage therapist with that kind of training nor can she take the time away to obtain training herself. The ordinance as prepared would have a significant negative impact on her business. She indicated that her salon licensure by the state licenses her to provide hair care, skin care, manicures, pedicures, hair extensions, and full salon services; where nail service salons are unlicensed. At the end of the day, she has to worry about herself, her staff, and the health and safety of them and others. She assures procedures are followed to keep everyone safe and healthy.

Moeller noted that being aware of issues the draft ordinance language could create will help guide staff to research provisions that might be a better fit for Long Lake, and that she will further look at hours of training and insurance requirements based on the conversation.

Christy Erickson, President of the Long Lake Area Chamber of Commerce, noted that the concern from the business community is not that people massaging may not know how to massage; but rather that massage services providers pass background checks and are held to meet health and safety standards.

*A motion was made by Schneider, seconded by Kaminski, to table discussion of the draft ordinance to allow for further review and information gathering.*

*Recognizing that the public hearing had not been opened yet, Council member Schneider withdrew his motion.*

Mayor Chillstrom opened the public hearing at 8:20 pm.

Amy Dyvik, 1780 Martha Lane, reflected that while she is appreciative of Hair Envy, she would like the Council to consider adoption of the ordinance proposed. She indicated she has learned some disturbing things about a business in town.

Mayor Chillstrom noted that the public hearing is for the purpose of considering an ordinance, and added that complaints about any business can be brought to the Police Department and to City Hall staff during regular business hours.

Ms. Dyvik asked that she be allowed to speak, and stated that she has concern if the ordinance does not go through, there is a safety issue in town that should be of concern to the Council as well. She has looked into a specific massage business in town that is listed on at least three adult websites. The advertisements contain multiple allusions that speak to the community of people looking for paid sex services. The business of concern is located across the street from a daycare, next to a bar, and near a park. She would like to see the business out of town, and asked that the Council support the ordinance. She indicated it appears the business offers pay for sex services, and she has contacted both the US Attorney's office and the Wayzata Police Department to make report of the business as a citizen within the past few weeks. She noted this is difficult for the Police to expose these operations without an ordinance that requires proper licensure of massage therapy. She offered to share the information she'd gathered from online research into the particular business's advertising practices.

Brian Carpenter, 1776 Martha Lane, appreciated Ms. Dyvik's courage to speak about the business mentioned in a public forum. He commented that it is easy to ask that people report concerns to staff and Police during business hours, but staff and Police are there to enforce the ordinances adopted by the Council. Businesses of this nature are a concern and appear in our current society, and issues like human trafficking are concerns of cities not far away. He encouraged doing some research to get the right thing done for Long Lake.

Mayor Chillstrom closed the public hearing at 8:37 pm.

*A motion was made by Schneider, seconded by Kaminski, to table discussion of the draft ordinance for 30 days to allow for further review and information gathering, with public participation welcomed. Ayes: all.*

### **Planning Case #2016-07 (Michelle Jerde) / Application for Lot Line Adjustment at 1735 and 1743 Watertown Road**

Planning Consultant Lewis reported that the applicant's properties located at 1735 and 1743 Watertown Road are zoned R-3 Single Family Residential District. A single family home exists on the lot at 1735 and the lot at 1743 is utilized as additional yard space. The applicant wishes to move

the interior lot line 15 feet to the northeast to provide additional space on the lot at 1743 with the intention of selling the lot for future development. Lewis reviewed the existing and proposed lot dimensions for both the 1735 and 1743 lots, as well as the dimensional requirements for the R-3 district.

The lot at 1743 is currently a non-conforming lot in that it does not meet the lot width or area requirements for the R-3 district. The lot was created prior to the R-3 district standards, making it a buildable lot. The requested lot line adjustment would bring the lot into conformance for both lot width and area. The lot at 1735 is a conforming lot and would continue to meet the lot requirements after the adjustment.

The property at 1743 appears well suited for development. The property is relatively flat and contains a few mature trees that would likely be removed if a home were constructed. Although the properties are not lakefront properties, they are located within 1,000 feet of the ordinary high water level of Long Lake, and as such are located within the shoreland overlay. Any proposed development that conforms to the zoning ordinance could be approved without further review by the City Council.

There is an existing curb cut and driveway providing access to the home at 1735 Watertown Road. With the lot line adjustment, the existing driveway and curb cut would encroach on to the lot at 1743 Watertown Road. Curb cuts and driveways are required to be located five feet from side property lines. The property owner will be responsible for relocating the driveway unless the proper cross access easements and maintenance agreement for a shared driveway are filed with Hennepin County and the City Clerk. Construction and relocation of new curb cuts will be at the property owner's expense.

The property owner would be charged for hookup fees for water and sewer at the time of the building permit.

The request is consistent with the comprehensive plan as the property is guided for single family residential use. The comprehensive plan states that "The City intends to support the preservation of existing neighborhood 'character' by requiring the type and intensity of new 'infill' development to be consistent with that, which already exists". The proposed lots appear to be consistent in size and density of the other lots in the neighborhood.

At the September 27, 2016 Planning Commission meeting, the Planning Commission voted 4-0 (Commissioner Jerde abstained) to recommend approval of the request.

*A motion was made by Dyvik, seconded by Kaminski, to adopt Resolution No. 2016-42 to approve a lot line adjustment for property located at 1735 and 1743 as shown on the attached survey dated August 9, 2016. Ayes: all.*

**Planning Case #2016-08 (City of Long Lake) / Zoning Amendment to Allow Accessory Structures in Front of the Front Building Line in the R-2 District**

Lewis stated that at the June 21, 2016 City Council meeting, the City Council discussed the zoning ordinance as it relates to accessory structures. Accessory structures are regulated under Section 19, Subdivision 4 of the Long Lake Zoning Ordinance. Provision B. of this Section states that:

*No accessory buildings shall be erected or located in front of the front line of the building or within the front yard of a property. Accessory buildings shall be five (5) feet or more from all lot lines adjoining lots, shall be ten (10) feet or more from any other building or structure on the same lot and shall not be located within a utility easement.*

The City Council acknowledged that for lakefront properties, a 75 foot setback is required from the Ordinary High Water Line of Long Lake, which may make it difficult to locate an accessory structure in the rear yard. The City Council directed the Planning Commission to analyze the effect of the ordinance on lakefront properties and develop a solution that would reasonably allow lakefront property owners to locate an accessory structure on their property, while maintaining the character of the neighborhood.

At the August 11, 2016 Planning Commission meeting, the Planning Commission proposed an amendment to the ordinance that would allow accessory structures to be located in front of the front line of the principal building if the accessory building still meets the required front yard setback for the principal structure.

Based on direction provided by the Planning Commission, staff is proposing an amendment to Section 19, Subd. 4, B of the Long Lake Zoning Ordinance to add an exception that in the R-2 Lakeshore Single Family District, an accessory building may be located in front of the front line of the building if it meets the front yard setback requirement for the principal structure.

The proposed amendment should provide additional area to locate an accessory structure for most property owners within the R-2 district. It is estimated that approximately 70-75 percent of the properties in the R-2 district have a principal structure setback greater than the minimum 35 feet required. This means that the amendment would provide some relief to those property owners by allowing them to locate an accessory structure in front of the front line of the principal structure.

The intent of the front yard setback requirement is to promote consistency in appearance of neighborhoods. The R-2 district is unique in that it is the single family residential zoning district intended for lakefront properties. The presence of the lake may create a desire to locate the principal structure closer to the lakeshore. As a result, there is not a consistent front yard setback among the existing homes in the R-2 district. This is also due to the fact that there is a wide variety in the shape and dimensions of the parcels in the R-2 district. Most of the parcels in other single family zoning districts are more consistent in terms of shape and dimensions, which contributes to a uniform and consistent appearance in these neighborhoods that is not as pronounced in the R-2 district. The proposed amendment would still require accessory structures to be a minimum of 35 feet from the front lot line. As a result, staff believes that the proposed amendment would not significantly alter the character of the area.

At the September 27, 2016 Planning Commission meeting, the Planning Commission voted 5-0 to recommend the City Council approve Ordinance No. 2016-09 as proposed.

Council members discussed the impact of the proposed change on both lakeshore and non-lakeshore lots located within the R-2 zoning district.

Council member Olson commented on examples of other areas in other zoning district where lots could benefit from the same change to allow accessory structures in front of the front line of the building.

Lewis added that as the district requirements provide now, a property owner could apply for a variance to request an accessory structure be allowed in front of the building on a specific lot. The reason the proposed amendment was brought forward was because initial direction from the Council and from the Planning Commission identified the characteristics of R-2 as differing from those of other zoning districts.

Council member Dyvik indicated that in the interest of full disclosure, he has an interest in putting up an accessory structure in front of the front line of his house that would meet the 35 foot setback, and had initially intended to apply for a variance. However, after further consideration, he realized his circumstance with the 75 foot OHWL setback was shared throughout the R-2 district and was not specific to his property. He noted that he would be abstaining from the vote on the ordinance due to his interest in constructing a front yard accessory structure.

Council member Olson felt strongly that if the setbacks of a property can be met, all residential districts should be afforded the same opportunity to place an accessory structure in front of the front line of their homes. Other Council members echoed her support for further ordinance amendment.

Lewis stated that because staff has not yet analyzed the impacts of opening up the change to all residential zoning districts, he would recommend tabling consideration of the ordinance at this time.

*A motion was made by Schneider, seconded by Olson, to table consideration of Planning Case #2016-08 and a zoning amendment to allow accessory structures in front of the front building line in the R-2 District until the next Council meet to allow for further revisions. Ayes: all.*

## **OTHER BUSINESS**

**BDI Grant Meeting Update** – Council member Schneider reported that a third BDI grant meeting had been held the prior Wednesday, and Mayor Chillstrom was also in attendance. He expressed appreciation to representatives from the County who came to explain what land acquisition process would be involved in the road reconstruction project.

**Community Block Party Car Show** – Council member Schneider recognized Dale Lemmerman whose car was one of the award winners at the Community Block Party Car Show. The Community Block Party event was well attended, and the car show awards were voted on by firefighters. Mayor Chillstrom also reiterated his thanks to everybody for their participation in the Community Block Party.

**Leaf Pickup Dates** – Council member Olson asked whether leaf pickup dates had been scheduled yet. Moeller stated that were being scheduled that week in preparation for publishing in the next newsletter and on the website.

**Regulating Drones** – Lewis stated that at the Planning Commission meeting, the Commission raised the issue of regulating drones in the City. At this point it is not something regulated by most cities as of yet. Council members agreed it was not a priority to be addressed at this time.

## **ADJOURN**

*Hearing no objection, Mayor Chillstrom adjourned the meeting by general consent at 9:20 pm.*

Respectfully submitted,

Jeanette Moeller  
City Clerk