Minutes
Minnetonka City Council
Monday, July 11, 2016

1. **Call to Order**
   
   Mayor Terry 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**
   
   Council Members Tony Wagner, Bob Ellingson, Dick Allendorf, Patty Acomb, Brad Wiersum, Tim Bergstedt, and Terry Schneider were present.

4. **Approval of Agenda**
   
   Wiersum moved, Acomb seconded a motion to accept the agenda, as presented. All voted “yes.” **Motion carried.**

5. **Approval of Minutes: June 6 and 27, 2016 regular council meetings**
   
   Allendorf moved, Bergstedt seconded a motion to approve the June 6, 2016 minutes, as presented. Ellingson, Allendorf, Acomb, Wiersum, Bergstedt and Schneider voted “yes.” Wagner abstained. **Motion carried.**

   Allendorf moved, Bergstedt seconded a motion to approve the June 27, 2016 minutes, as presented. Wagner, Ellingson, Allendorf, Acomb, Bergstedt, and Schneider voted “yes.” Wiersum abstained. **Motion carried.**

6. **Special Matters: None**

7. **Reports from City Manager & Council Members**
   
   City Manager Geralyn Barone reported on upcoming events and meetings.

   Assistant City Manager Perry Vetter provided an update on Imagine Minnetonka, the community outreach effort.

   Schneider reported that he attended the Regional Council of Mayors monthly meeting where there was a good presentation about recent police shootings and training and support available. The mayors of St. Anthony, Falcon Heights and St. Paul provided valuable information.
8. Citizens Wishing to Discuss Matters not on the Agenda

Sue Shuff from the Lake Minnetonka Conservation District provided an update on the LMCD’s activities.

Tim Litfin from the Minnetonka School District presented information about this year’s Tour de Tonka.

9. Bids and Purchases:

A. Bids for manhole rehabilitation Phase VII

Barone gave the staff report.

Wiersum moved, Wagner seconded a motion to award contract to Hydro-Klean in the amount of $148,670. All voted “yes.” Motion carried.

10. Consent Agenda – Items Requiring a Majority Vote:

A. Third Amendment to site lease with New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC for Williston Water Tower

Allendorf moved, Acomb seconded a motion to approve the third amendment to site lease agreement. All voted “yes.” Motion carried.

B. Resolution appointing election judges and absentee ballot board for the State Primary on August 9, 2016

Allendorf moved, Acomb seconded a motion to adopt resolution 2016-052 appointing the election judges for the August 9, 2016 State Primary. All voted “yes.” Motion carried.

C. Resolution approving preliminary plat of FRETHAM 18th ADDITION, a three lot subdivision at 12689 and 12701 Lake Street Extension and an unaddressed parcel

Allendorf moved, Acomb seconded a motion to adopt resolution 2016-053 approving the preliminary plat of FRETHAM 18th ADDITION. All voted “yes.” Motion carried.

11. Consent Agenda – Items requiring Five Votes:

A. Agreement with Metropolitan Council for the 2016 Street Rehabilitation project for the Libb’s lake area
Allendorf moved, Bergstedt seconded a motion to approve the construction cooperative agreement with the MCES and amend the Capital Improvements Program (CIP) to appropriately reflect the additional expenditures and offsetting revenues under the agreement. All voted “yes.” Motion carried.

12. Introduction of Ordinances: None

13. Public Hearings:
   A. Temporary on-sale liquor license for The Rotary Club of Excelsior, 5016 Co Rd 101

   Barone gave the staff report.

   Schneider opened the public hearing at 7:01 p.m.

   Molly Swenson from the Excelsior Rotary Club said the club was looking for a new fundraiser when the idea of partnering with Tour de Tonka on an after party came up.

   Schneider closed the public hearing at 7:03 p.m.

   Bergstedt moved, Acomb seconded a motion to hold the public hearing and grant the temporary liquor license in connection with a fundraising event. All voted “yes.” Motion carried.

14. Other Business:
   A. 2017-2021 Capital Improvements Program (CIP)

   Barone gave the staff report.

   Wagner noted earlier in the day he had a discussion with Barone about Robinwood Park and park dedication fees. She reminded him there was a nexus around park dedication fees and usually when a park is constructed it was done in conjunction with a development. He said there were a lot of young families moving into the neighborhood. With additional revenues coming in he suggested constructing the park sooner rather than later. He didn’t want the park to be built after the children who would use it have already grown up.

   Barone noted at the study sessions the council had good discussion about trails and the public safety component of trying to improve walkability to some of the commercial areas in the city.
Schneider said there was a significant shift in philosophy and approach from the county and state regarding safety issues. It used to be including a trail was not a high priority. Now trails are often a high priority in the planning. This might enhance the city’s ability to access grants.

Wiersum moved, Wagner seconded a motion to adopt resolution 2016-054 approving the 2017-2021 Capital Improvements Program. All voted “yes.” Motion carried.

B. Ordinance rezoning a portion of the property at 4301 Highview Place and an adjacent unaddressed parcel from R-1 to R-1A

City Planner Loren Gordon gave the staff report.

Wagner asked if there was a time limit for filing the plat. Gordon said for this particular project there was an application so the filing of the plat would occur fairly quickly. He said the timing of the platting had limitations for when it would expire. The ordinance does not include limitations. Schneider said the council could choose to change the zoning back to R-1 but there would have to be some rationale to do that.

Allendorf said he was confused by some of the wording in the staff report that read, “If the formal plat is substantially consistent with the conceptual plat and meets the lot standards of the R-1A district, the city would be obligated to approve the plat.” He asked if what was before the council was a conceptual plat and if approved, if the council would have any discretion in terms of the density. Gordon said if the council approved the rezoning and the conceptual plat, it would be accepting the level of density. If the final plat was largely consistent with the conceptual plat the council would pretty much be obligated to approve it. Allendorf said he recalled that the council was not comfortable with the density and the discussion included comments about having the applicant look at dropping at least one lot.

Schneider said some of the earlier versions were not looking to rezone to R-1A but included variances. That provided the council with different discretion than the rezoning to R-1A.

Wiersum said when the council sees an R-1 proposal with no variances, the city attorney has informed the council it essentially had to approve the proposal. Similarly, if the council approved this request to rezone to R-1A and the proposal met R-1A standards with no variances, the council would have to approve it.
Schneider said the council had significant discussions with the different iterations of the proposal. He recalled the discussion was going with more than eight lots with smaller lot widths was a reasonable compromise given the area had two major highways as boundaries and the area around this area had smaller lots. He was comfortable with having eight new, hopefully modestly priced, homes.

Bergstedt said the council had looked at multiple proposals. The first proposals were for R-1 zoning with many variances. Originally the developer was looking at 10 new lots and the council was unanimously opposed to that amount of density. The next proposal was for nine new lots and the council thought that too was too much density. Given the two highways it didn't seem feasible to have normal sized lots. When he looked at the broader surrounding area he thought this was a great example where R-1A zoning should be used.

Wagner said he agreed with Bergstedt and Schneider. The project met the city’s criteria. If these were the only sub half-acre lots in the area he would have looked at the proposal differently. He was supportive of the rezoning.

Wiersum said the eight new lots fit into the R-1A zoning designation well. The homes would be somewhat smaller because of the floor area ratio.

Ellingson said the last time the developer was before the council several council members asked that he come back with an eight lot proposal. He noted that there was a lot of opposition from neighbors to the nine and ten lot proposals. There wasn’t that opposition at the planning commission hearing for this eight lot proposal.

Gordon clarified that the approval remains in place until the plat comes in. The ordinance becomes effective upon the approval of the plat.

Wagner moved, Allendorf seconded a motion to adopt ordinance 2016-09 rezoning a portion of the property at 4301 Highview Place and an adjacent unaddressed property from R-1 to R-1A. All voted “yes.” Motion carried.

C. Resolution endorsing the Glen Lake Neighborhood Study

Gordon and Community Development Director Julie Wischnack gave the staff report.

Mark Koegler, Hoisington Koegler Group Inc., presented the study.

Richard Urban, 5625 Eden Prairie Road, said he participated in a lot of the sessions and the report reflects much of what was discussed. The key
piece that was underplayed or missing in the report related to what he considered false choices. He said often the choice presented was between development plan “A” or development plan “B.” There never was a plan “C” that would preserve open space and preserve and maintain the quality of the lake. There would be a cost to this but he thought this was important information to include. He said the open water area of Glen Lake was probably half of what it was 20 years ago. The amount of development shown on the Hennepin County site would make Glen Lake just like Birch Island Lake which is a pond with a lot of cattails.

Jane Telleen, 5625 Eden Prairie Road, said the word “develop” was used 179 times in the study. The term “natural resources” was used eight times sometimes linked with amenities. She didn’t think the environment was just an amenity. She was concerned that the density around the lake would change the wildlife around the lake.

Anne Hossfeld, 14616 Glendale Street, said her family owned the two parcels that comprise the west site. Her mother’s father bought the parcels in 1924 and the family had lived there ever since. She said nowhere in the meeting notices was there any indication that specific properties would be identified and put before the public for discussion. She requested that the information about the west site be removed from the report. Her family does not support the development designs for the property. She intends to live on the property for the rest of her life. She said she has been harmed by the information in the report. Because her property has been targeted, she has to live with the fear for the rest of her life and be continually vigilant about what discussions were going on about her property. She had been in shock since June 20 at the end of the final neighborhood meeting when she began getting phone calls and emails from people surprised that she was planning on redeveloping her property. Her long term fear was if the information was included in the final report it will become the basis for discussions as the next comprehensive guide plan was developed.

Hossfeld said there was no harm to the city in removing the section out of the report. Because her family had no intention to develop, it was unlikely the information would be useful in the foreseeable future. She noted the resolution contained language stating, “The study represents a common vision for future change in the area.” She disagreed because her property was included. She said the study process had been a missed opportunity for the city because she wasn’t asked for her intent for the property. Her mother’s vision for the property, which she agreed with, was that she wanted the property to remain as undeveloped space. She requested the section be removed but suggested if it remained alternative language be included that read: “The west site is located southwest of Excelsior
Boulevard and Eden Prairie Road. It is a large contiguous piece of land with an old farmstead situated in the center of the site. The property owners recognize the historical and unique character of this wooded property and have expressed their intention not to develop their site. The city floated some higher density housing plans during the study but given the owners don’t plan to develop and wish for privacy, the city recognizes the value as well, of retaining some of the last open pockets of original green space in Glen Lake. They have historical value as well as social and community value and serve as refuge for many types of wildlife that enrich the lives of Glen Lake residents.”

Bill George, 13519 South Street, said the development plan didn’t include science behind the plan. The lake was very unique to the city. Nothing had been investigated or brought forward as far as the hydrology. He believed the amount of hard cover contributed to the springs that weed the lake. If the lake becomes lower because of development he questioned how this would impact the aquifer underneath as well as the wells. He recommended that some type of environmental impact statement be done to investigate the hydrology and the environmental aspect to the bird migration. He said the city should look to White Bear Lake as an example of all the costs involved because of the lowering of that lake.

Annette Bertelsen, 13513 Larkin Drive, asked that the information about the Hennepin County site be removed from this study and instead be looked at in a broader visioning process. The site is 146 acres. The same lens used for the Glen Lake study of how properties could be developed for residential housing was applied to the Hennepin County property as well. She said it seemed the city moved really fast to a high development, high density scenario in the study. There were a lot of great ideas for the property that were discussed during the process that were not included in the final vision. She questioned if 146 acres of community owned property should only have a small neighborhood perspective given to it or if the whole community should be looking at it.

Lee Kaphingst, 5109 Beacon Hill Road, said if one looked at the glacial geology of the Hennepin County property area, it would be a challenge in terms of putting in footing for homes. Several years back the city approved the building of several very nice houses at the north edge of Beacon Hill. There was a big drain that went into the pond. A heavy rain flooded the pond and some of the existing homes. There was now a pipe that went to the east. With all the homes’ beautiful yards that are chemically maintained he said soon he would be able to walk across the pond. He questioned if a similar thing would happen with Glen Lake if there were a lot of homes added. He noted there were a number of retired residents living on a fixed income as well as young people crushed with college
debt. When looking at things like doing an entry feature for Williston Road such as a gateway or place-making element to announce arrival into the Glen Lake area, it was important to keep in mind it would be paid for with taxes. He said when he brings visitors around the city they do not notice things like parking lots and buildings but instead notice the big lots and beautiful trees.

Jane Stowers, 14319 Stewart Lane, said the traffic on Stewart Lane was already horrible. Zvago will add more traffic and bringing in townhomes or single family homes on the east site would only make the problem worse. Her other concern was there were a lot of beautiful mature trees on the east site. In order for it to be developed every single tree likely would have to come down.

Keith Weigel, 14209 Glen Lake Drive, said his spirit, his wallet, his happiness, his personality, and his faith in representative government had all paid a heavy price. He learned he can’t fight city hall. He asked if the council did nothing else, at least it should grant Hossfeld’s request because a person in the United States should not have to ask to get off a list that puts her property up for sale. At the planning commission hearing it was stated that Glen Lake was tired, some places obsolete, blighted, needed a face lift. There were comprehensive guide plan discussions, rezoning from R-1 to R-5 with variances still needed. Then there was eminent domain abuse. He asked how the people who will have to give up their homes would be fairly compensated. He agreed with Stowers that the trees should be preserved. He suggested adding a veteran’s memorial because there likely were several veterans living in the senior facilities. He hoped notices would be sent to Zvago, Glen Oaks, and St. Therese residents. He questioned if the council would approve variances for the Hennepin County site similar to the variances that were approved for Zvago. He questioned if the study process was merely an effort to make the neighbors feel good.

Joan Hiller, 5638 Glen Avenue, asked the rationale behind rushing the approval of the study. There had not been a stable containment area, a stable set of boundaries used during the five meetings. She said the council should take a step back and think things through. The original plan for Glen Lake was to have an apartment building and condos. The units were not restricted to any age. However what was approved was senior housing only. This didn’t allow the city to bring in young people. Because the area was redlined for seniors the focus should be on the other areas. When it came to the county’s site the only option she ever saw was for housing. She suggested exploring putting a college campus with a convention and training center on the site. Some of the natural features of the site could be incorporated into the design. She said the plan doesn’t
allow for that type of flexibility. She suggested the city look at building the convention and training facility to generate revenue.

Hiller said she had experience with what happens when a person’s property was identified by developers and told by the city that the property was going to be subdivided. In 1999 she and her family moved in and started receiving phone calls asking if she was interested in subdividing the property. After a number of calls she inquired who informed the developer that she might be interested in selling. She was told it was the city planner. This put a target on her family’s back. Now she was watching the city start put the same target on Hossfeld’s back. She suggested not endorsing the study but instead officially saying the council would take the study under advisement. This preserved the hard work that had been done, and the work was recognized and valued, but would not start the city down the path where people point to information in the study as being the plan for the area.

Schneider said it was difficult for him to think the process as being rushed since the work had been going on for eight years. There had been a very patient evolution of dialogue, thought and public hearings. What was being done was basically saying the study made sense. It was not being adopted or made formal. It was an evolution of the process that recognized change was inherent in all the city’s activities. He said the city could just wait to see what happens or try to be proactive and look at what the consequences might be. A good example was the Hennepin County property and the path that the county was on in consolidating the home schools. By statute, when the county has an excess piece of land used for public purpose, the county was required to put it on the market for the highest and best use. He said there would be many developers bidding for the property. The county was obligated to sell it for the best price. His preference was for the council to get ahead of that in order to establish perimeters about what the expectations might be. The study was a document that would help inform future councils as to what the dialogue was and position of the council was at the time.

Hiller asked if what was being voted on was the housing only option and if this meant that was the only option the council was willing to accept at this time. Schneider said the city asked the consultant to come up with some reasonable alternatives for the site that would give some indication what the impacts would be under different scenarios. This would allow the council to consider if something was way too dense or if something could possibly be approved at some point. It was a study based on a consultant’s best expectations of the highest and best use based on the zoning ordinances. The council was not adopting what was in the study.
Hiller asked for clarification on what “endorsing” the study meant. Schneider said he had the same question and the council would discuss it.

Schneider called a recess at 9:16 p.m. He called the meeting back to order at 9:25 p.m.

Wagner noted a comment that was made raised the question if one section of the plan involving the Hennepin County site should be viewed in a broader study. In his time on the council the biggest property that was looked at was the Jondahl property that was one seventh of the Hennepin County property. As the city goes through its Imagine Minnetonka process the conversation could be adjusted to indicate what was in this study was the initial housing view but different views could now be looked at as part of that process.

Acomb said she thought the Hennepin County site should be included in this study and also should be looked at more in depth. Comments were made about keeping it in a natural state and what the cost of that might be. She thought this was worth having a discussion about.

Allendorf thought the property should be included in this study because it was part of the area being studied. He thought every parcel in the area being studied should be included because that’s part of the planning process. He said the sale of the Hennepin County property was so far in the future and the city had so little control over what happens, that to focus on it when what was being studied was the Glen Lake area as a whole, diverted attention from whether the council should endorse or accept the study. The options discussed for the Hennepin County property were so diverse that they recognized that the piece of property would require a concentrated study of its own over a period of time.

Wiersum said the Hennepin County property was a large part of the Glen Lake area and to take it out of the study would make the study incomplete. Nobody believed this would be the last study of what could be done with the property. There were many options for the property. One option was housing. Another might be a major corporate headquarters. The options that exist were extremely broad. What was being discussed in the study were concepts and not a prescriptive plan for what would happen to the property. He said the idea of a regional park was nice but it was doubtful someone would pay for that.

Wiersum said no study of the Glen Lake area was complete without consideration of the lake itself. It was the amenity that made the community. Some years ago the council discussed the health of the lakes in the city. The largest lake, Lake Minnetonka was getting healthier. All the
other lakes were not. He thought realistically understanding what the future of Glen Lake was, was an important part of what needed to be looked at. His fear was the lake was disappearing and he wanted to know if there was anything that could be done to prevent that. Understanding this might have a big impact on the types of things the city considers for the area. He thought the ecological aspect of Glen Lake, which was not included in the study, needed to be considered as the area was looked at in the future.

Schneider agreed that even though the hydrology was not part of the study, it was part of the evolution of the Glen Lake area. The city wanted to do whatever was feasible to protect or enhance the quality of the lake. This had to be based on science and not wishful thinking. It was not known if the issue was spring fed or surface water. He was guessing it was both. He had seen enough pictures of the lakes over time in the area that were not super deep that had a fairly broad watershed. The lakes eventually nitrify into wetlands. This happens naturally over time with the process accelerated by fertilizers and other things. If there were scientific ways to maintain or preserve a lake those would have to be at the top of the list of requirements included for any developments around the lake.

Allendorf said when Jim Miller was the city manager 22 years ago, he had the University of Minnesota do a study of Glen Lake. At that time the neighbors were accusing the city of allowing a lot of development to go on that was draining the lake. Allendorf said he was hoping that the formal study the city paid for was still available and that it might be beneficial to get the University to do an update of the study. Wischnack noted last summer the city’s water resources engineer researched the history and evolution of the lake.

Wagner said even though the council knew buying the Hennepin County property was not realistically feasible, he wasn’t sure residents knew that as well. He thought it would be beneficial to get cost information. He thought the conversation about the property should be a part of this study. The narrative could be changed to say these were some housing alternatives but the city believed there would be broader conversation over many years as more information about the property comes out.

Acomb agreed that if the city had cost information then it would be easy to justify why purchasing the property wasn’t the responsible thing to do.

Ellingson said he was glad the Hennepin County property was included in the study. One concern he had was the recommendation was inconsistent with the residents’ comments. Every comment indicated a wish for a park, open space or recreational use. He lived in the Glen Lake area for 22
years and he hasn’t met a single person who said they wanted high density housing on the property. He said comments had been made that since the county owned the property, the city had no say in what would happen. Yet for every other property, the city always thought it had some say. The property was currently guided for institutional use and would have to be re-guided. How it was guided and zoned was the city’s decision and not the county’s. The plan indicated 40 percent of the land would be open space. This was to let the county know that some of the land could not be built on.

Bergstedt agreed the Hennepin County site should be included in the neighborhood study. At the same time there was so much uncertainty about the site, and given the size of the parcel and all the potential uses, it would require a community process to figure out the best use and the city’s role. He didn’t want that piece to dominate the rest of the discussion. The city needed to focus on the Glen Lake neighborhood study.

Allendorf noted a couple of comments were about always having a no build alternative. The east property, for example, didn’t have to be built on as articulated in the study. Not every parcel had to be built on. It was fundamental that not every parcel had to be built out to its highest density.

Schneider asked staff to comment on the questions about if the resolution was legally binding on any of the properties. City Attorney Corrine Heine said the document was a planning study and guide but was not being proposed to be adopted as an official control. It does not determine the zoning of the property and was not an amendment to the comprehensive plan. The zoning code and comprehensive plan govern any development of the property.

Acomb said her preference was to remove the west parcel from the study. She said this was because Hossfeld had asked that it be removed. Acomb said she understood the study was a planning tool and was not intended to be anything concrete or binding but she thought it was disrespectful to include the property when Hossfeld had asked for it to be removed. She said if a resident was asking for something regarding their property from the city, the city should be respectful of the request.

Bergstedt said his initial concern with excluding the west side was if one property was allowed to be excluded, what would happen if other property owners requested their properties be excluded as well. All of sudden the neighborhood study would look like swiss cheese. He said listening to Hossfeld he thought there was a real desire for the family to stay on the property for the long term. If the property was not excluded there would be so many declarations on multiple pages indicating the property owner did
not want the property to be developed. He wasn’t sure what would be gained by leaving it in.

Allendorf said to not include the west parcel would mean having an incomplete study area. He said he could support including Hossfeld’s suggested amended language to the narrative if the parcel was to be left into the study. This would tell everybody who looked at the study that the area was looked at but provide information about its current state and the state it would remain in for the long term.

Wagner agreed with Allendorf. He further suggested language could be included indicating multiple housing options were looked at. He would leave the parcel in the study but highly outline the language Hossfeld suggested. He noted when there were projects in his district along County Road 73 and I394, the language in the previous studies of the Syngenta site informed the council’s discussion. For him, the language included in the studies matters and the council should respect Hossfeld’s request.

Wiersum said he truly believed Hossfeld did not want to sell the property. It was a part of her family and was a very personal and emotional issue for her and her family. He thought the language she proposed was good. He agreed removing the parcel would diminish the study but part of the study should include a fair disclaimer that this property owner intends to not develop or sell the site.

Ellingson said he thought the property should be removed from the study. The study was already public information. Nothing would be lost by not including it in the study. The issue was how the city treated residents. The city would learn from its mistake of not initially letting Hossfeld know her property was going to be included in the study.

Schneider said he thought there was some accommodation that needed to be made to keep the property in the study acknowledging it was a large property adjacent to the lake while coming up with some wording similar to what Hossfeld suggested. This would inform developers that the property was not available. His inclination was to remove the vignettes while keeping the narrative and including language similar to what Hossfeld suggested. Acomb said she would be OK with that approach. Allendorf said he also liked Hossfeld’s suggestion of removing the word “common” from the portion of the resolution that reads, “The outcome of the Glen Lake Neighborhood study is a document to guide future discussions for change in the neighborhood. The study represents a common vision for future change in the area.”
Wagner said he wasn’t even sure he would use the word “vision.” Saying this was a selection of resident feedback through a formal process was more accurate than it was to say it was a true vision of the area. A very large parcel was included even though it was being set to the side, but looking at the map he questioned what was truly left. The west side and Hennepin County’s site would not be commented on. The central area was an area that was no longer collective. This left one slice of property in the middle. Using the term vision was a pretty strong statement. This was a collection of feedback that was going to guide future development discussions. Using vision with such large pieces of property set aside sets a tone that he didn’t think the document represented.

Wiersum said he liked Wagner’s comments. In documents like this one, words were exceedingly important. The council wanted to be very clear this wasn’t a prescriptive plan. When he uses the word “vision” he thinks of consensus. When he works on vision for a strategic plan, the people involved coalesce around a consensus for the vision. While the council had heard from several Glen Lake residents, to use the word consensus would be misspeaking. He agreed “vision” was too strong.

Allendorf noted from 2003-2015 he attended a number of sessions, with 50-60 people in each session, and he bet that for half of the sessions things begin by stating it was a visioning session for what Glen Lake was going to become. He wondered why he and all those people attended those sessions if what was being done now was watering down the vision or feedback that was given.

Schneider said using the term “common vision” was overstating what was being achieved with the study. There was agreement to remove the word common but there was a question about whose vision it was. Saying it was just a list of feedback recalled the days when the facilitator captured a list of everybody’s comments. This wasn’t all that useful until the evolution of the process where certain desired levels of density in certain areas was identified from the comments. This document was more than a collection of comments but probably something less than a vision. He said what the study was really trying to do was establish a framework for further discussion. The study was a good framework that captured the feedback that was received layered by what things might look like based on the feedback. It was something the council could work with that wasn’t cast in stone.

Schneider asked if the term “endorsed” had been used with past studies. Wischnack indicated it had been used many times including for the Highway 7 and County Road 101 study and also for the Shady Oak Road station area study. Schneider said he thought there needed to be some
discussion about what the word “endorsed” meant. He said it probably meant something similar to “support” but was not the same thing as “accept” and was definitely not “adopt.” It meant the study had some substance to it and was valued for further discussion. Barone said Heine’s comments about the study not being legally binding were also helpful.

Ellingson said he would be more comfortable saying the council “received” the study. He said in 2003 the council received a report and then ignored it. Schneider said it was a different process in those days. There was no intent to formalize that as a common document. This study was part of a multi-year project. He said for him to say the council “received” this report was a slight and meant the study was meaningless.

Allendorf said he sensed where the council was going was to ask staff to take the council’s comments and put them into a form that could be brought back.

Wiersum said he liked Schneider’s suggestion of using the word “framework.” He thought endorsing a framework was a lot easier than endorsing a vision.

Schneider suggested including language in the study in the Hennepin County site section indicating what was in the study was a scenario that may be feasible and that future effort on the site would require community wide involvement. He would also include language about developing an analysis about what could be done to protect and enhance the lake.

Wagner moved, Acomb seconded refer the item back to staff. All voted “yes.” Motion carried.

15. Appointments and Reappointments: None

16. Adjournment

Wiersum moved, Acomb seconded a motion to adjourn the meeting at 10:27 p.m. All voted “yes.” Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,

David E. Maeda
City Clerk