ROLL CALL:  Mueller, Gunn, Hull, Meehlhause, Bergeron

PUBLIC COMMENT

Citizens may speak to issues not on tonight’s agenda. Before speaking, please give your full name and address for the minutes. Also, please limit your comments to three minutes.

AGENDA ITEMS DISCUSSED BY CONSENSUS

1. State Representative Elect Kelly Moeller – Legislative Priorities
2. Sketch Plan, Long Lake Woods Second Addition - Sevald
3. Sketch Plan, Crossroad Pointe - Sevald
4. Discuss 2019 Street Project - Woodale Drive, Parking, Sidewalk on South Side - Peterson
5. HR Update - Zikmund

NEXT COUNCIL WORK SESSION:  Monday, March 4, 2019 at 6:30 pm
NEXT COUNCIL MEETING:  Monday, February 11, 2019 at 6:30 pm
1. Where are you (the developer) in the negotiation process with the needed homeowners-sellers?

2. When are you getting the survey and permit from Rice Creek Watershed District?

3. If you have not done so, how could you make an educated plat? We see that survey data has not been used to complete this first draft.

4. Why did you choose the area that you did for the storm water retention pond?

5. In accordance with Minnesota State Law as of November 2018, IF ANY wetland of ANY size is found within the development site, you MUST recreate an ecological feature of the same size and the same function somewhere else in the community. Have you made any plans to address this potential issue. And if so, what are they?

6. Are you aware that a storm water retention pond by state and federal law is NOT considered a wetland or functioning ecological feature of similar value?

7. SEE DEFINITION OF STORM WATER RETENTION POND
   https://stormwater.pca.state.mn.us/index.php?title=Stormwater_ponds_combined

8. Who will own the storm water retention pond? Who will be responsible to drain it’s contaminants? Does the City of Mounds View have the appropriate filtration system in place to remove the salts, toxins, yard chemicals and petrochemicals that will, by definition, accumulate in the storm water retention pond? Who will be responsible for structural damages caused by a misuse of storm water retention management?

9. SEE MATERIALS REGARDING STORM WATER RETENTION SYSTEM MAINTENANCE AND INSTANCES OF MISMANAGEMENT.


   https://www.pca.state.mn.us/water/chloride-101

10. Are you aware that odiferous, foul, algae blooms are 100 % probable given the urban characteristics of the site? How do you plan on incentivizing current block residents to knowingly accept this new addition?

11. Are you aware of the high danger of overflow a retention pond in this climate with this soil stratigraphy would incur? During periods of high precipitation, how will you assure us that this will not result in property damage given the experiences of others in similar local developments?

12. SEE FIRST HAND MATERIALS
13. Why should current and future residents care about the needless development of an essential ecological feature? According to the EPA, areas surrounding storm water retention ponds have higher rates of mosquito borne illness. This is because storm water retention ponds cause a direct net positive effect on insect populations 100% of the time. Additionally, the same insecticides that are used to control runaway mosquito populations in the case of such an event are inherently toxic to not only people and pets, but the other living organisms that eventually populate the retention pond’s habitat- which brings me to my next point...

14. Storm water retention ponds are created for the express purpose of slowing down the flow of water and contaminants into a municipal water system. You can dress them up with native plants and shrubbery, but they will always be toxic to children, dogs, and wildlife. Their beauty is superficial as their ecological function is zero. You won’t be able to sell the properties with honesty if you label it a “water feature”. The state and federal government advises zero physical interaction with storm water retention ponds that retain water for longer than 2 days at a time. How do you consider this a positive effect on the resale value of our homes, and the homes you will be constructing?

15. PLEASE SEE FIRST HAND TESTIMONIALS ON LAND VALUE DEPRECIATION
https://www.trulia.com/voices/Home_Buying/ Detention_pond_on_the_back_What_is_its_affect_on_-325280

Storm water retention ponds are an artificial closed system, they require constant human interference to manage their toxicity. In contrast, the natural soil stratigraphy of the land in question acts like a natural sponge—absorbing and effectively sequestering the pollutants that are ubiquitous with urban developments. The land in question sports a water table that is naturally high year round—hence the small ponds and puddles that are present in our yards year round even after storm water drainage ditches were established years ago. The above ground water level may grow and shrink from year to year, causing for wetlands above ground to change size from year to year, but the underlying ecological features will not be displaced by a development-only paved over.

Because of the immovable structures in the soil, its characteristics, and the increasingly high precipitation of our climate—your storm water retention pond would need constant human management. You will be replacing features that allow water and surface contaminants to be filtered and sequestered over time, with impervious materials and structures. Putting in a storm water retention pond will not change the soil of the lots on the block remaining, the puddles and high water table will persist, and what you will be left with is backyards that continue to hold water and a storm water retention pond that is prone to flooding and at high risk for ground water contamination.
Tensions rise around neighborhood ponds

Some residents say they were misled about ponds' purpose — which isn't to look pretty.

By Shannon Prather (http://www.startribune.com/shannon-prather/188067161/) Star Tribune

DECEMBER 14, 2014 — 6:22AM

When Jim Tauer bought his home in the Lakes of Blaine development, the pond at the foot of his sloping back yard was a selling point for which he paid extra.

But last spring, record rains turned the man-made pond into a costly problem. Rain and runoff filled it to the brim and caused erosion, leaving a small cliff at the shoreline. Tauer and some of the other two dozen homeowners whose yards back up to the pond fear they'll lose even more ground in next spring's rains and runoff.

"I thought [the pond] was part of the beauty of the landscape," Tauer said. "I thought they put all these in for aesthetics. ... I paid a premium to be on this pond. I think it was about $10,000."

He said he and neighbors were never told that it was built to collect and filter stormwater.

Their pond is one of about 300 dotting newer neighborhoods across Blaine. They've become ubiquitous in more recent suburbs. Woodbury has nearly 550, Maple Grove about 360.

The ponds were not meant to look pretty or to be clean and pristine, city scientists and staffers say. They were built to comply with federal law.

Since 1994, the U.S. Clean Water Act has required new developments to trap pollutants, said Michael Findorff of the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency, which oversees stormwater pond construction and permitting.

"Realtors say it's waterfront," he said. "Really, it's a stormwater treatment device."

In older neighborhoods without ponds, runoff laced with lawn chemicals, grass clippings, sand and trash goes straight into storm sewers, then into lakes and streams.

Newer neighborhoods added ponds to prevent that. As the ponds age and require dredging, city officials are spending more money to maintain them and to educate residents about their purpose.

Blaine spends $1.1 million on its stormwater program to meet federal requirements, while Woodbury spends more than $800,000 and Maple Grove an estimated $1.5 million annually. Cities pay to maintain them as stormwater basins, but ownership varies from pond to pond. Cities own some, neighborhood associations own some and, in some instances, the homeowners bordering ponds own them.

'Not going to be blue water'
Initially, many developers built ponds close to homes and bordering back yards, marketing them as a little slice of serenity in the suburbs, and many homeowners enjoy the birds and wildlife they attract. But years later, homeowners and city officials have realized the proximity isn’t always ideal.

“We constantly get people calling and saying their pond is not clean,” said Rick Lestina, water resources engineer for Maple Grove. “It’s not going to be blue water. They are going to have to understand they are used to clean up water.”

Some people remove native vegetation around the ponds, which can cause problems.

“People put lawn right up to the water’s edge,” Lestina said. “The best thing you can have around the pond is vegetation, but people often don’t want that. They see it as weeds. ... But if maintained properly, native grasses can look nice.”

When a city brings in heavy equipment to do maintenance, lawns sometimes get torn up. Cities have taken steps to mitigate that, including having some ponds built on outlots on the edge of developments.

Each winter, Woodbury does full pond dredging on three to seven ponds. Doing it then “creates the least disruption for the wetland and pond, and it really cuts down on damage if we have to disturb someone’s yards,” said Woodbury environmental resources coordinator Sharon Doucette.

Who should pay?

In Blaine, the mayor and a City Council member met with Tauer and his neighbors, toured their pond’s shoreline and had crews examine how the pond is functioning.

“We had record rains in June,” said Blaine stormwater manager Jim Hafner. “Everything was saturated. There was no place for water to go,” resulting in erosion.

The makeup of the soil, originally peat, contributed to the problem, he said. Builders hauled in sand to build homes but left the peat on the pond bed. The erosion occurred where the sandy soil meets the peat.

One contractor estimated that fixing the shoreline could cost $300,000 to be split by six homeowners, including Tauer.

“I almost had a heart attack,” Tauer said of the estimate. “It’s more than my home alone is worth. ... The bottom line, is I don’t think ... homeowners should be responsible for this.” The city owns the pond and should pay for it, he said.

Blaine Mayor Tom Ryan said the situation is unusual and unfortunate, but not the city’s problem.

“The city’s liability is nil here, in my opinion. We didn’t do it,” Ryan said. “It isn’t probably what they dreamed when they came in. That’s what you get when there are waterways. Ten years after the construction, we don’t have any responsibility for that, nor does the builder.”

The mayor isn’t unsympathetic, though. He knows firsthand the hassle a stormwater pond can be. Last summer, a pond owned by Anoka County that borders his property filled with water for the first time in decades, killing a dozen of Ryan’s large pines.

“They were 25 feet high,” Ryan said. “That is a fact of life. I will replace them. I will start over.

“The next time, I will learn and plant higher.”

Shannon Prather has covered philanthropy and nonprofits for the past two years. She has two decades of experience reporting for newspapers in Minnesota, California, Idaho, Wisconsin and North Dakota. She has covered a variety of topics including the legal system, law enforcement, education, municipal government and slice-of-life community news.

Shannon.Prather@startribune.com  612-673-4804  ShannonMPrather
Introduction
A sketch plan is an informal review, intended to provide the developer feedback prior to them going through the expense of preparing extensive plans. The planned subdivision of “Long Lake Woods, Second Addition” is located on the 8100-8200 block of Long Lake Road (west side). The block includes a number of large lots (e.g. 1+ acres). A majority of the property owners are working with a developer, Marty Harstad, to extend Greenwood Drive as a cul-de-sac, and subdivide the back half of their lots, creating 12 new single-family lots.

City Council members are asked to provide feedback to the developer. There is no “formal” approval, denial, or consensus needed.

Discussion
Much of western Mounds View was platted in the 1940’s as acreage lots. When municipal sewer became available in the 1960’s, blocks were divided, roads built, and lots re-subdivided into to what we see today. This block was not, and remains intact. It is one of the few areas of town with deep lots that are not restricted by wetlands. The area is wooded, and includes a drainage ditch. The developer conducted a wetland delineation in September, 2018. No wetlands were found.

As a reference, the block west of this project was similarly re-subdivided in 1987 (Red Oak Park), with 17 lots, and creating Red Oak Court (cul-de-sac).

The properties are guided for Single-Family Detached residential in the Comprehensive Plan, and are zoned R-1 Single-Family Residential.

The City has partial (30’) right-of-way (ROW) through the block. 60’ ROW width is needed for designated “local streets”. A cul-de-sac (Greenwood Drive) is proposed from the south. The developer chose this route because it has the least impact to existing homes. If to be a thru-street, the two existing homes on the north end would have non-conforming setbacks from the new street. If a cul-de-sac from a different direction, it would require removal of a house.

Minimum lot size for non-corner lots is 11,000 sq ft. Proposed lot sizes vary; 14,500 sq ft – 31,000 sq ft (approximate). The sketch plan does not identify lot widths (minimum required is 75’).

Planning Commission Recommendation
The Planning Commission members reviewed the project on January 16, 2019 and offered the following recommendations:
1. Consider rain gardens in front yards.

2. Consider a buffer adjacent to back yards of; 8150, 8200, 8206 Long Lake Rd. These existing lots have shallower backyards compared to other lots on the block.

At this meeting, there were four residents who spoke, with the following concerns (summarized):

1. Stormwater Pond;
   Water quality, groundwater pollution; proper maintenance of the pond, and liability related to the pond.

2. Greenwood Dr cul-de-sac;
   Does not serve a public use. Questions related to the process of eminent domain to be used in acquiring right-of-way if property owners are not willing participants in the plat.

3. Property Values;
   Concern that development of the woods/open space will negatively affect adjacent property values.

4. Damages;
   Potential damage to trees on adjacent properties due to soil disturbance when new street, etc. is constructed.

The Developer has provided additional drawings, illustrating the neighborhood, and clarifying existing public land and easements.

Staff Recommendation

1. Consider sidewalk connecting Ardan Ave to Greenwood Dr cul-de-sac. This would provide north-south access between neighborhoods.

Summary
Harstad Hills (Marty Harstad) has proposed a sketch plan for 12 single-family lots, and the extension of Greenwood Drive from the south as a cul-de-sac. A Sketch Plan is an informal review, and is advisable prior to a developer submitting an application for Preliminary Plat.

A Neighborhood meeting was held November 20, 2018, attended by 26 neighbors, representing 20 properties. Notice of that meeting, as well as this Planning Commission meeting and City Council Work Session was provided to property owners and residents of this block.

Recommendation
The City Council should provide comments on:

- Streets & sidewalks
- Lot layout
- Any features to be preserved
- Other items as appropriate
Respectfully,

Jon Sevald, AICP
Community Development Director

ATTACHMENTS
1. Concept Plan and drawings, Jan 18, 2019
2. “Planning Commission Mounds View”, submitted by Alex Yoder-Fox, 8206 Long Lake Rd
FIRST FLOOR PLAN

121 GARAGE STALLS  121 UNITS TOTAL BUILDING
46,150 SF THIS FLOOR  182,210 SF TOTAL BUILDING

CROSSROAD POINTE APARTMENTS  MOUNDS VIEW MINNESOTA
City of Mounds View Staff Report

To: Honorable Mayor and City Council  
From: Jon Sevald, Community Development Director  
Item Title/Subject: Sketch Plan, Crossroad Pointe

Introduction
A sketch plan is an informal review, intended to provide the developer feedback prior to them going through the expense of preparing detailed plans. Crossroad Pointe is located on the southeast corner of Mounds View Boulevard and County Road H2. INH Properties is proposing a 127-unit apartment building. The project includes the closure of Greenfield Avenue through the project. The primary driveway access will be on Edgewood Dr. An optional secondary access may be on Greenfield Ave (Council should advice).

City Council members are asked to provide feedback to the developer. There is no “formal” approval, denial, or consensus needed.

Discussion
The property was formerly occupied by a gas station and Roberts’s Off Ten bar/restaurant. The City’s Economic Development Authority (EDA) purchased the properties in 2006 and 2013, and conducted a redevelopment study of the block in 2006 (County Road H2 to Woodale Drive), with a desire for a mixed-use development of the block (apartments, townhomes, offices, retail). The Council has considered a number of development proposals, and entered into a pre-development agreement in January 2019, with INH Properties, for a 127-unit apartment building.

Analysis
Comprehensive Plan
The properties are guided Mixed-Use (MU-PUD), intended for residential, and commercial/office. “…Sites with this designation should be developed as [PUD’s] to provide flexibility to ensure that integrated efficient and well-planned development occurs.”

Zoning
The properties are zoned B-3 Highway Business, and are within the County Road 10 Corridor Overlay District.

A Zoning Map Amendment is needed to rezone the properties from B-3 to PUD.

Item 03

1 2008 Mounds View Comprehensive Plan, p 3-20
Use

The property will be used for multi-family residential (127 units planned). Multi-Family Residential is a permitted use with the PUD district.²

Lot Size

As a Residential PUD, the minimum lot size is 3-acres (4.25 acres existing, including Greenfield Ave ROW).

Density

As a PUD, density is at the discretion of the City Council.³

Unit Floor Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Min Required⁴</th>
<th>Min Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Studio (one-bedroom)</td>
<td>630 sf⁵</td>
<td>570 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Bedroom</td>
<td>630 sf</td>
<td>796 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Bedroom</td>
<td>750 sf</td>
<td>1,062 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three Bedroom</td>
<td>900 sf</td>
<td>1,336 sf</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An ordinance amendment is needed to allow the proposed studio apartments.

Architecture

A minimum of 50% of all exterior wall finishes must be brick, stone, glass, stucco, or similar materials. The Sketch Plan does not detail building materials. The developer has stated that the architecture will be similar to the adjacent Bel Rae Senior Living building.

The building will be three stories above a parking garage. The garage will be partially below grade, depending on the water table. As a PUD, building height is up to the discretion of the City Council.

Each unit will have a balcony. A common patio/deck is shown on the north side of the building.

Planning Commission Comments: Consider using more than one exterior color (e.g. not all white).

² City Code, Section 1119.02 (Permitted Uses)
³ City Code, Section 1120.02, Subd 6 (Density). NOTE: this conflicts with Section 1120.03, Subd 1(e), which allows a 10% density bonus, e.g. 3.8 acre site (excludes ROW) is allowed 66-units + 10% (72-units max). One unit per 2,500 sq ft lot area is the base density for multi-family residential. As the City Code is updated (amended), this conflict will be addressed.
⁴ City Code, Section 1104.02, Subd 4(c) Minimum Floor Area Per Dwelling Unit (Multiple Dwelling Units)
⁵ 2015 MN Building Code: Efficiency Units shall have a minimum area of 120 sf (one occupant); 220 sf (two occupants); and 320 sq ft (three occupants). Efficiency units have additional standards for cooking areas and bathroom areas.
Staff Comments:

North: Common patio/deck should be an architectural “feature” (front door) viewed from eastbound Mounds View Blvd., OR located on the NW corner of the building where there is more space.

East: - -

South: More pronounced building entrance/feature, e.g. large suspended balcony over entrance.

West: Q: Are walk-up units an option on the first floor (units with exterior access), e.g. yard is graded up, with individual stairs/patios (brownstone)? The intent is to integrate the building more with the single-family neighborhood.

Building Location Minimum Setbacks:

North: 30’
East: 5’ (maximum)
South: 20’ setback from drive lane. Rear setback equal to the building height from south property line.6
West: 30’

Staff Comments: The east 5’ setback may not be practical because of buffer needed between the trail and landscaping, to be used for snow storage. This will be addressed during the grading plan review (Preliminary Plat stage).

Planning Commission Comments: Consider shifting building such that it covers entire length of Mounds View Blvd side of lot, and relocate tot lot and dog run to Edgewood Dr. side.

Access

Primary entrance will be from Edgewood Drive. Optional secondary access from Greenfield Ave.

NOTE: City Council should provide a direction on which of the following options to pursue:

1. Cul-de-sac Greenfield Ave, no driveway access.
2. Cul-de-sac Greenfield Ave, allow driveway access.
3. Connect Greenfield Ave to Edgewood Dr.

Planning Commission Comments: Keep Greenfield Ave open. Consider access through Bel Rae property.

---

6 City Code, Section 1120.03, Subd 1(d) (Yards)
**Staff Comments:** Edgewood Drive can handle the additional traffic from the apartments.

Staff does not recommend that a traffic study be required, because no access is proposed onto Mounds View Blvd, nor Co Rd H2 (options are limited).

Ramsey County Access Management Policy\(^7\) recommends a minimum 660’ (1/8th mile) distance between Co Rd H2 and a driveway or side street. If a driveway were at the south property line, this would be about 450’ from Co Rd H2. 660’ distance is equal to Bel Rae’s main building entrance. It is not practical for Crossroad Pointe to share an access with Bel Rae.

If applying the county’s policy to Co Rd H2 (city street), a driveway onto Co Rd H2 is not supported. The Edgewood Dr intersection is about 475’ from Mounds View Blvd (e.g. less than 660’ spacing).

Sidewalk to be added along Co Rd H2, with buffer between it and the street. The hammerhead dead-end on Greenfield Ave needs to accommodate backup movement of fire truck/vactor truck. Dimensions need to be confirmed, but generally allow for 50’ X 20’ area + snow storage.

**Planning Commission Comments:** Address pedestrian visibility along sidewalks on Edgewood Dr, and Co Rd H2. Provide an enhanced experience for pedestrians (e.g. landscaping).

**Landscaping**

A minimum of 15% (0.5 acres est.) of the property must be landscaped open space.\(^8\) The amount proposed is not known.

**Plantings (est. minimum):**

84 Overstory deciduous shade trees  
84 Coniferous trees  
152 Understory shrubs\(^9\)  
23 Ornamental trees\(^10\)

---

\(^7\) Ramsey County Access Management Policy, Figure 3.2 (Category 5B). Policies: “A parcel has the legal right to one access from a public street. If access can be obtained from an adjacent street, rather than from a County Road or County State Aid Highway, access should be directed to the minor street.”

\(^8\) City Code, Section 1129.05, Subd 5(b) (Landscaping)

\(^9\) One (1) understory shrub for every three hundred (300) square feet of building (i.e. 45,520 sf building area / 300 sf = 152 shrubs) or one (1) shrub for every thirty feet (30’) of site perimeter, whichever is greater (i.e. 1,973’ perimeter / 30’ = 66 shrubs).

\(^10\) One (1) ornamental tree for every two thousand (2,000) square feet of building (i.e. 45,520 sf building area / 2,000 sf = 23 trees) or one (1) ornamental tree for every two hundred feet (200’) of site perimeter, whichever is greater (i.e. 1,973’ perimeter / 200’ = 10 trees).
**Staff Comments:** It is not likely that this amount of plant material will fit on the site.

**Planning Commission Comments:** Consider moving tot lot away from Mounds View Blvd.

Parking

Parking guidelines\(^{11}\) are 1 garage stall, and 1.5 surface stalls per unit. Proposed: 1 garage stall and 1 surface stall per unit.

**Staff Comments:** This is consistent with The Boulevard apartments on Groveland Rd (2018).

Outside Storage

A refuse area is identified within the parking garage. If to be located outside, it must be screened.

**Summary**

INH Properties has submitted a Sketch Plan for *Crossroad Pointe*, a 127 unit apartment building to be located at the southeast corner of Mounds View Boulevard and County Road H2. A Sketch Plan is an informal review of plans, intended to provide the developer with feedback prior to preparing engineering and building plans.

This project will require:

1. Zoning Map amendment, from B-3 to PUD
2. Conditional Use Permit for a Residential PUD
3. General Concept Plan (aka Development Review)
4. Ordinance Amendment to allow studio apartments, less than 630 sf in size
5. Vacation of portion of Greenfield Avenue
6. Preliminary/Final Plat

It is anticipated that these items will be applied for and reviewed concurrently.

**Planning Commission Recommendations**

The Planning Commission reviewed the sketch plan on January 16, 2019. Commission members’ recommendations are incorporated into this report.

**Staff Recommendation**

City Council members are asked to provide feedback to the developer. There is no “formal” approval, denial, or consensus needed.

---

\(^{11}\) City Code, Section 1129.05, Subd 4 (Off-Street Parking)
Notice has been provided to property owners and residents in the area, using addresses used for a neighborhood meeting, held June 27, 2018. During the January 16, 2019 Planning Commission meeting, four residents spoke with the following concerns (summarized):

- Too much density
- Opposes apartment access onto Greenfield Ave (yes; cul-de-sac)
- Opposes cul-de-sac of Greenfield Ave, if directs more traffic onto Edgewood Dr. (no; cul-de-sac)
- Apartments will decrease property values
- Apartments will increase traffic on Edgewood Dr.
- Pedestrian traffic and safety (crossing Co Rd H2, Mounds View Blvd).
- Increased crime at the apartments (e.g. automobile break-ins)

Respectfully submitted,

Jon Sevald, AICP
Community Development Director

**Attachments**
1. Comments, Mark Gavett, January 16, 2019
2. Sketch Plan
MEMORANDUM

to: Mounds View City Council
from: Nyle Zikmund, City Administrator
re: February 4, 2019 Workshop
date: January 31, 2019

Some background for the workshop Monday night.

Representative Moller:
Representative Moller is specifically seeking feedback from the council on what issues are important/critical to you. We have spoken a number of times and I have shared the importance of LGA, Local Control, and Unfunded mandates. I am also meeting with her next Monday to discuss the definition of prosecuting agency with respect to Chapter 307 of the statutes based on the media inquiry we received. That chapter deals with fines levied and used to combat sexual exploitation of youth.

As of this writing Thursday morning she is the Chief Author of 3 bills; House Files 10, 327 and 418 (the latter two just introduced on the 28th). All deal with criminal sexual assault/harassment/conduct. From my 25+ years’ experience down at the capitol, this shows remarkable discipline as most freshman introduced a larger number of bills. Furthermore, this is in her professional field of expertise and clearly a passion. She is co-author on 27 other bills which provides some insight into other areas she supports.
Topics range from free public transit on election day, to insulin assistance program, to firefighting issues, to mental health, hands free cell phone when driving, gender equality and more.

Sketch Plans:
Both the Long Lake Woods (Harstad proposal) and INH/Crossroad Pointe projects will be before. Staff needs direction on both in order to proceed. Both have gone before the Planning Commission and both have had neighborhood meetings.

Long Lake Woods – In short, we are to the point of go or no go. A go decision is likely to result in the City having to use eminent domain to obtain the final right of way/road dedication on the platted road that exists. This action will be limited to the Doll property as the developer has either the City has acquired or the developer has agreements to acquire. Attorney Riggs will be present.
Crossroad Pointe – Developer is looking for consensus on design/layout issues specific to Greenfield Avenue access, site amenities such as the tot lot, dog run, and outside patio. Based on feedback from the P & Z they moved the tot lot and dog run to the West side proving more barrier and green space to the single family homes on Edgewood. The plan, as you can see, also shows an actual road to Greenfield with an option to still limit southbound traffic directly out of the complexes parking lot.

Street Redevelopment for 2020:
Don will be on hand to share some thoughts and concerns about our current plan and a suggestion for you to consider that we believe will eventually result in a lower cost.

HR Issues:
Since I was first hired you had established a goal which is now part of the Strategic Plan, to focus on HR issues with one of the priorities being retention. To that end, Council had ordered a market rate study for non-bargained employees to make sure wages were competitive and Council has, since receiving that document, endeavored to implement the recommendations which are all done or nearly done.

Council is also aware of the labor shortage and specifically as it related to public employment with evidence in several positions such as law enforcement which generated over 100 applications per position and now we are fortunate to receive 20.

Over the past year Rayla and I have been working with the HR committee on benefits resulting in a number of Council approved policy changes last summer. We have also made greater investments in training as well as constructing very robust hiring processes that include intense probation requirements and subsequent feedback. This is all designed to ensure our employees have maximum ability to succeed.

Staff continues to work with the HR Committee (as we did on all these issues) and have been working with them on a couple of specific issues related to department heads/senior employees. For example, we have reviewed, updated and repointed the Assistant to Public Works Director. We are in process on updating the Cable Coordinator Job Description and have done an update on market rate.

And, for over a year, I have been researching and evaluating department head compensation and benefits. As you know changes have been made to the Public Works Director (promotion and increase), hiring of HR position, creation/promotion of Assistance City Administrator.
While we have achieved a level of success in consistency and stability on the position and fiscal compensation side of the equation, those same situations do not exist on the benefit side. We have been working with the HR Committee on remediating that and I will share Monday night what they have provided feedback and support on.