

- 3.5 Mini Pumper Truck - Approve Purchase and Fund Transfer** Requested Action: Approve the purchase of a Mini Pumper from Rosenbauer Minnesota, LLC under HGAC contract #FS12-13 for the amount of \$248,644.00 and approve an increase of \$22,184 to the budget appropriation in account 617-0619-499-7042.
- Motion was made by Abrams, seconded by Baloga, and all voting aye, to approve the purchase and the budget appropriation.
- 3.6 Carpet for Public Works Building - Approve Purchase** Requested Action: Approve the purchase and installation of carpet in the Public Works building in the amount of \$129,213.65 from Hiller's Commercial Floors under State of Minnesota Contract #14495 and #14453.
- Motion was made by Abrams, seconded by Baloga, and all voting aye, to approve the purchase as described above.
- 3.7 People's Electric - Approve Contract Amendment** Requested Action: Approve an amendment to the contract with People's Electric to increase the not-to-exceed amount of \$270,000.
- This item was held by Oleson who questioned why the City is contracting for twice as much work as was planned.
- Mark Bernhardson, City Manager explained this is an unusual circumstance. It was explained the extra work involves a new fire protection electrical code for the City's park maintenance buildings.
- Motion was made by Oleson, seconded by Abrams, and all voting aye, to approve the amendment to the People's Electric contract as presented.
- 3.8 Brett Anderson; 8433 Rich Avenue; Variance to Reduce Side Yard Setback** Requested Actions: In Case 10935A-14, staff and the Hearing Examiner recommend adoption of a resolution approving a variance to reduce the required side yard setback from 10 feet to 6 feet for living area expansion above an existing attached garage at 8433 Rich Avenue South, subject to the two conditions listed in the staff report.
- Motion was made by Abrams, seconded by Baloga, and all voting aye, to adopt a resolution approving a variance at 8433 Rich Avenue South subject to the two conditions in the staff report. (R-2014-68)
- 3.9 Terratron, Inc. Subordination Agreement** Requested Action: Adopt a resolution allowing the Mayor and City Manager to execute the Subordination Agreement between the City and Wells Fargo for the Alpha A parcel.
- Motion was made by Abrams, seconded by Baloga, and all voting aye, to adopt the resolution executing the Subordination Agreement. (R-2014-69)
- 3.10 Public Health Emergency Preparedness Agreement (PHEP) with MDH Amendment** Requested Action: Approve amendment to the Public Health Emergency Preparedness (PHEP) Agreement with the Minnesota Department of Health.
- Motion was made by Abrams, seconded by Baloga, and all voting aye, to approve the amendment as presented.

3.11 Award of Contract for the Bloomington Central Station Phase 2A Infrastructure Improvement Project (2013-304)

Requested Action: Award a contract to Midwest Civil Constructors, LLC in the amount of \$2,029,815.00 for the Bloomington Central Station Phase 2A (Hotel) Infrastructure Improvement Project 2013-304 and approve funding for various contract changes up to a 12% contingency of the original contract amount (\$243,577.80) for a total project construction authorization of \$2,273,392.80.

This item was held by Oleson who questioned why public money is paying for part of this assessment when the hotel was willing to pay over \$2 million. He asked if there will be an assessment to the hotel.

Shelly Pederson, City Engineer explained the titles for Items 3.2 and 3.11 were transposed when the agenda was set. Item 3.2 pertains to the easements and Item 3.11 pertains to the bid award. Regarding the bid award, she said the City received two grants ahead of time. She said McGough owns the land and they've agreed to pay the assessment but it's up to them to determine if the hotel is going to pay a portion of that assessment.

Winstead commented the grant dollars were specifically allocated to these infrastructure projects.

Pederson said the grants are only for road construction and sewer and water.

Oleson questioned why tax money would go towards the project if there is a private party willing to pay an assessment.

Bernhardson explained the City is doing this project (streets around the hotel) through the Port Authority and that it's located in a Tax Increment Financing (TIF) District. He said the construction amount listed in Item 3.11 is the total amount and then there is the amount they are being specially assessed. They will have to pay the special assessment. He said the TIF increment that is generated from this project goes to help pay off the assessments on this project and other Bloomington Central Station projects. He said this development would not have happened had it not been for the public subsidy (grants).

Motion was made by Oleson, seconded by Baloga, and all voting aye, to adopt a resolution accepting the bid from Midwest Civil Constructors, LLC in the amount of \$2,029,815.00 for City Project 2013-304 (BCS Phase 2A [Hotel] Infrastructure Improvement Project) and approved a 12% contingency amount of up to \$243,577.80 to cover various contract changes for a total project construction authorization of \$2,273,392.80. (R-2014-65)

3.12 Mall of America Amended Easement Agreements Approve

Requested Action: Approve the amended easement agreements with the Mall of America to extend the termination date of the temporary easement from June 15, 2015 to November 30, 2015.

Motion was made by Abrams, seconded by Baloga, and all voting aye, to approve the amended easement agreements.

3.13 Ice Garden 2014-15 Rental Agreements

Requested Action: Approve the ice rental agreements as listed in the agenda item.

Motion was made by Abrams, seconded by Baloga, and all voting aye, to approve the ice rental agreements as listed in the materials.

3.14 Meeting Minutes

Requested Action: Approve the following 2014 City Council study meeting minutes as presented: January 6, January 27 and February 3.

Baloga noted the Council member roll call is incorrectly listed on the February 3, 2014, study meeting minutes.

Oleson asked about the delay in bringing the Council study meeting minutes to the Council for approval.

The Mayor explained the minutes for study meetings are more detailed and take longer to prepare and the secretary tends to focus on the regular meetings; where items are acted upon.

Motion was made by Baloga, seconded by Lowman, and all voting aye, to approve the minutes for the January 6 and 27, 2014 study meetings as presented and the February 3, 2014 Study meeting as amended.

3.15 Request for Proposals (RFP) for City Manager Search

Requested Action: Award a contract to Springsted, Inc. in the amount of \$22,000 to act as the City's consultant in its search for a new city manager.

Motion was made by Abrams, seconded by Baloga, and all voting aye, to award a contract to Springsted, Inc. in the amount of \$22,000.

4 PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

The Mayor declared the public comment period open for those wishing to address the Council on matters other than items included on the agenda.

Speaker #1: Sally Ness, 8127 Oakland Avenue South Referencing the Dar Al Farooq Youth & Family Center (AFYFC) at 8201 Park Avenue South, she said the City obtained a map and a plan of the uses in that building, which was proposed as a school. She said the more the building uses increase, the greater the potential for crime in the area. She said AFYFC has to abide by the conditions of its Conditional Use Permit, which limits the occupancy to 500. She said AFYFC is asking for permission to use the Smith Park parking lot into the night due to the overuse of the building. She said she recorded the loud noises coming from the AFYFC parking lots at 11 pm last night. She said the Islamic University is not a Code complying use of that building. She said the traffic is excessive. She said they can't have more than 500 people in the gymnasium so questioned what 49 spaces would do for them. She said allowing AFYFC users to park in the Smith Park parking lot is creating a special set of rules for them.

Winstead stated AFYFC was sent correspondence indicating there was a problem with over parking at their site.

Bernhardson said he observed the parking situation at AFYFC on Friday, July 18th and the only car he observed parked in the street was someone going to the public garden. He said there may be times when people park in the street, but as long as AFYFC's lot is not full, it's a choice people can make to park in the street, as it's not illegal. He said AFYFC has tried to get their attendees to park in their lot. He said to the extent there are violations, they are violations of the individuals and staff is looking into that. He said the 500 limit in the gymnasium is related to the parking. He mentioned Council will be discussing the Joint Use Agreement on July 28, at which time, they could choose the proposed single Joint Use Agreement or continue with the current Joint Use Agreement.

Bernhardson said if the Council makes a choice that AFYFC is not able to use the Smith Park parking lot in the evenings after 10 pm, it will result in those cars parking in the street where it's legal. He said City staff continues to look at possible Fire Code violations but if AFYFC were to consistently exceed their parking lot capability, it would trigger the need to construct additional parking.

Speaker #2: Vi Rozek, 8214 Park Avenue South
She also commented on the activities occurring at AFYFC. She said they have two packed Friday services every week to the point where she has seen three police officers directing traffic. She said those officers also agreed it was a lot of traffic. She said she requested a traffic analysis from the City but finally received one from a neighbor who observed daily traffic volumes between September 12 – October 15, 2013, when there were no major events at 8201 Park Avenue. She also provided the numbers that were taken during quiet times. She said it was stated traffic was going to increase from 1,145 to 1,447 cars for the Martin Luther Manor expansion and yet the traffic numbers around AFYFC are a lot greater. She questioned why this is allowed to continue in their neighborhood.

Mayor Winstead asked if there was anyone else who wished to address the Council or the public comment period would be closed. No one else came forward to speak so the public comment period was closed.

**5 LICENSING DIVISION:
PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**5.1 Applebee's; 9601
Lyndale Ave. S; On-
Sale Liquor License
Amendment**

Requested Action: Approve the Temporary On-Sale Liquor license amendment for Applebee's for their hosting of a classic car show on Saturday, July 26 from 11 pm – 10 pm.

Doug Junker, Licensing Examiner clarified the car show time is from 11 am to 10 pm.

Motion was made by Baloga, seconded by Busse, and all voting aye, to approve the Temporary On-Sale Liquor license for Applebee's.

**6 DEVELOPMENT
BUSINESS: PUBLIC
HEARINGS**

**6.1 Marilyn Jimenez
Acevedo; 10532 Xerxes
Avenue; Variance to
Increase Fence Height
and Opacity**

Requested Action: In Case 10931AB-14, adopt a resolution approving variances to increase the fence height from four feet to six feet and increase the fence opacity from 50 percent to 100 percent at 10532 Xerxes Avenue South, subject to the conditions listed in the staff report.

Glen Markegard, Planning Manager presented the staff report on this variance request to increase fence height and opacity, which results in a 6-foot, full privacy fence across a portion of the front yard of a home located on a very busy section of Xerxes between Old Shakopee Road and 106th Street. He showed an aerial of the property stating the house is surrounded by single-family housing and multi-family housing to the west. He stated the two practical difficulties this application has in complying with City Code include the special needs of the applicant's two autistic children and the small size of the rear yard in combination with the traffic volumes on this segment of Xerxes Avenue. He said it's recommended for approval by both staff and the Planning Commission.

Winstead indicated his support of this application.

Baloga said he didn't think Council could approve Condition #3 subject to a sale because the variance traveled with the property.

Markegard said the same condition exists at a residence at 81st & Russell and asked if Legal had any concerns in attaching such a condition.

Sandra Johnson, City Attorney said if the next owner's children were to have the same special needs as that of this applicant, the fence could remain in place. If not, Council has the authority to require the next owner of the property to make the fence Code compliant.

Oleson said the Planning Commission had an issue regarding whether or not the new owner or a perspective buyer would need to be told that the fence will have to go away.

Markegard replied the conditions will be on file and in the record so a realtor should inform a perspective buyer of this situation.

Motion was made by Baloga, seconded by Lowman, and all voting aye, to adopt a resolution approving a variance to increase the fence height from four feet to six feet and increase the fence opacity from 50 percent to 100 percent at 10532 Xerxes Avenue South, subject to the conditions listed in the staff report. (R-2014-70)

7 TRANSPORTATION & UTILITY IMPROVEMENTS: PUBLIC HEARINGS

No items.

8 ORDINANCES: PUBLIC HEARINGS

8.1 Environmental Health Plan Review Ordinance and Fee Amendments

Requested Action: Approve the proposed amendments to Chapters 14 and 15 of the City Code for updating and clarifying standards and Environmental Health fees for plan review of several different types of licensed businesses including body art, food, lodging, therapeutic massage, public swimming pools and tanning establishments, with new fee categories for Hazard Analysis for Critical Control Points (HACCP) plan review, annual HACCP audits and public pool seasonal opening reinspections.

Lynn Moore, Environmental Health Manager provided the staff report on the Plan Review ordinance and fee amendments, which include updates to the fees for plan review for several services, creates new categories, and addresses reinspections for the re-opening of seasonal pools. Staff wants to set a fee for the actual swimming pool opening. She described all of the items Environmental Health inspects. She reviewed the current and proposed fees in this Code amendment. She provided a chart in paper form comparing the fees of various cities. She said Bloomington spends a lot of time explaining the State, Federal, and City food codes. She said the proposed Plan Review Fees are available on the City's website and reported staff has received no calls from the public on this issue. Staff's recommendation is to approve the proposed amendments.

Winstead commented the proposed fees put Bloomington in the high range on everything. He indicated his desire to ensure the fees are justified. He wants to ensure this is something of value to public safety.

Moore replied Bloomington is closely involved with the hospitality industry so the City conducts inspections at a higher frequency. She said the City does a lot of work to prepare and educate its food and lodging establishments so they're meeting the codes and standards when they open their doors.

Busse commented a hotel opening with a coffee shop, restaurant, and a swimming pool would get hit with a lot of fees.

Moore explained the State Pool Engineer conducts the review on the initial pool opening. She said Bloomington looks at the items the State inspector doesn't. She said there is the lodging license for the hotel, a separate license for the restaurant, and another one for the bar.

Busse inquired as to what the yearly revenue would be if all of these new plan review fees were implemented.

Moore said it could be between \$55,000 - \$60,000 in plan review fees collected.

Oleson commented Bloomington is known for having higher standards so it needs to ensure that inspectors are passing along the education to those requesting the inspection.

Carlson referenced the table on page 107. He said they're all one-time plan review fees and asked staff if the City has the appropriate number of employees to provide the plan reviews.

Moore said one staff member works exclusively with businesses.

Baloga asked if the plan review for lodging establishments is for the rooms.

Moore explained with a hotel plan or an assisted living facility, staff is walking the plan through the State and City Code requirements. They look at rooms, common areas, laundry areas, garbage area, and the vending areas. She said it's not tied into the food codes.

Baloga asked how this interacts with the building codes and building inspections. He said it sounds like it could be a duplication of inspections.

Moore replied Bloomington is charged with performing an annual inspection of all of its hotels and lodging establishments. She said staff looks at approximately 10% of the individual rooms annually, but with a Plan Review on the initial opening of a hotel, staff inspects all of the rooms using the State's Lodging Code; not the State Building Code.

Bernhardson said staff meets together to ensure that all of the codes (Building, Fire, and Health) have been met.

Lowman questioned how the lodging taxes figure in.

Bernhardson replied the lodging taxes are paid by existing operations based on the revenue generated. The annual inspection fees are separate from that and include inspections for 10% of the rooms for the hotel. He said the Plan Reviews are related to the set up. She said a successful inspection of a restaurant and a hotel on the front end will help that establishment thrive long-term.

Lowman said it's hard to compare Bloomington's fee to those of other cities, as the quality of what the City provides is much greater.

Moore talked about Hennepin County. She said Bloomington provides the staff resources for Richfield's plan review. She said Minneapolis' fees are not listed because they're very complicated.

Abrams questioned which cities receive inspection services from Hennepin County.

Moore replied Hennepin County provides plan review services for all of the cities and the Airport except for Minneapolis and Wayzata.

Busse questioned what differs from Bloomington's inspections compared to those in other cities.

Moore explained St. Paul does a paper review in the office and sends a letter. She doesn't believe the plan review inspector in St. Paul inspects hotel construction all the way through. She said the State has jurisdiction over all of the areas in which the local county doesn't have authority.

Baloga questioned whether there is a safety difference between the inspections that are done in Bloomington compared to Minnetonka.

Moore said Bloomington inspectors spend a lot of time in Bloomington hotels. It's an intensive inspection and our inspectors spend a lot of time with the hotels.

Baloga questioned if Bloomington is spending too much time on inspections compared to the other communities.

Larry Lee, Community Development Director commented other cities might be absorbing their fees but Bloomington's Council wanted the City to do more in the way of cost recovery. He said in Minnetonka, the taxpayers are subsidizing the provision of the inspection services.

Abrams said it speaks to Bloomington's standard of quality that is enjoyed in its restaurants. It's not just a benefit for the establishment but it's a service delivered to every resident and visitor of the establishment. Everyone benefits from it.

Speaker #1: Maureen Scallen-Failor, Bloomington Chamber of Commerce She said the Chamber represents over 300 businesses in Bloomington. She said she didn't come to oppose the ordinance but wanted the Council to consider the fact that she didn't see the notice of this meeting until late this afternoon and hasn't had time to digest all of the information. She said the Council needs to consider how new fees will impact businesses coming into Bloomington as well as those that have invested in their business. While she understands there is a cost for the services the City employees are performing, the Council needs to be methodical in the structuring of its fees. She said these are new fees that will be imposed on new businesses. She said the cost of doing business in a city is a consideration businesses make when deciding where to locate. She commented these fees are substantial and asked if they're really necessary. She suggested perhaps City staff needs to talk to the hospitality industry. She requested staff review the proposed fees to ensure they are justifiable; and if they're not, to determine a more reasonable fee. She said the proposed fees seem very high. She suggested the City bring some business sectors together to talk about the fees.

Lowman questioned if staff reached out to the Chamber.

Scallen-Failor replied no they didn't.

Winstead asked if there was an administrative hearing on this ordinance.

Lee explained these plan review fees are for new businesses. They are not annual fees for existing businesses that are members of the Chamber.

Winstead commented a lot of it is plan check for establishing a new fee.

Bernhardson reiterated the plan review fees are generally for new businesses coming into Bloomington. He said the City wouldn't have the success it has had in the hospitality industry long-term if it backed off what it's been doing. He said it's a question of do they pay for the work that is being done through fees or does the City collect the amount proposed here that reflects the amount of staff time they spend with the business. It's the Council's choice on policy -- on the property tax rolls or on the businesses when they come in.

Scallen-Failor said she recognizes these are fees for new businesses. She asked if these fees would apply to establishments that are remodeling.

The answer was yes. The fee for a restaurant making a minor upgrade would be \$200.

Scallen-Failor asked the Council to look at the hotels that make major renovations. She asked that the fees be reasonable for the businesses that are currently operating in Bloomington but desire to make upgrades to their business. She said the desire is to entice residents and businesses into Bloomington so the Council needs to be mindful of that when imposing a new fee structure on the community.

Busse commented the Council has looked at phasing fees in over time to lessen the sticker shock.

Lee said the recovery of 80% - 100% of the costs to provide the service is incorporated in these fees. He said if the Council chooses to have some stepped implementation, it could give staff some direction tonight on a step to recover some percentage of the cost less than 80-100%. He said staff could bring back a new fee schedule that defines whatever threshold the Council defines.

Busse said he would be more comfortable phasing these fees in over a period of years.

Baloga said if Richfield is removed from the equation, the delta between Bloomington and every other city is very great. He said the City is creating a barrier for new businesses. He said if businesses are proposed to pay for these fees, the Council should look at the levy. He asked if consideration is being given to reducing the levy by the amount of the new fees, which will not be picked up by the businesses.

Bernhardson said the Council can set the fees wherever they want. This money would be added into the General Fund as outside fees and would reduce the levy by \$50,000. He said if the Council wants to phase the fees in over a few years, the higher the levy will be.

Winstead said other cities probably don't review to the same standards as Bloomington and are receiving some tax subsidy for their inspections. He said a lot of this relates to the hotels. They pay a considerable amount of tax into the City's General Fund. He said the hotels are a big taxpayer so maybe there could be a subsidy by the taxpayers. He suggested reducing the lodging plan review fees but letting the rest stand on their own.

Lowman asked if an argument could be made that if the fees were reduced or eliminated, the addition of more businesses would assist the City's tax base.

Bernhardson said he doesn't know if these fees would make much of a difference in a large scale development.

Abrams said Council is requesting staff revisit the observations that have been made by the Council tonight, particularly regarding the categories where there are currently no fees. To create a fee but to a lesser degree than what was presented tonight. She said Council needs to be mindful of its client base of aspiring entrepreneurs as well as the large businesses. She said it would be helpful to continue the hearing to receive testimony from those that could speak to the value of Bloomington's inspectors and the difference that makes for a city. As there is no real consensus on the philosophy of fee support, the timing of a phased fee schedule, or the amount of the fees, more information would be helpful for Council as well as more time to process it.

Oleson said if this is delayed, staff should have some dialogue with the business community. He supported phasing in the new fees.

Lowman concurred it would be good to phase in some of these fees.

Bernhardson said staff put in a lot of time trying to justify the liquor license fees in the past. He said these fees relate to new hotels that are not yet located in Bloomington. He said this item could be postponed for two months. Staff will bring back a modified fee schedule for the hotel area using a phased-in approach. Staff will talk with the Chamber and the Hospitality Industry. He said it will be a trade-off with the levy. He advised the Council not change the level of service the City provides this community.

Winstead said the Council gave direction to staff to off-set the cost of inspections and plan review with fees; without putting it on the taxpayer. He asked that the fees be reviewed in the context of the budgeting exercise. He said the subject of license and permit fees has been ongoing discussion over the years to try and align fees with services; a mandate to staff that has been out there for a long time.

Bernhardson said this ordinance will be postponed to the September 22, 2014, Regular Council meeting.

Carlson commented there is a legitimate reason to charge for the fees discussed but Council now desires to look at phasing them in over time to fully recoup staff's time invested in providing this service.

Winstead said this will be considered in the context of the budget.

Motion was made by Lowman, seconded by Oleson, and all voting aye, to continue to the September 22, 2014, regular Council meeting, the proposed amendments to Chapters 14 and 15 of the City Code and the Environmental Health fees for further consideration in the context of the budget.

8.2 City Charter Relating to the Candidate Filing Fee Ordinance Amending

Requested Action: Adopt an ordinance amending Chapter 4 of the City Charter.

Janet Lewis, City Clerk provided the staff report explaining the Charter Commission, at its annual meeting on May 1, 2014, made a recommendation to the City Council changing the candidate filing fee from \$2 to \$50. She said Charter amendments take longer to become effective. In this case, the Council needs to unanimously adopt the proposed ordinance in order to enact the change. She said if adopted, it would be published and then it would take effect after 90 days after publication. She explained citizens can petition that the ordinance be changed or the Council can send it back to the Charter Commission for more discussion. She added a candidate for any election can, by State statute, file for office by submitting a petition containing a required number of signatures in lieu of paying a filing fee.

Winstead stated the fee increase being proposed is for Mayor and Council member municipal elections. He said primary elections are very expensive, and on occasion, they've been a waste of time and money. In other instances, there have been serious candidates running. He said he can support the proposed ordinance.

Carlson stated his support for the amendment.

Lowman asked if a \$50 fee is comparable to other cities.

Lewis replied because Bloomington is a charter city, it can charge whatever it deems is necessary. She said statutory cities have to charge what the State charges. She said a \$50 filing fee is very comparable to other cities and restated the statutory filing fee is \$2.

Johnson reported she attended the Charter Commission meeting. She said former Council member Steve Peterson asked how primary elections can be avoided while ensuring the candidates that file for office are serious about doing the job on the Council and suggested an increase in the filing fee. She said filing fee amounts from \$200 to \$50 were discussed and although the commissioners were interested in some cost recovery for conducting primary elections, they didn't want to disenfranchise anyone from filing due to the fee. She explained primary elections are very costly for the City and in many cases the voters aren't familiar with all of the candidates. She said the Commission wanted people to think about whether or not they really want to file for office, as people will file but then don't do anything to run a campaign. She said the commissioners also discussed the petition method in lieu of paying a filing fee and determined that would be doable method for serious candidates. She said it came down to where the line should be drawn for the serious candidates. It was determined to be a \$50 filing fee.

Oleson said a \$50 fee is not an unreasonable filing fee.

Motion was made by Oleson, seconded by Lowman, to adopt an ordinance increasing the candidate filing fee to \$50.00, thereby amending Chapter 4 of the City Code. No vote was taken at this time.

Abrams said special municipal elections are prompted by the number of candidates who file for an office and it causes the need for a primary election and when the City and/or the School District calls for a special election. She asked who bears the cost when the School District calls a special election.

Lewis replied the School District pays for it.

Abrams talked about her experience on the School Board and said the Board’s decision to hold a special election was not a decision that was taken lightly. She said a \$50 filing fee might cause someone to think twice about filing.

Lowman said a \$50 fee might be too low and inquired as to why a \$200 fee was not supported by the Commission.

Johnson said the Charter Commission looked at the filing fees for current State offices and wanted Bloomington’s fee to be much less than that. They didn’t want to deter viable candidates from filing. She said some cities are still at the \$2, some are at \$40, and others are more. She said the Commission discussed a \$200 fee but felt that was too high. She said the fee can be raised again if it’s deemed appropriate. It went from \$200 to \$100 to \$50.

Winstead said if the Council wants a different amount, the amendment would have to go back to the Charter Commission, as they must initiate the ordinance.

Busse said a \$50 filing fee makes sense. He said that doesn’t need to be spent, as a required number of signatures can be obtained in lieu of paying the fee. He said that could be as few as 100 signatures. He said given the cost of primary elections, it makes perfect sense to follow through on the Charter Commission’s recommendation.

Baloga asked for an update on where the City sits with regard to rank choice voting. He would prefer to have a general election using rank choice voting rather than having a primary election.

Lewis said the City’s voting equipment could handle simple rank choice voting. She would like to see some State statutes governing rank choice voting but there aren’t any yet.

Mayor called for a vote on the motion. It passed 7-0. The ordinance amendment will go into effect after 90 days after publication. (O-2014-10)

9 OTHER: PUBLIC HEARINGS

No items.

10 ORGANIZATIONAL BUSINESS

10.1 City Council Policy & Issue Update

- The City Manager reminded the Council of the Joint/Council meeting tomorrow night at 5:30 pm in the Haeg Conference Room; a Study meeting on July 28 at 6 pm. He said there will be no Study meetings ahead of the August 4 and 18 Regular meetings, but there will be a Study meeting on August 11 at 6 pm.
- Oleson thanked City staff for putting on a wonderful Summer Fete event. He also thanked the City Manager for the communication that went out to the Al Farooq Youth & Family Center (AFYFC). He said he met with some of the Smith Park neighborhood and he’s committed to getting all points of view. He hopes a date can be set at the study meeting to get moving on something concrete.

Baloga asked if this document has been reviewed by AFYFC.

Johnson said all of the changes in the proposed Agreement have been provided to the AFYFC director and he's been willing to sign the Agreement but staff desired more direction from the Council.

11 ADJOURN

Mayor Winstead adjourned the meeting at 9:16 p.m.

Barbara Clawson
Council Secretary