Minutes
Minnetonka City Council
October 24, 2016

1. Call to Order

Schneider called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

2. Pledge of Allegiance

All joined in the Pledge of Allegiance.

3. Roll Call

Councilmembers Bob Ellingson, Dick Allendorf, Patty Acomb, Brad Wiersum, Tim Bergstedt, Tony Wagner, and Terry Schneider were present.

4. Approval of Agenda

Wiersum moved, Bergstedt seconded a motion to accept the agenda as presented with modifications and additional comments included in the addendum dated October 24, 2016. All voted “yes.” Motion carried.

5. Approval of Minutes: September 12, 2016 and September 26, 2016 Regular Council Meetings

Acomb moved, Allendorf seconded a motion to approve the September 12, 2016 regular council meeting minutes as presented. All voted “yes.” Motion carried.

Acomb moved, Allendorf seconded a motion to approve the September 26, 2016 regular council meeting minutes as presented. Acomb, Wiersum, Wagner, Ellingson, and Schneider voted “yes.” Bergstedt and Allendorf Abstained. Motion carried.

6. Special Matters:

A. Proclamation declaring November 8, 2016 as Election Judge Appreciation Day.

Councilmembers approved the proclamation declaring November 8, 2016 as Election Judge Appreciation Day.

B. Proclamation of Extra Mile Day.

Councilmembers approved the proclamation for Extra Mile Day on November 1, 2016.
C. Recognition of 2016 Photo Contest Winners.

Councilmembers recognized 2016 photo contest winners.

7. Reports from City Manager & Council Members

City Clerk David Maeda reported that 4,300 voters have already cast their ballot at city hall which equals 12 percent of the current number of registered voters.

City Manager Geralyn Barone announced that Williston Center's tennis professionals Felicia Raschiatore, David Wolden, and Boris Gonikman were recognized by the United States Tennis Association. The instructors were nominated by their students.

Community Development Director Julie Wischnack received the Minnesota Chapter of the American Planning Association Planner of the Year Award in September.

Barone reviewed upcoming meeting dates.

Schneider thanked Brian Kuhnly for supporting the community as a Cub Foods representative and wished him well on his retirement.

Acomb was appointed by the National League of Cities to be an advisor to the Environmental Protection Agency.

Wagner announced that the Metropolitan Airports Commission will host an open house on Wednesday from 4 p.m. to 6 p.m.

8. Citizens Wishing to Discuss Matters not on the Agenda

Ward Hertsted, 15480 Wing Lake Drive, requested that the city create a fund like the stormwater fund to make improvements to small lakes like Wing Lake. Residents would petition for funding similar to what is done for stormwater improvements. He would appreciate the council considering this at a future meeting. Schneider explained that the city council conducted a work-study session to look at all lakes in Minnetonka to determine what realistic maintenance and improvements could be made and more will be held in the future.

Barone will have assessing staff contact Mr. Hersted to address his questions regarding the property tax status of the new daycare on Excelsior Boulevard and Williston Road.
9. Bids and Purchases:

A. Purchase of property at 3138 Lake Shore Boulevard.

Barone gave the staff report.

Chris Wheelock, 3138 Lake Shore Boulevard, stated that he is pleased that the city has plans to use the land to improve the neighborhood. If the land would become a park, then he suggested naming it “Cottage Park” and requested that a bench with his daughter’s name, “Gabriella,” be placed in the park.

Wiersum moved, Wagner seconded a motion to adopt resolution 2016-116 authorizing the purchase of the property. All voted “yes.” Motion carried.

10. Consent Agenda – Items Requiring a Majority Vote:

A. Temporary Construction Easement Agreement with Metropolitan Council for the Blue Lake Interceptor Rehabilitation Project.

Allendorf moved, Acomb seconded a motion to approve a temporary construction easement for the MCES Blue Lake Interceptor Rehabilitation project. All voted “yes.” Motion carried.

B. Resolution regarding a grant application to Hennepin County for Lionsgate Academy.

Allendorf moved, Acomb seconded a motion to adopt resolution 2016-117 authorizing the city of Minnetonka to serve as the local government unit representing Lionsgate Academy in their application for a Hennepin County Youth Sports Program Grant Application. All voted “yes.” Motion carried.

C. Resolution adopting the 2017 meeting schedule for the Minnetonka City Council.

Allendorf moved, Acomb seconded a motion to adopt resolution 2016-118 establishing its 2017 meeting schedule with the changes provided in the addendum dated October 24, 2016. All voted “yes.” Motion carried.
D. Resolution rescinding and replacing Resolution 2013-043 regarding parking along Minnetonka Boulevard in Minnetonka Mills.

Allendorf moved, Acomb seconded a motion to adopt resolution 2016-119 approving rescinding and replacing Resolution 2013-043. All voted "yes." Motion carried.

E. Resolution authorizing the certification of delinquent fire alarm response fees to the Hennepin County Auditor.

Allendorf moved, Acomb seconded a motion to adopt resolution 2016-120 authorizing the certification of fire response fees to the Hennepin County Auditor. All voted "yes." Motion carried.

F. Agreement related to the Green Line Extension (Southwest LRT).

Allendorf moved, Acomb seconded a motion to approve the Subordinate Funding Agreement with the Metropolitan Council for the new scope LRCI design work and authorize the mayor and city manager to execute the agreement, including subsequent non-material changes, as approved by the city manager and community development director in a form acceptable to the city attorney. All voted "yes." Motion carried.

G. Ordinance amending the city code regarding floodplain districts.

Allendorf moved, Acomb seconded a motion to adopt ordinance 2016-14. All voted "yes." Motion carried.

H. Resolution authorizing the certification of delinquent water and sanitary sewer charges to the Hennepin County Auditor.

Allendorf moved, Acomb seconded a motion to adopt resolution 2016-121 authorizing the certification of delinquent water and sanitary sewer charges to the Hennepin County Auditor. Acomb, Wiersum, Bergstedt, Wagner, Allendorf, and Schneider voted "yes." Ellingson abstained. Motion carried.

11. Consent Agenda – Items requiring Five Votes: None
12. Introduction of Ordinances:
   A. Ordinance amending Section 710 of the city code regarding increases/changes in fees.

   Community Development Director Julie Wischnack gave the staff report.

   Schneider felt that the building permit fees are a great value for residents because inspectors provide consultations for each project along with enforcement of the building code. Acomb agreed.

   Bergstedt moved, Wagner seconded a motion to introduce the ordinance. All voted “yes.” Motion carried.

13. Public Hearings:
   A. Temporary on-sale liquor license for Episcopal Parish of St. David, 13000 St. David Road.

   Barone provided the staff report.

   Bill Jacobs, representing St. David’s Church, announced that the Bounty of Blessings Gala will be held November 12. Funds raised will be used for community outreach and the I.C.M.A. Food Shelf.

   The public hearing was opened. No testimony was submitted and the hearing was closed.

   Wagner moved, Wiersum seconded a motion to hold the public hearing and grant the temporary liquor license for the annual gala at St. David’s. All voted “yes.” Motion carried.

   B. Off-sale liquor license for Fernriver Enterprises, LLC at 11048 Cedar Lake Road.

   Barone provided the staff report.

   The public hearing was continued from September 26, 2016. No testimony was submitted and the hearing was closed.

   Allendorf moved, Wagner seconded a motion to grant the license. All voted “yes.” Motion carried.
C. Items concerning Unmapped Brewing Company, LLC, at 14625 Excelsior Boulevard.

1) Conditional use permit, with variances, for a microbrewery and taproom with outdoor seating area at 14625 Excelsior Boulevard.
2) On-sale brewer's taproom and Sunday liquor license, and off-sale liquor license (for growlers) for Unmapped Brewing Company, LLC, 14625 Excelsior Boulevard.

City Planner Loren Gordon and Wischnack provided the staff report.

Allendorf did not want to set an unattainable expectation of noise mitigation. Gordon stated that the conditional use permit would restrict the hours of operation of the outdoor patio. The applicants have stated that there would be no music played outdoors. The noise ordinance prohibits noise to exceed a certain decibel level. Human conversation would not violate the noise ordinance requirements. Voices may be able to be heard by surrounding property owners. A wall or six-foot fence would be constructed to mitigate sound.

Megan Park, 3941 Brown Lane, stated that she and her husband, J.D. Park, are founders of Unmapped Brewing. She stated that starting a business in the community is important to them. They each have an entrepreneurial spirit. She thanked councilmembers for their consideration and was available for questions.

The public hearing was continued.

Anne Malm Hossfeld, 14616 Glendale Street, stated that:

- Her letter is included in the change memorandum.
- She is open minded about the proposal.
- The use would attract constant traffic, be there for some time, and have outdoor seating. There is a lot unknown.
- She was concerned with the brewery creating an odor from the brewing process. She requested HVAC equipment be required to keep odors away from residential properties.
- She asked for a noise barrier on the south side that would decrease sound more than a chain-link fence.
- She asked if odor regulations could be created and enforced.
- She asked if it is anticipated that the parking lot would be full and where overflow parking would be located.
Chris Novak, 10327 West 34th Circle, stated that:

- He is the potential buyer of the Kraemer's Shopping Center.
- He wants to be a good neighbor and manage issues as well as possible.

Luke Van Santen, 2148 Sheridan Hills Road, stated that:

- This is one of the things that will keep Minnetonka a strong, desirable place to live.
- He encouraged the resolution be approved.

No additional testimony was submitted and the hearing was closed.

Wiersum favored allowing the noise ordinance to trigger enforcement of a sound violation. The condition requiring a barrier could describe the type of barrier, such as a solid fence with the intention of mitigating sound, but it would not be possible to guarantee that no sound would escape.

Schneider was concerned with special events creating too much noise. He suggested adding a six-foot screening fence on the property line on the south side from the edge of the building to screen the patio, traffic, and parking area. It would be a better investment to provide sound mitigation and block light.

Wagner noted that the number of special events would be restricted to three days each year. A fence may detract from the ambience. He thought a barrier surrounding the patio could be a tasteful part of the look and feel of the renovation of the center and would make more sense.

Allendorf agreed. He suggested a condition requiring a barrier south of the outdoor patio to be approved by planning staff. Wischnack clarified that each event could last up to two days, for a total of six days a year.

Bergstedt is thrilled with the proposal. It would provide unique repurposing and a new level of vitality and energy to the Glen Lake area. He is concerned with building fences for the sake of building fences because they have to be maintained over a long time. He thanked John Kraemer for his service to the community.

Wischnack reviewed the ordinance and regulations regarding odor. Staff would work with the HVAC contractor to try to mitigate odor as best as possible, but adding a condition would not be feasible since it may not be possible to eliminate all odor.
Wiersum confirmed with Gordon that staff talked to staff of cities with breweries. The only complaints received from neighbors were related to parking.

Bergstedt moved, Allendorf seconded a motion to adopt resolution 2016-122, a conditional use permit with variances for a microbrewery and taproom with outdoor seating area at 14625 Excelsior Boulevard; and grant the license. All voted “yes.” Motion carried.

D. Resolution authorizing and affirming the issuance, sale, and delivery of multifamily housing revenue bonds for the benefit of CHC Minnetonka Affordable Housing LLC and authorizing the execution and delivery of related documents.

Wischnack provided the staff report.

Acomb asked why HUD financing did not come through. Julie Eddington, Kennedy and Graven, explained that HUD denied the application. There are new personnel in the Minnesota office who have different expectations. The project will move forward with two publicly-offered bonds.

The public hearing was opened.

Jay Jensen, of Shelter Corporation, 1600 Hopkins Crossroad, stated that he appreciates the support and patience from staff and councilmembers. He is hoping to close and start construction in early December.

No additional testimony was submitted and the hearing was closed.

Wagner moved, Wiersum seconded a motion to hold the public hearing and adopt resolution 2016-123 authorizing the execution of related documents that include: Bond Series A documents and Bond Series B documents. All voted “yes.” Motion carried.

E. Public hearing and resolution approving the issuance by the city of Lilydale, Minnesota of its non-profit facility revenue note for Relate Counseling.

Wischnack provided the staff report.

The public hearing was opened. No testimony was submitted and the hearing was closed.
Allendorf moved, Bergstedt seconded a motion to adopt resolution 2016-124 approving the issuance by the city of Lilydale, Minnesota of its non-profit facility revenue note for Relate Counseling. All voted “yes.” Motion carried.

14. Other Business:

Wagner was absent for the remainder of the meeting.

A. Resolution for the 2017 Street Rehabilitation project, Crosby Road area.

City Engineer Will Manchester provided the staff report.

Luke Van Santen, 2148 Sheridan Hills Road, stated that:

- The city does quality work rebuilding roads.
- He and his family walk and bike in the area often. He requested bike lanes be included or as wide a lane as possible to enhance safety for bikers along Crosby Road.
- He preferred mountable curb for the entire project, but if that would not be possible at least between Portico Drive and 2009 Crosby Road to allow turtles and other small animals to cross more safely.
- He asked for a posted speed limit of 25 miles per hour on Crosby Road.
- He requested a cross walk at McGinty Road West because that is a connection point.
- The next opportunity to make improvements to the road would not be for 20 to 25 years.

Manchester would look at the area Mr. Van Santen suggested and consider surmountable curb. Manchester estimated an additional three feet of width would be available on each side of the proposed road. Options could be look at.

Schneider noted that the speed limit for the proposed city street would be 30 miles per hour.

Wiersum questioned if it would be possible to square the intersection of Crosby Road and McGinty Road West. There is a need to make the intersection safer.
Wiersum moved, Acomb seconded a motion to adopt resolution 2016-125 receiving the feasibility report, ordering the improvements, authorizing preparation of plans and specifications, and authorizing easement acquisition for the 2017 street reconstruction Crosby Road area Project No. 17401. Acomb, Allendorf, Bergstedt, Wiersum, Ellingson, and Schneider voted “yes.” Wagner was excused. Motion carried.

B. Preliminary plat of Mayfair at Copperfield, a three-lot residential subdivision with lot access variance, at 14700 Copperfield Place.

Gordon provided the staff report.

Allendorf asked how large a house could be built on one lot. Gordon estimated 20,000 square feet.

Wiersum asked how many lots in the area are below 22,000 square feet in size. Gordon counted 22 lots.

Elizabeth Wright, 13564 Westernesse Road, applicant, stated that:

- She has lived in Minnetonka her entire life.
- The driveway would be 18-feet wide. At the fire marshal’s request, the driveway would be made of asphalt instead of pavers.
- The driveway would have a turn around and service all three residences. Four houses share a driveway on Old Wood Court which is adjacent, behind the site and was built in 1978. The average width of driveways on Old Wood Court are between 22 feet and 27 feet wide. The driveway across the street from the site is 21 feet wide and the driveway across from the proposed houses is 26 feet wide. The driveway next to the pond is 23 feet wide.
- There are numerous cul-de-sacs in the area. The proposal is the same as the existing enclaves made up of three or four houses. The proposal would fit with the size of lots and cul-de-sacs currently on Copperfield Place. The proposed houses would be safer and be a continuation of the plan when it was originally developed.
- The proposal meets all of Minnetonka’s ordinance requirements. The lot sizes would be appropriate, fewer trees than allowed would be removed, and the new houses would be restricted to 4,400 and 4,900 square feet in size.
• If the proposed driveway location would not be approved, then three separate driveways would be created with one located on McGinty Road.
• The proposal would provide the best continuity for the neighborhood and use for the land.

Karen Ring, 14741 Copperfield Place, stated that:
• The proposal is a lot behind a lot. There would be no frontage on Copperfield Place. That is not in keeping with the neighborhood.
• The driveways on Old Wood Court only share a curb cut and a few feet of pavement. That is different than the proposed driveways. The proposal would almost be a mini cul-de-sac. It would not meet the size of the other cul-de-sacs. It would create a lot-behind-lot affect.
• None of the other lots include a pond.
• She was concerned with overflow parking on Copperfield Place.
• The property could still have a use without a variance. The variance is for the convenience of the developer.

Brian Loushine, 14721 Copperfield Place, stated that:
• The proposal would remove trees and he would have to look at two houses.
• He wants the houses to be in the unique, classic style of the rest of the neighborhood.
• He requested that the application be denied.

Monya Johnson, 14811 Copperfield Place, stated that:
• She was concerned with the traffic congestion and safety of the neighborhood. The east access has a better sight line where McGinty Road meets Copperfield Place because the west access has an obstructed view due to the curve.
• From 7 a.m. to 9 a.m., 30 to 50 drivers turn east at that intersection. There is already a lot of traffic. Traffic would be increased by 300 percent. It is also congested from 4 p.m. to 6 p.m.
• She requested the variance be denied.
Tom Jaeger, 14506 McGinty Road West, stated that:

- The city has no obligation to maximize the developer's profit.
- The proposal does not complement the community.
- He questioned if the structure on the lot adjacent to his property would meet setback requirements and if all wetland protection requirements would be met.

Ken Novak, 14801 Copperfield Place, stated that:

- He did not like the design. The houses would be jammed together and face each other.
- He did not want both new houses to have their driveway on Copperfield Place.
- The new lots would be treeless.

Nancy Torrison, 2821 Mayfield Place, stated that:

- She picked her house because of the nice view of the pond.
- The proposal would affect her property's value since the backs of houses would be visible from her property.

Dan Mord, 14831 Copperfield Place, stated that:

- He was surprised that the calculation of the property's size includes the pond.
- The proposal does not meet the character of the neighborhood because of the perceived size of the lots.

Andy Barenburg, Plymouth resident, stated that:

- The proposal meets buildable area requirements.
- All of the front lot lines are parallel on Copperfield Road and the houses would be 10 to 15 away from each other. The proposal would have larger setbacks than the existing residences.
- The setback from the pond and wetland buffer requirements would be met.
- There are 30 existing houses and adding two houses would not increase traffic by 300 percent. The homeowners would be located closer to McGinty Road than any other resident; therefore, they would not drive passed the other houses on Copperfield Road to access McGinty Road.
Michelle Nelson, 14711 Copperfield Place, stated that:

- She was concerned that there would be additional garbage and recycling cans on pick up day.
- She was concerned with what the houses would look like.
- She was concerned that the lots would be sold to whoever could pay for them.
- The city has no control over what size and type of houses would be built.
- Trees would be removed and the lots would be bare.

Wiersum sympathized with many of the comments. He knew that a proposal to create one new lot would have its own set of issues. Regardless of who owns the property, the proposal conforms to ordinance regulations. He could not find an objective, legal rationale to deny the proposal.

Allendorf noted that the proposal meets all ordinance requirements and would have been approved without review by the city council if not for the driveway variance request. He pointed out the location of the driveway on the compliant plat exhibit. The proposed location of the driveway would be safer and the variance makes an awful lot of sense. The neighbors he spoke to were not objecting to the location of the driveway, but to two houses being built. The creation of one lot would allow a mansion to be built that would be out of character with every house on Copperfield Place. The proposal would allow the creation of two lots and restrict the size of the houses to up to 4,400 square feet and 4,900 square feet which would be in character with the neighborhood. The buildable area of both of the two proposed lots would meet all ordinance requirements. The new houses would not be positioned one behind the other and both would have street frontage. He did not see a reason to deny the application. He supported staff’s recommendation.

Acomb stated that a property owner has rights. The sizes of the proposed lots and buildable areas meet ordinance requirements and are similar to the character of the neighborhood. There have been proposals that she voted against because they did not fit the character of the neighborhood. The proposal is representative of the lots in the neighborhood. She understood that change is hard. She could not find a reason to legally deny the application.

Ellingson stated that the only issue is the variance to relocate the driveway. The proposal is the best option for the location of the driveways
from a traffic, safety, and design point of view. The size and number of lots complies with ordinance regulations.

Bergstedt said that two new houses would change the character of the neighborhood somewhat, but there is no legal reason to deny the application.

Schneider concurred. The proposed location of the driveway would be the best option and a private turn around next to a very nice house would generate a better design and quality of houses that would fit appropriately on the site. Trees would be removed, but new trees may be planted and five to eight years from now the two residences would fit. He agreed that there is no basis for denial. It would be preferable to have the shared driveway in the proposed location than to have one driveway access McGinty Road West.

Barone clarified that a two-thirds vote of the council is needed to pass a motion to approve the application.

Allendorf moved, Acomb seconded a motion to adopt resolution 2016-126 approving Mayfair at Copperfield. Acomb, Allendorf, Bergstedt, Wiersum, and Schneider voted "yes." Ellingson voted "no." Wagner was excused. Motion carried.

C. Items concerning The Enclave at Regal Oak at 3639 Shady Oak Road and 3627 Regal Oak Lane:

1) Ordinance rezoning the properties from R-1 to PUD;
2) Master Development plan; and
3) Preliminary and final plats.

This item was removed from the agenda at the applicant's request.

D. Concept plan review for a Williston water tower monopole.

Gordon provided the staff report.

Allendorf did not object to the proposal, but asked if Towerhill Park's reservoir would be a good location for a monopole. It would not be as noticeable. Gordon explained that the location of the reservoir and area topography would not make it feasible.
Wiersum understood the limitations of placing the antennae on top of the water tower. He asked if there is another option on the water tower that could work. He found the monopole unsightly. He questioned the need for it.

Gordon explained that the issue is the height needed for the antennae to be effective. Wischnack explained the reasons why other options had been disqualified. The height is needed. The question is where to locate the monopole. The proposal is the best solution.

Wiersum asked if there would be technology in the future that would make monopoles irrelevant. It is amazing how creative people can be when told "no." He did not want to settle for this. He wanted to see if there is a better solution to the eye pollution. Gordon stated that technology is evolving. There is a trend to use more antennae that cover smaller sites. He could not predict how long there would be a need for monopoles.

Bergstedt asked if the city has a legal obligation to help a cell phone company. Gordon explained that the Federal Communications Commission does obligate governments to not inhibit the use and delivery of communication services. Bergstedt noted that the proposal would locate the monopole on public property. He asked if it would change anything if the proposed site would be privately owned. Gordon answered in the negative. Wischnack clarified that the city has the authority to allow or deny the monopole as the property owner of the proposed site. The applicant could apply to locate a monopole somewhere else.

Gordon noted that the organization of the equipment on the water tower follows the city's policy. Changing the policy could be revisited, but that has been done before and the policy remained the same.

Schneider said that the proposal could be a lot worse. The city is obligated to allow something to happen. Having some ability to control the design, location, and configuration while gaining a substantial amount of revenue may not be such a bad idea. After a while, a person would get used to seeing the tower. The water tower is more unsightly than the monopole. The lease would be for a defined amount of time. He saw a trend of residents discontinuing their land lines. Having the best location, utilizing a stealth pole, and the city receiving the revenue may be the best scenario.

Acomb agreed that the trend is to discontinue land-line telephones. Requiring colocation with another provider could be a condition of approval to prevent redundancy. City Attorney Corrine Heine explained that the details of the negotiation have not taken place yet. The city would
require the facility to be capable of colocation and would require colocation as owner and proprietor of the site. In addition, in the zoning ordinance, the city requires an applicant to colocate telecommunications equipment if the applicant is able to obtain the same coverage area by colocation.

Wiersum anticipated that cell use will continue to grow. The proliferation of need should be discussed. He would like to have a thought-out approach to determine where in the city the antennae and equipment would have the least amount of impact.

Bergstedt understood that no one loves monopoles. The location recommended by staff is one of the highest points in Hennepin County and city-owned property. Without the water tower, a monopole would stick out visually a lot more. People will notice the monopole initially, but within a few months, it would blend into the water tower and wooded backdrop. From the proposed site, there is a steep topographic drop traveling toward Glen Lake and Eden Prairie. He saw the service as one needed by the residents of Minnetonka. He is not enamored with the monopole, but delaying action on the application to have time to create a policy does not make sense. The proposal is the best option available.

Allendorf stated that it is inevitable that the monopole would be built. He agrees that it would disappear over time. He suggested moving it more to the east, away from Williston Road. Gordon explained that water lines are buried in that space.

Schneider suggested moving the monopole 20 feet into the trees and planting new trees around it so it would not be as visible without looking up.

Acomb suggested locating the monopole on the edge of the trees and planting additional trees around it.

Gary Lysiak, Owl Engineering, city consultant, stated that:

- The federal government prevents telecommunication companies from talking to each other.
- After looking at the coverage maps, he agrees that the antennae must be at the proposed height or taller.
- His analysis looks at each provider separately. It is hard to do a "what if" scenario with any accuracy. He does not recommend it.
- If this proposal would be denied, then Verizon would apply for a monopole on a commercial property in Minnetonka.
Wiersum stated that he voiced his preferences, but understood that something has to be done.

Bergstedt attended the neighborhood meeting where staff reviewed the other sites that had been considered. Every possible site has been considered. This is the best site possible.

Wiersum would be open to considering locating the monopole on private property if it would provide better aesthetics.

15. Appointments and Reappointments: None

16. Adjournment

Schneider moved, Allendorf seconded a motion to adjourn the meeting at 10:26 p.m. All voted "yes." Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,

Lois T. Mason
Deputy City Clerk