

**WORKSHOP MINUTES  
OAKDALE CITY COUNCIL  
October 11, 2022**

The City Council held a workshop on Tuesday, October 11, 2022 at Oakdale City Hall, 1584 Hadley Avenue North, Oakdale, Minnesota. The meeting began at 5:00 PM.

**Present:** Mayor Paul Reinke

**Council Members:** Jake Ingebrigtsen  
Susan Olson  
Colleen Swedberg

**Absent:** Kevin Zabel

**City Staff Members:** Christina Volkens, City Administrator  
Katie Robinson, Deputy City Clerk  
Sara Ludwig, City Clerk  
Andrew Gitzlaff, Community Development Director  
Brian Bachmeier, Interim City Engineer  
Jason Zimmerman, Finance Director  
Jim Romanik, Public Works Manager  
Jim Thompson, City Attorney  
Julie Williams, Recreation Superintendent  
Kevin Wold, Fire Chief  
Lori Pulkrabek, Communications Manager  
Luke McClanahan, City Planner  
Nick Newton, Police Chief

**Other:** Andy Morcomb, Guest (Council Candidate)

Prior to any presentations and/or discussion, Mayor Reinke reminded the Council, staff and guests these workshop meetings are for information gathering, question clarifying, and no decision making will be made as a Council body.

**PROPOSED ORDINANCE AMENDMENT FOR BREWERIES AND DISTILLERIES**

City Planner Luke McClanahan presented on the proposed ordinance amendment for breweries and distilleries.

He started the discussion with relevant background on an approved Chapter 10 amendment from 2021 that defines and licenses “micro distilleries” and “distilled spirits”. He clarified that the aforementioned are different from breweries. He also referenced the recently proposed concept plan for a brewery that is associated with HOM Furniture.

He presented two options for consideration by the Council.

- Option 1 - Amend Chapter 10.03 and 10.04 of the Oakdale City Code of Ordinances. This would define breweries and establish a licensing type similar to what has been done for micro distilleries. A conditional use permit would still be required for a brewery in the C2

district. (Note: adding a conditional use permit would allow for the addition of certain restrictions such as hours of operation and /or square footage.)

- Option 2 - Amend Chapter 10 and Chapter 25, Article 13 of the Oakdale City Code of Ordinances to allow breweries as a permitted (i.e., by-right) use in the C2 district. If breweries are defined as a permitted use, only Site Plan approval would be required. The City would not be able to add conditions.

He then asked for direction from the City Council on the proposed options.

Mayor Reinke asked about the language found in Chapter 10, Section 10-05 in reference to persons that are eligible for a retail license.

City Administrator Chris Volkens replied stating the language comes verbatim from state statute, Chapter 340A.402.

Mayor Reinke suggested treating a brewery and a distillery like a restaurant, in the sense that restaurants are not regulated except from the zoning code, meaning it is a permitted use in certain zones. The unique aspects of a brewery like outside music, alcohol, and hours of operation will be handled on a licensing aspect or by special request.

Mayor Reinke is in favor of adding both distilleries and breweries to the permitted use category, which is Option 2 as presented by Mr. McClanahan. Council Member Ingebrigtsen agreed and added his sentiment is that less regulation is better. Council Member Olson is in agreeance with Mayor Reinke and Council Member Ingebrigtsen. Council Member Swedberg originally felt Option 1 was the better choice, however after hearing Mayor Reinke's thoughts she does agree with the others about selecting Option 2.

Mayor Reinke noted that Option 2 allows the market to regulate viability of these establishments.

Council Member Ingebrigtsen added that limiting the number of these establishments would limit the number of people coming to the City of Oakdale and the people who are visiting these establishments are also buying food and gas within the City.

Ms. Volkens clarified with the group that the Council is in favor of moving distilleries by supporting Option 2.

Community Development Director Andrew Gitzlaff asked to get clarity from the Council about the current permitted use definition. He explained that HOM Furniture was planning outdoor dining and activity areas, and it had been proposed to treat that as a conditional use because it is not explicitly stated in the ordinance. However, given that the general sentiment is that type of activity is more of a permitted use, and licensing will regulate noise and other externalities, the permitted use definition of brewery would be constructed to also include some accessory outdoor activities. In doing so, this type of activity would not require a conditional use permit. The reason for this suggested change is so that the establishment does not have to come back for a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for another reason beyond being a brewery.

Mayor Reinke asked if there is a way to handle the potential gathering in parking lots as this was a safety concern brought up by Police Chief Nick Newton. He also asked about the access and egress.

Mr. Gitzlaff confirmed that the access and egress would be handled as part of the Site Plan approval. Additionally, any event or gathering held in the parking lot of the establishment would require a special event permit.

Mayor Reinke commented that outdoor seating would be handled as part of the Site Plan process, which may not involve Council.

Mr. Gitzlaff asked if outdoor seating and events is part of the permitted use for a brewery.

Ms. Volkens expressed concern about the suggested permitted use definition for a brewery to include outdoor seating and events. She suggested options should be brought forward for discussion.

Mayor Reinke is in favor of the suggested permitted use definition for a brewery to include outdoor seating and events.

Ms. Volkens asked if the matter had been researched enough and if the Council Members have been provided enough information to share their initial thoughts on the matter.

Mr. Gitzlaff explained that without the change in code and permitted use definition for a brewery, the establishment would require a CUP for outdoor activities.

Council Member Olson asked about the concerns with moving forward with the suggested permitted use definition for a brewery to include outdoor seating and events.

Ms. Volkens explained that with the change in definition, an entirely different use is added automatically without a prior discussion. She also noted that outdoor seating is still being tested.

Mayor Reinke stated that restaurants with outdoor patios are not regulated.

Further discussion ensued about current restaurants that have outdoor seating and whether those restaurants required separate approval for their outdoor seating. Mr. Gitzlaff confirmed it is part of Site Plan approval. He further explained that Council would have the opportunity to review the outdoor activities as part of that process, and if approved, would not require the establishment to come back for a CUP.

Mayor Reinke asked if outside activities, parking, egress, and handicapped parking were considered as part of the Site Plan process.

Council Member Swedberg concluded that if the outside activities are covered in the Site Plan approval then it is okay to change the permitted use definition for breweries.

Mr. Gitzlaff stated the next step is a public hearing at the next Planning Commission, which might include a draft presentation of the proposed changes.

Mayor Reinke stated the sentiment of the present Council Members is in support of the suggested permitted use definition for a brewery to include outdoor seating and events which would be reviewed and considered in the Site Plan approval process.

### **UTILITY BILLING SOFTWARE CONVERSION**

Finance Director Jason Zimmerman began his presentation expressing the importance of a strict timeline in regards to the utility billing software conversion contract and implementation, given the difficulty to get on the vendor's schedule with the proposed implementation date of summer of 2023 and concluding in November of 2023.

He also provided background information on the current software, BillMaster, which is distributed by Data West Utility Technologies. The software has been utilized by the City for over 25 years, with the most current version of the software implemented more than 15 years ago. Generic product support is no longer available, with all calls now being billed at an hourly rate. No enhancements or modifications are currently available.

The limitations of the current software include:

- BillMaster is not directly connected to the City's financial system (Incode) or merchant processor used for electronic payment. Staff is required to complete several journal entries monthly and daily uploads/downloads to accurately reflect transactional detail in Incode and account balances online.
- BillMaster lacks several key features expected with modern utility billing software, including universal rate tables and advanced search functions.
- BillMaster has a very outdated user interface. Windows does not dynamically resize the content to fit the size of the screen, navigation is not intuitive, and reports are difficult to export. Users must be masterful of the software to ensure there are no errors.

Staff recommends entering into a contract with Tyler Technologies for their ERP Pro 10 Utility Billing Software. Some of the key features of the software include:

- Full cash collection and receipting integration with existing Tyler Incode 10 financial software.
- Enhanced citizen/customer service experience with online portal.
- Extensive out-of-the-box reporting and querying functionality.
- Ability to import meter reading data from any third-party system through configurable integration.
- Modern system interface, with navigation via dynamic links that drill down into the application.
- Reports can be exported into more than a dozen formats including PDF, Word, and Excel.
- Flexible rate engine to calculate complex and simple rates without the need for customization.

- Billing based on consumption, flat rate, assessment and installation agreements.
- Multiple bill generation options including email and online presentment.

Mr. Zimmerman stated the one-time fee would be \$60,000 and the recurring fee would be \$13,500, making the Year 1 investment about \$73,000. Although it is becoming less common to purchase software licenses compared to entering into SaaS agreements, due to how this proposed product is priced, the breakeven point would be approximately Year 4. The issue not only lies with having a license, but also with hosting the software. Metro-Inet has the ability to host the product at a lower cost compared to what Tyler Technologies charges to use their servers. Assuming the software is utilized by the City for beyond the breakeven point, staff recommends purchasing the license outright. The current cost for BillMaster is \$8,000 per year, with additional fees for support, which is charged at an hourly rate. On the contrary, Tyler Technologies provides unlimited technical support at no extra charge.

He continued by presenting the more advanced customer service product option, which is Tyler Technologies version of a smart meter portal. This portal adds:

- capabilities to the online bill pay system,
- allows customers to see detailed consumption as it is communicated to radio read access points,
- provides city staff administrative tools related to smart meters, and
- enables users to set up alerts regarding water usage.

With the current configuration of meters and how they are being read, it is about \$10,400 for the smart meter version right now. This cost is prorated based on the ~5,500 meters being read by radio frequency in 15-minute increments. The remaining ~3,600 meters in city households are read manually once per month. It should be noted that the \$10,400 quote is not included in the budget. If this smart meter portal version is something Council would like to pursue then the budget would need to be increased to accommodate this.

Mr. Zimmerman asked Council if they would support the product, support to move forward with the quote, allow staff to come back with a formal ask, and pursue the signing of a contract.

Council Member Ingebrigtson asked if we move forward with this software conversion now will we incur additional costs as the ~3,600 meters are converted at a later date. Ms. Volkens indicated the \$10,400 is a prorated cost for the ~5,500 meters. Mr. Zimmerman added that whenever the conversion happens the cost is going to be prorated based on the number of meters that have the radio frequency feed. Council Member Ingebrigtson followed up by asking which option is cheaper long term. Ms. Volkens stated it is prorated based on the number of customers.

Council Member Olson asked if the \$10,400 was the average yearly cost. Mr. Zimmerman confirmed that it is the yearly cost.

Ms. Volkens stated that if the ~3,600 meters converted over to the smart meter version the yearly cost might increase to ~\$15,000-\$16,000.

Council Member Olson asked if Willowbrooke is automatically going to be on the smart meter version. Mr. Zimmerman indicated it depends on the proximity of the radio tower. Public Works Manager Jim Romanik added that due to the current infrastructure and topography Willowbrooke would not be on the smart meter version. Council Member Ingebrigtsen commented on the poor infrastructure of this technology being utilized in Oakdale. Mr. Zimmerman stated that it is an expensive proposition to outline a city as narrow as Oakdale. This would be a conversation for a later date about replacing the transmitters. Council Member Ingebrigtsen said if the technology is not there currently or not cost effective then there is not much that can be done. Council Member Olson stated everyone should have the same experience when it comes to meter reading.

Mayor Reinke brought up the benefit of improving the current software especially as it relates to reducing internal errors and staffing needs. With the move to an automated system, the need to have an experienced reader of the system is eliminated. Five years from now, relevant staff should be able to do the essential duties within the system.

Mr. Zimmerman recapped a few of the portal features in detail.

Council Member Olson asked if Helmo is part of the smart meter version. Mr. Romanik stated he would have to check on the topography of the area before providing an answer. The nearest meter reader to that area is Tower 4. Mayor Reinke asked if the readers are wired/cabled or if they can be put on top of some of the light poles. Mr. Romanik indicated the light poles are not high enough for the readers.

Mayor Reinke asked the group for a consensus on a desire to have automation where possible, and stated that there is some information that needs to be provided when it comes to Council agenda.

Ms. Volkens summarized that it seems the contract process can move forward as quoted for ~\$73,000, however some of the additional items that need research and follow up should be brought back to Workshop such as adding on the ~\$10,400 advanced customer service product. There was a consensus in favor of Ms. Volkens' summary.

### **REVISED PURCHASING POLICY**

Mr. Zimmerman began by stating Minnesota State Statute 412.271 gives the City Council authority to pay claims on behalf of the City. After review of the current purchasing policy it was determined the limits set were referencing the statute as it was in 1998. The Council can be more restrictive than the statute. Looking back at past practices, the purchasing program was not in line with the purchasing policy. With new auditors coming on it is imperative to establish a new purchasing policy and follow it.

Mr. Zimmerman continued by referencing Section 3.0 – Quick Reference Guide and Additional Notes, which outlines the purchasing thresholds, the quotes and approvals needed, and the payment options. The Quick Reference Guide is an easy way to ensure every department head is on the same page about the process. He reminded the group that the \$25,000-\$174,999 and Greater Than \$175,000 purchase value thresholds/guidelines are in line with state statute.

He moved on to discuss employee expenditures in Section 5.0 – Employee Wellness and Recognition Programs. The City’s insurance program includes a rebate program that encourages employees to participate in wellness activities. Looking specifically at Section 5.5.1, language was drafted to exclude any program that is primarily of a social nature. Council Member Olson asked for an example.

Ms. Volkens provided an example of employees attending a Minnesota Twins baseball game. The insurance company has approved this outing as part of the wellness program for the last two years. She reiterated that Mr. Zimmerman brought this to her attention to bring to Council to ensure they are okay with this type of expenditure.

Council Member Olson said if the insurance company approves it then there is no need to stop these types of activities. Council Member Swedberg and Mayor Reinke agreed.

Mr. Zimmerman moved on to Section 5.6 – Meals and Refreshments and mentioned the current policy does a good job outlining those things.

He moved to Section 6.0 – Payments, which explains what the finance department needs in order to submit payments.

He highlighted Section 7.0 – Prohibited Expenditures, and explained that it is not a complete list.

Council Member Olson asked for clarification about the inclusion of Holiday Decorations on the list.

Ms. Volkens clarified that employees are not reimbursed for holiday decorations bought for the office, but that staff are still able to put up holiday decorations in the office.

She also wanted to make note of the language in Section 7.1, ‘with exceptions only/if as otherwise noted in other City Policy’. She went on to say that if the items listed here are found in other policies, there might be exceptions.

Mr. Zimmerman continued by moving on to Section 6.4, which references Minnesota Statute 412.271. The policy allows purchasing to be delegated by the Council to the city administrative official.

He moved to Section 10.0 – Preapproved Purchases, in which staff compiled a list of contractual accounts for services that are approved as part of the budget process.

Lastly, he touched on Section 13.0 – Ethics / Relations with Vendors, which lists practices employees should avoid when making purchases on behalf of the City.

Council Member Olson asked if finance staff have the ability to pull a current report of budget totals. Mr. Zimmerman confirmed they do.

Mayor Reinke asked if there is a difference between a service or tangible item in reference to the value limitations in Section 3.0. City Attorney Jim Thomson confirmed that no bids are needed on

services that are less than \$175,000. At its current state, any bid or contract or purchase \$25,000 or greater must have Council's approval. He also noted the current values, or any proposed changes to these values, would be at the Council's discretion. Mr. Thomson's opinion is that \$10,000 seems low for delegation. He wanted the group to keep in mind that there are other approvals needed regardless if there is a threshold increase for authority for purchases.

Mayor Reinke is comfortable with Section 3.0 as presented. Council Member Olson is in agreeance due to the current approval process that is required for a check request.

Council Member Swedberg thought \$10,000 was low, but instead of a \$24,999 upper-limit in the second category, she proposed an adjusted upper-limit of either \$14,999 or \$19,999 in the second category (city administrator approval), on a trial basis to get a better understanding of how this process would work with these changes.

Council Member Ingebrigtsen stated he has wanted to change the current \$1,000 threshold for quite some time. The Council should trust the city administrator to spend more than \$1,000. He stated he is comfortable with \$25,000, or an amount a little bit higher.

Mayor Reinke asked if a check request is the same as a wire, and if it was possible to lump all ACH (Automatic Clearing House) payments together. Mr. Zimmerman said it was possible to do so.

Council Member Olson asked for a little better description when putting in the checks for payment so Council can clearly determine what is being paid from the claims list.

Mayor Reinke summarized the concern regarding the current valuation limits and given the current approval process there is no opposition to the updated purchase limits including giving the city administrator \$24,999 in spending authority. If there are concerns down the road, the limits can be revisited.

#### **WILLOWBROOKE PARKS PROGRAMMING, MASTER PLAN AND DESIGN UPDATE**

Mayor Reinke stated staff is requesting direction from Council on the selection of the Base or Base Plus option for each of the three parks within Willowbrooke.

Mr. Gitzlaff recapped sentiment from a previous workshop in July 2022. He reiterated the Council did not support a specific concept or level of amenities and that there was a preference for active use programming in locations where parking is provided. Council was concerned about theft and vandalism. Council was open to phasing improvements over time. He confirmed that splash pads, pools, community centers, dog parks, and skate parks would not be appropriate for Willowbrooke parks.

He stated that since the July 2022 workshop meeting, staff has met with the Parks Commission and Stantec was asked to do additional work to provide justification for the appropriateness of certain amenities within Willowbrooke and to complete a geographic analysis.

Mr. Gitzlaff recapped the location and size of each park for the group. Commons Park is the largest of the three parks at 9.5 acres, and sits in the center of the neighborhood. Neighborhood Park North is just off of 40<sup>th</sup> Street and is 5 acres. Neighborhood Park West is adjacent to I-694 and is 6 acres.

He gave a brief overview of the staff's recommendation of Base Plus for Commons Park. In the planning for Willowbrooke, the Commons Park has always been intended to be a place for community gathering and activities. The intent is to attract other community members in addition to Willowbrooke residents. One of the key features is a central gathering shade structure. The space can be used for performances or different events in addition to picnicking and gathering. The Base Plus concept features a 2-5 year-old playground and a 5-12 year-old playground. Staff recommends adding parent supervision exercise equipment to make the park more multigenerational. One unique feature is the Teen/Adult play area that features an American Ninja Warrior style challenge course. The hammock grove is another unique feature offered in the Base Plus option. Additionally, this option includes a full brick and mortar restroom facility with an attached picnic area.

Mayor Reinke praised the manner in which the park options and budgetary implications were presented to Council in this packet. He clarified that the ask from staff was for Council to decide if it is more important to them to select the Base or Base Plus option for each of the three parks.

Council Member Ingebrigtsen noted the need for a more thorough negotiation when the planning for Willowbrooke was initially taking place in regards to ownership of park development cost. He also noted that the added amenities could wait in his opinion. The project could start with green space only and add amenities later in the CIP. He shared concern with the overall cost of the project.

Ms. Volkens stated the estimated cost was \$5-6 million for all three parks.

Mayor Reinke reminded the group that the estimated value of Willowbrooke once complete is \$330 million for the 200-acre project. Council Member Ingebrigtsen asked when this would be complete. Mayor Reinke noted 25 homes are already complete with Continental filling up fast. Council Member Ingebrigtsen made mention of the increase in interest rates. He also shared his disagreement about expecting the anticipated tax revenue in the next few years due to the financial/economic situation we are in right now.

Council Member Olson asked about the City's legal obligation in regards to the timing of the completion of these parks. Mr. Gitzlaff said the development agreement says the City will build the parks to coincide with the phases of the Willowbrooke development. There is no specific language about what constitutes a park or what amenities must be included. The Commons Park is proposed to start development next year; Neighborhood Park West would break ground in 2024; and Neighborhood Park North would be the last park developed in 2025.

Council Member Olson asked if the City is responsible for the maintenance in the parks. City Attorney Thomson confirmed this. She then asked why the parks have six-foot wide concrete paths, but in other places in the City, Council was told six-foot wide concrete paths could not be maintained in a cost-effective manner. She referenced the Greenway project and the asphalt paths recently designated for there. Council Member Ingebrigtsen mentioned the aforementioned project was in reference to citizens' front yards, and the limitation due to the size of the right of way. Council

Member Olson recalled that the Council was told asphalt was the best option due to cost, maintenance, and the ease of snow blowing. She asked why it is okay for the Willowbrooke parks to have concrete paths, but not the residents along Greenway. Mr. Gitzlaff suggested deferring to Public Works regarding the width of the sidewalks. Council Member Swedberg stated the issue lies in the material used versus the size. Interim City Engineer Brian Bachmeier recalled there was a difference in opinion between engineering staff and community development staff regarding the use of asphalt versus concrete for the Greenway project. Council Member Olson stated her inability to support the use of concrete paths now given the Greenway project decision to have asphalt paths.

Mayor Reinke asked Council Member Olson if she prefers the Base or the Base Plus for Commons Park. Council Member Olson asked about the durability of the sunshades. Council Member Swedberg expressed concern given the recent snow and wind Oakdale has received. Ms. Volkens noted that the sunshades would be taken down for the winter months. Mr. Gitzlaff added that staff will do more research about what removing the sunshades entails and the lifespan of the product. Council Member Ingebrigtsen stated he would defer to staff on the maintenance needs of the sunshades because he trusts their judgment. Council Member Swedberg added the Council needs to do its due diligence by asking questions.

Council Member Olson asked about the material of the picnic tables given their individual cost of \$3,000. Mr. Gitzlaff indicated their cost may be due to their durability. Staff will do further research on the specifics of the picnic tables.

Council Member Olson asked if the exercise equipment is waterproof. Ms. Volkens stated that they do not have an electronic component.

Council Member Olson is supportive of the Base Plus option for Commons Park. Mayor Reinke agreed.

Council Member Swedberg is not in support of the hammock grove. She indicated that without a shade over the area it would not get much use. Her preference would be another amenity in its place. She shared concern about the durability of the hammocks due to overuse. Overall, she is in support of the Base Plus option for Commons Park but would like more information about the sunshades and the hammocks.

Mayor Reinke shared his sentiment about the struggle of trying to reduce vandalism of public park restrooms and amenities, but still providing nice public spaces for residents and the community.

Mayor Reinke noted that the Council was supportive of the staff's recommendation of Base Plus for Commons Park. The community development staff will continue to get data on the sunshades, hammocks, and exercise equipment per the Council's request.

Mr. Gitzlaff continued the presentation by going over the staff's recommendation of Base for Neighborhood Park West. This park is directly south of the Roers project. Staff is researching connections between the two projects due to proximity. This park includes a U12 soccer field that can double as an open lawn space when not being used for games or practices. The cost driver for this park is pickleball. The Base option includes eight pickleball courts with lighting for playing after

dark. In the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) for 2025 at Eberle Park there is pickleball identified in that expansion. The Willowbrooke project will help the City get a sense of the demand for pickleball and look at phasing in additional courts if there is a need. Another amenity of the Base option is a prefabricated restroom building.

Council Member Olson asked if the Base option is selected can a few amenities be added. Ms. Volkens confirmed that is possible. Council Member Olson suggested adding a bocce ball field, table tennis courts, corn hole, and the upgraded restroom facility. Ms. Volkens noted that the prefabricated restroom option has real toilets that run through the City's sewer and water system. There is a \$160,000 difference between the Base restroom option and the Base Plus restroom option.

Mayor Reinke asked if the prefabricated restroom could be expanded into the shelter option later. Mr. Gitzlaff will take this question to Stantec.

Ms. Volkens asked the group their thoughts on the three added amenities suggested by Council Member Olson. Mayor Reinke stated they are not needed at this time.

Council Member Swedberg supports the eight pickleball courts as part of the Base option, and prefers they are grouped together at one park versus spread around the City at multiple parks. She is in agreeance to add the bocce ball fields and the corn hole but is unsure about adding the table tennis courts. She is in favor of the Base option restroom but agrees with Mayor Reinke about his inquiry to see if the shelter portion can be added later.

Council Member Olson shared concern about the need for a bigger restroom given the number of people who may need to use it at one time.

Mayor Reinke supports the Base option for Neighborhood Park West, which includes eight pickle ball courts.

Council Member Ingebrigtsen suggested monetizing the use of the pickleball courts. Ms. Volkens asked about the logistics of charging for the use of the pickleball courts.

Council Member Ingebrigtsen shared his thoughts on non-Oakdale residents using the pickle ball courts as a reason to charge \$10/hour. Mr. Gitzlaff said the community development staff and the parks and recreation staff will do research on ways to monetize this amenity. Recreation Superintendent Julie Williams stated that commercial and private entities charge for the use of pickle ball courts, but not cities as far as she knows Council Member Swedberg raised concern about staffing and the money collection process. Council Member Ingebrigtsen suggested a self-funding option.

Council Member Ingebrigtsen supported the recommendation of the prefabricated restroom for Neighborhood Park West.

Mr. Gitzlaff continued the presentation with the last of the three parks, Neighborhood Park North. There is no off-sight parking available. Staff recommended the Base concept, which includes a basic and natural play area.

Council Member Swedberg supported the concept of the nature-based play experience. She is in favor of the Base Plus option for Neighborhood Park North as it has playgrounds for different age groups.

Mayor Reinke supported the recommendation of the Base option for Neighborhood Park North. If there is a need after the initial Base option is built, then the Base Plus amenities can be added later on. Council Member Ingebrigtsen supported the notion of having all three parks begin as the Base option and look into additional Base Plus amenities down the line.

Council Member Olson supported the Base Plus option for Neighborhood Park North.

Mr. Gitzlaff returned to Neighborhood Park West to present the parking recommendation. He referenced the Roers development application. The City's stance was Roers is paying for and building the roadway. The development agreement is not clear on who is responsible for paying for the roadways and parking lots. The subdivision ordinance requires developers to pay for roadway improvements that serve the development. In the handout provided to Council, there is a section on the park map that is outlined and dashed that goes beyond the Roers development.

The first option presented would reference the master development agreement in which there is not explicit language stating the City is obligated to pay for the roadways and parking lots. The developer could argue that because the language does not explicitly state the developer is obligated to pay for the roadways and parking lots, and the proposed parking lot is shown as part of the park and not part of Roers, then the City should pay for it. There have been discussions with the underlying owner about a potential split on some of the cost. The outlined area is estimated to cost \$550,000; with contingencies and designs, the cost would increase to ~\$700,000. The community development staff compared how parking lots were handled with the other parks. For The Commons, the City is paying for half of the parking lot build. Mr. Gitzlaff did note that the City would not pay for rough grading which would lower the \$700,000 estimate. In discussion with the owner, the City's max contribution was suggested to be \$200,000 for the parking lot and the adjacent pedestrian improvements.

Mr. Gitzlaff indicated that the parking lot featured on the handout differed from the original concept, which included two turnarounds and 118 parking stalls. Staff requested that Stantec adjust the estimate to include a more reasonable number of parking stalls. The redrafted concept ranged from 52-72 parking stalls depending on the selection of the Base or Base Plus option. The concept on the handout includes 73 parking stalls. The cost estimates referenced are based on this revised concept. The developer covers the part to the north of the park on the handout.

Mayor Reinke pointed out that parking is essential, but the goal is to have the City incur the least amount of cost. He is in support of the redrafted plan handed out by Mr. Gitzlaff.

Mayor Reinke proposed electric vehicle (EV) parking options in The Commons parking lot. Ms. Volkens clarified that the City would not put in any chargers for these vehicles, but some parking spaces could be designated EV. Mr. Gitzlaff suggested looking for grant opportunities in relation to EV parking designations. Ms. Volkens would rather let the vendors come in and install the chargers themselves. Mayor Reinke is in agreement. He stated recommending EV designations to the developer. Council Member Olson opposed the use of the word 'recommend' and suggested using 'encourage' instead, per Ordinance 883.

#### **LUMEN RELOCATION FOR 40<sup>TH</sup> STREET PROJECT**

City Attorney Jim Thomson recapped the need for Lumen to relocate its existing underground telecommunications facilities because of the 40<sup>th</sup> Street North reconstruction project. Applicable Minnesota law states if Lumen needs to relocate due to a public project they would have to pay, but if they need to relocate due to a private entity then the private entity would pay. The disagreement lies with the reason for their relocation. The City's attorney worked with Lumen's attorney and with the developers' attorneys to resolve the issue regarding payment of Lumen's relocation costs, which were estimated at \$1.1 million. The City's attorney negotiated a deal with Lumen that they will be reimbursed for \$450,000 from the developer of the estimated \$1.1 million. The work to begin relocation is scheduled to start at the west end on October 17, 2022. An invoice will be submitted to the City by Lumen in which the City has 30 days to pay. Lennar will ultimately reimburse the City the \$450,000. The developer has paid all City attorney fees throughout the negotiations.

Staff recommends City Council consider and approve the agreements between the City and Lumen and between the City, White Star Farms and Lennar.

Mayor Reinke praised Attorney Thomson and team for their work to incur no cost to the City while coming to an agreement.

#### **COUNCIL TOPICS**

Council Member Olson asked for clarity on the determination of concrete or asphalt in regards to the difference of information between past and proposed projects.

Council Member Ingebrigtsen asked if the Gold Line project requires any eminent domain of property in Oakdale. Mr. Romanik indicated the affected properties have been notified and there is no indication of eminent domain due to the Gold Line project. Council Member Ingebrigtsen referred to the Star Tribune article citing the City of Maplewood's intent to pull out of the Purple Line project. The Metropolitan Council intended to eminent domain a strip mall in Maplewood without Maplewood City Council approval. Ms. Volkens clarified that there is no known eminent domain due to the Gold Line in the City of Oakdale.

Mayor Reinke reminded the group about his sentiment on the Oakdale Marketplace project that is coming for Council consideration later tonight, specifically about the lack of a park and green amenities, but stated that the park projects within Willowbrooke will benefit the Oakdale Marketplace project. He justified his opinion on selecting Base Plus for The Commons by stating there will be non-Willowbrooke residents using the park. Council Members Swedberg and Ingebrigtsen agreed with the Mayor's assessment.

WORKSHOP MINUTES  
OCTOBER 11, 2022  
PAGE FOURTEEN

**ADJOURNMENT**

The workshop was adjourned at 6:44pm.

Respectfully submitted,  
Sara Ludwig  
City Clerk