

CITY OF EXCELSIOR
Hennepin County, Minnesota

MINUTES

City Council Work Session

Monday, April 1, 2013

1. Call to Order/Roll Call

Mayor Gaylord called the meeting to order at 6:10 p.m.

Councilmembers present: Beattie, Caron, Fulkerson, Miller (arrived at 6:15 p.m.), and Mayor Gaylord

Also Present: City Manager Luger, City Planner Richards (arrived at 6:18 p.m.), Finance Officer Tumberg, Public Works Superintendent Wisdorf, and City Clerk Johnson

2. Agenda Approval

Caron moved, Fulkerson seconded, to approve the agenda. Motion carried 4/0.

3. Long Term Financial Plan

Tumberg stated that at the last Work Session, the Council made a decision on what years to include the Phase III Street Improvement/Five Corner Intersection Project and the City Hall/Library Projects in the Long Term Financial Plan (LTFP). The Council also wanted to discuss what items identified in the Council's goals should be added to the LTFP. The first item of discussion is parking meters.

Luger said that the Planning Commission will be forwarding a recommendation to the Council for upgrading the parking meters with meters that accept credit cards. Fulkerson asked how much would the new meters cost. Luger said she is not sure, but the City Planner may have a cost estimate.

Mayor Gaylord said modern parking meters should be installed as soon as possible.

Caron asked how much do the current parking meters cost. Wisdorf said it costs approximately \$1,700 to purchase 4 meters.

Luger said the new meters will be a large expense, so the City will want to incorporate the cost into the LTFP.

Fulkerson asked how old the current meters are; Wisdorf responded that there are some that are 20 years old.

3. Long Term Financial Plan – (Continued)

Caron said before the City starts planning for this expense, the Council needs to have the discussion of whether to charge for parking. Luger said the Council is only discussing if it makes sense to purchase more of the current meters if the City wants to move forward with a new parking meter system.

Tumberg asked if the Council wants to incorporate any funding in the 2013 LTFP towards a new parking meter system.

Mayor Gaylord asked how much the City collected in 2012 in parking meter revenues. Tumberg said approximately \$52,000.

Luger asked Richards how much the new parking meters would cost. Richards said that each unit costs around \$15,000 to \$20,000 each and handles between 7-10 parking spaces.

Miller suggested that the City continue using the old meters until it has more information on the new meter system, but keep the new meters on the potential list for next year.

Fulkerson asked whether the parking should be reconfigured. She did not think there was adequate space to handle two way traffic and the parking. Wisdorf said that there is enough space for the two way traffic and the parking.

Caron said the road is perceived by drivers that it is too narrow, which is helpful in slowing down traffic.

Tumberg said another goal of the Council was to improve the residential and commercial docks. If the Council would like to include this goal into the LTFP, the Council should identify the types of improvements and dollar amounts so she can incorporate the dock improvements into the LTFP.

Mayor Gaylord said if the City adds extra amenities, can it increase the rates? Miller said the City has a policy in place for setting the dock rates, which would allow for the payment of capital improvements.

Miller said the docks are a separate fund, so would the dock improvements get incorporated into the LTFP? Tumberg said yes, all funds are included in the LTFP.

Miller said the City Council has developed a policy for establishing the dock rates, which include capital improvements and replacement costs. So, any improvements to the docks should increase the rates. He noted that there have been years where the Council has overridden the policy.

3. Long Term Financial Plan – (Continued)

Caron said the Council needs to have more discussion on the dock improvements before they can be placed in the LTFP.

Tumberg said the Council will be discussing the Enterprise Funds in October and November and that the 2014 dock rates will be discussed at that time.

Miller asked if the improvements to the docks are essential items. Wisdorf said they are not essential, but would be nice to have.

Caron said that the new charter amendment makes the timing of the discussions on these items difficult.

Miller said the Dock Fund has to have the fund balance at a level that reflects replacement costs first and then items that are not necessary can be considered.

Beattie asked if the City has a defined depreciation schedule for the docks. Tumberg said yes. She noted that there are still inter-fund loans that need to be paid back for the docks that were recently built.

The Council decided not to make any more changes to the LTFP at this time.

Mayor Gaylord asked when the City retires equipment, where does the income from either trading or selling the item show up in the LTFP. Tumberg said it will either be reflected in the revenues or the net cost will be shown in the LTFP.

Caron asked why the St. Albans Bay Bridge is not reflected in the LTFP. Tumberg said that the bridge repair/replacement is not an item that needs to be addressed at this time, and there is not a funding source identified. Mayor Gaylord said that the City of Greenwood is not ready at this time to tackle the bridge either.

Miller said the City should use the 4 to 5 years lead time to get the bridge incorporated into the plan.

Tumberg asked if the Council has any questions or comments on the economic synopsis. The Council said the information was good and very helpful.

Tumberg noted that to comply with the new charter amendment, the 2014 budget document will be broken down into funds, then public service programs, and then by department and each will have a lengthy narrative. Mayor Gaylord asked if anyone who authored the charter amendment is following the new

3. Long Term Financial Plan – (Continued)

requirements. Tumberg said not that she knows of. She said the Charter Commission will be discussing what their role should be regarding the charter amendment on Wednesday, April 3rd.

4. Overview of HPC's Ordinance, History, and Role

Richards said that there are provisions in the City Code and Zoning Code that establishes and sets up the role of the Heritage Preservation Commission (HPC). The HPC meets once a month. Overall, it is important to have an HPC in a community that dates back to 1857. The Planning Commission functions in land use and zoning capabilities; whereas, an HPC deals with the historic value. The main place where the HPC has been extremely helpful is in the renovation of the Downtown Historic District. There was a hiccup in the process with regard to the hotel and how to deal with a planned unit development; staff will be looking into how best to deal with this in future projects.

Caron said she spent a significant amount of time with HPC Commissioner, Mark Macpherson during the hotel project and the design charrette. In reading through the HPC's denial of the hotel, it noted how the HPC doesn't look at the use of the property. The City chose to create the HPC due to the historic nature of the community. The HPC's oversight is significantly different than the Planning Commission's. She had suggested to the City Manager that before the Council meets with the HPC that it would be helpful for the Council to look at the HPC's ordinances and understand their role.

Beattie asked Caron how she sees the discussion with the HPC. Caron said the big issue from HPC's perspective is the Planned Unit Development (PUD) process. Staff recognizes this issue and wants to focus on it.

Richards said that the HPC has discussed the desire to work closer with the Planning Commission and work on items that overlap. How does the HPC dovetail with the Planning Commission and how can each connect better with these issues. The focus is about process. One item for discussion with regard to process is who should look at a project first, the HPC or Planning Commission.

Richards said under the current City Code, the City has only 45 days for the HPC to act on a Site Alteration Permit. He is not aware of any requirement for the 45 day timeline. It would be beneficial to have the timeline be the same for HPC as it is for Planning Commission items, which is 60 to 120 days.

4. Overview of HPC's Ordinance, History, and Role – (Continued)

Mayor Gaylord asked if there is a State Statute that requires the Planning Commission to overlap with the HPC; why are there two separate commissions. Caron said the City has a historically designated district so it may be required to have an HPC.

Beattie said the HPC is a quasi-judicial body, so most cities have separate HPCs and Planning Commissions.

5. Other

a. Street Improvement District Legislation

Beattie asked if the City has a recommendation and position on the street improvement district legislation that the legislature is discussing. Luger said this topic came up in 2009, right before the first street project. The City has started the street improvement projects and assessments, and the assumption is that the City would continue in that manner. She noted that the City Engineer thought that it would still be beneficial for the City to support the street improvement districts. She noted that this item has a lot of support from other cities, so it probably wouldn't be necessary for Excelsior to get involved.

Caron said when the City discussed the assessment policy, the City Council decided to keep the assessments low.

6. Adjournment

Beattie moved, Caron seconded, to adjourn at 7:00 p.m. Motion carried 5/0.

Respectfully submitted,

Cheri Johnson
City Clerk