



MINUTES
REGULAR MEETING OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF
THE CITY OF WHITE BEAR LAKE, MINNESOTA
TUESDAY, AUGUST 22, 2017
7:00 P.M. IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Mayor Jo Emerson called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. Councilmembers Bill Walsh, Doug Biehn, Dan Jones, Kevin Edberg and Steven Engstran were present. Staff members present were City Manager Ellen Richter, Assistant City Manager Rick Juba, City Engineer Mark Burch, Community Development Director Anne Kane, Housing and Economic Development Coordinator Jacquell Nissen, Chief of Police Julie Swanson, City Clerk Kara Coustry and City Attorney Andy Pratt.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mayor Emerson introduced the new City Attorney, Andy Pratt, and welcomed him to the City Council meeting.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

It was moved by Councilmember **Walsh** seconded by Councilmember **Edberg**, to approve the Minutes of August 8, 2017, as presented.

The motion carried unanimously.

3. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

It was moved by Councilmember **Biehn** seconded by Councilmember **Jones**, to approve the Agenda as presented.

The motion carried unanimously.

4. VISITORS AND PRESENTATIONS

Nothing scheduled

5. PUBLIC HEARINGS

Nothing scheduled

6. LAND USE

A. Consent

Nothing scheduled

B. Non-Consent

1. Consideration of a Planning Commission recommendation for denial of a request by Admiral D's for a Conditional Use Permit Amendment and a variance for the property located at 4424 Lake Avenue South. (08-3-Sa and 17-13-V)

Community Development Director Kane explained Admiral D's is located in an area of the Marina Triangle that is zoned Lake Village Mixed Use (LVMU) located in the Shoreline Overlay District of White Bear Lake. The applicant, Brian McGoldrick, is requesting an amendment to an existing Conditional Use Permit to expand the restaurant building, add a louvered roof over the patio, and create a rooftop bar. These improvements will require a 50-foot setback variance from the Lake's ordinary high water level.

The proposed site plan depicts the existing building and proposed addition, overhead roof structure, and newly created rooftop bar, accessed by an exterior staircase, that is 525 square feet. All enclosed buildings with the exception of water-oriented structures with a maximum of 15 feet in height and 50 square feet in area must maintain 50-foot setback from the ordinary high-water line. The restaurant addition is proposed to go right up to the ordinary high-water level. City Staff recommends that any vertical extension is out of the shore impact zone, or half of the ordinary high-water level setback, which in this case is 25 feet.

Staff met with the applicant and his architect and expressed concerns about the proximity of the building to the ordinary high-water level. Staff indicated that a variance of this magnitude is unprecedented for a commercial building in the City and little basis has been put forth by the applicant as to why the variance is necessary for reasonable use of the property.

This same provision was required for a second-floor addition to a residential home, the Glass residence on South Shore Boulevard. The City Council will want to consider whether it is necessary to be consistent in holding a commercial building to the same requirements.

Admiral D's is proposing to install a louvered roof over the patio. Retractable drop shades are proposed on the sides of the 9-foot structure along the west wall that, when in use, will obstruct the public's view of the lake. Visual access to the lake was a crucial aspect of the original design of the restaurant, and staff objects to further reduction of visual access.

The roof structure may impact existing mature trees on the patio, causing concern within the Shoreland Overlay District as well as regulations related to commercial properties affecting mature trees. If the drop shades are eliminated, the louvered roof reconfigured to stay out of the shore impact zone, and mature trees are retained, staff would not object to the proposed patio cover.

A proposed rooftop bar above the existing restaurant would have seating for 29 patrons with access via an exterior metal staircase. The bar area would have a similar louvered roof and retracted shades but public views would not be restricted. This was a unique aspect sought for the 2-story restaurant at Boatworks Commons, affording patrons a beautiful view of the lake.

However, the location of the metal staircase, near the lake path and close to underground utilities, raises concerns. If it was relocated to be no closer to the trail than the existing building, staff would support the modification.

Ms. Kane explained that staff completed a parking analysis of the shopping center to ensure adequate parking. Applying the Zoning Code requirement of 1 stall per 2.5 seats, there are 2 extra parking spaces in the overall parking area along Highway 61. However, to be consistent with parking requirements for other uses within the LVMU, the City Council can approve a 20% parking reduction, based on proximity of municipal on-street parking. This would reduce the parking requirement for Admiral D's to 1 stall for every 3 seats.

The Planning Commission did not find the variances to be reasonable nor the minimum necessary to alleviate the practical difficulty of the lot size and shape. The 50-foot setback from the ordinary high-water level has been in place since mid-1980s when regulations were adopted in cooperation with the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (MN DNR) and new buildings and expansions are expected to abide by this requirement.

The Planning Commission was willing to waive the 6 or 12 month waiting period for the permit and variance, which has been incorporated into the revised Resolution for City Council consideration. A decision is required no later than September 21, 2017, and is extended tonight at request of applicant

Councilmember Walsh stated staff indicated the proposal does not meet reasonable use. He asked if there is a precedent for reasonable use, and whether staying open more days of the year is considered reasonable use.

Community Development Director Kane stated seasonal/environmental factors were in place in 2008, when the original conditional use permit was submitted, and did not believe much has changed to warrant such deviation from Code.

Councilmember Biehn asked whether any other older structures in the commercial district do not meet the 50-foot setback.

Community Development Director Kane confirmed that buildings constructed prior to Shoreland regulations are closer than 50 feet to the ordinary high water mark but they are considered pre-existing non-conforming.

Councilmember Jones stated, for the purposes of disclosure, his daughter is employed by Mr. McGoldrick.

Councilmember Jones asked if property owner could plant trees on the entire perimeter. Community Development Director Kane confirmed this, adding there are no restrictions on planting materials.

Councilmember Edberg requested clarification regarding staff's support for the covered patio and rooftop seating.

Community Development Director Kane stated the covered patio will be satisfactory if it is not located in the shore impact zone, no closer than 25 feet to high water level and does not impact trees, and if side shades are removed.

Staff's primary objection to the rooftop deck is the staircase access. The staircase would block access to maintain the existing forced main sanitary sewer and there is concern about the safety of pedestrians on the path. If the stairway to be re-aligned, that would be an acceptable solution.

In response to Councilmember Edberg, Ms. Kane explained the MN DNR provided an administrative permit to allow a deck that had been extended over the ordinary high-water level to remain at its location until such time as any repair or modification is needed to the deck. If the building is expanded or renovated, the MN DNR would make a determination.

Councilmember Biehn added, a MN DNR memo states that the deck must be moved to the set back if there are any modifications. He asked whether the MN DNR will rely on the City to enforce the ordinance, or if they have enforcement capability. Community Development Director Kane stated the MN DNR has jurisdiction beginning at the ordinary high-water level.

Councilmember Walsh requested clarification on the distance from the water to structures, and whether it's 32 feet, 25 feet, or the halfway mark, or zero feet. He added the patio and retaining wall are at zero right now. Community Development Director Kane stated that retaining walls are a permitted obstruction within shore impact zone, and the patio is made of pervious pavers, and she is not aware of a variance for that as it is an pervious, horizontal structure.

Mayor Emerson opened the public hearing at 7:29 p.m.

Bob Djupstrom, 3895 Cranbrook Drive, stated a representative of the DNR informed him in 2010 that Admiral D's was given a restoration order to move the structure out of the public water. In the absence of doing that, they entered into the administrative agreement.

Brian McGoldrick, 36 Moonlight Bay, Stillwater, thanked Community Development Director Kane for being cooperative and helpful. He added the boat launch has not been used in eight years and there have not been 200 boat slips for a long time. Originally there was a lot of traffic at the boat launch so they connected the transient slips to a staircase. This was reported to the DNR, and we agreed to make it one inch bigger.

Councilmember Walsh asked whether there is another way to do the staircase. Mr. McGoldrick stated he does not believe the forced main is there, and he thinks it runs in the street.

Tom Barbeau, of Barbeau Architects, stated he is the architect for the project. The staircase goes up to a roof deck and that particular location is the only one that works for the staircase that is not in the trail or adjacent to the trail. The staircase would be an

interesting, attractive feature and the steel vertical elements would give it a light footprint.

Councilmember Walsh asked whether trees would be removed on the patio. Mr. Barbeau stated he understood no trees would be removed. The louver system is flexible and can be adjusted.

In response to Councilmember Edberg, Ms. Kane stated it is correct that the water main may be located either under the street or under the path, but because of an easement for repair work, the building and other permanent improvements must be set back from the right of way. The proximity of the staircase landing is a safety concern, and its height or level is unknown at this time.

Mr. Barbeau stated the landing would be at 12 feet.

Community Development Director Kane stated that alleviates some concern, but the easement will need to be drawn out to ensure public agencies have access to the sanitary main.

Councilmember Edberg asked whether Mr. Barbeau would consider a compromise or option that would help to meet these concerns.

Mr. Barbeau agreed to look into it. He added he is concerned that people would be able to loiter under the landing, which could be a safety concern.

Councilmember Biehn asked whether the stairs could be designed so the bottom part is removable. Mr. Barbeau stated he is unsure about that possibility, and the expense, and what it would take to disassemble, and where it would be stored.

Councilmember Jones stated he does not support the location of the staircase so close to the path, which allows more exits and entrances for people to bring alcohol to the path and park. He added he does not have a problem with the rooftop patio.

Mr. McGoldrick stated the staircase goes down onto the gravel path and not onto the trail. He added trail access would not change as the gravel path is already there.

Mayor Emerson closed the public hearing at 7:46 p.m.

Councilmember Biehn thanked staff for their hard work on this issue, taking into account current City ordinances related to natural environment. He stated most residents do not have property on the lake, and the City's commercial businesses allow that access. Councilmember Biehn would like to see different rules in the commercial district than areas outside the commercial district. He added he wants Admiral Ds to be able to stay open longer in the year, and he likes the louvered patio cover, and he supports the restaurant expansion.

Mayor Emerson stated a denial would mean the applicant could come back sooner with a new plan.

Councilmember Jones stated he would like the applicant to go back and look at the staircase and alternative options, and try to be creative. He added no views would be blocked that are not already blocked.

Councilmember Walsh stated he likes the louvered panels and the rooftop patio. He added he would put in the resolution that no trees should be removed, and the sun walls on the side should be removed if a majority wants that. He agrees that there should be another way to do the stairs. He expressed concern that the setback, at 32 feet right now, is a difficult decision to make, and he would support having this issue go back through the Planning Commission.

Community Development Director Kane stated that staff supports a denial of the resolution, so the issue can be reviewed by the Planning Commission again and more specific plans provided by the applicant.

Ms. Kane stated the City was granted a variance for the Boardwalk pavilions, so the covered patio would be consistent with that if there were no side walls.

Councilmember Walsh stated the tougher decision is the permanent structure and the 32-25-0 foot setback discussion. He added 25 feet does not seem like it is enough to make it worthwhile, but zero is not acceptable.

Councilmember Jones stated a zero-foot setback does not bother him, and he will rely on staff to provide final details. He added he would like to see a nice building with nice materials. He noted clarification is required regarding what was proposed for the original building ten years ago, as the plans changed from the time they were approved at the Planning Commission to when they were reviewed by the City Council. Councilmember Walsh agreed.

Councilmember Edberg stated he does not support a zero foot setback. He added he is fine with the roof and stairway, as well as the louvered patio covering.

City Attorney Pratt reviewed a variance analysis, stressing the importance of maintaining harmony with the general intent of the Zoning Ordinance and Comprehensive Plan, to preserve the reasonableness, uniqueness and essential character of the locality. He stated the 50-foot setback is required to protect the lakeshore, and for visual reasons. He added economic considerations alone do not justify a variance, so the argument that the applicant must be open for more months of the year does not justify a variance. He noted, regarding tree removal and the location of the staircase, the City Council may place conditions that are proportionate and reasonable.

It was moved by Councilmember **Engstran** seconded by Councilmember **Jones** to adopt **Resolution No. 12077** for denial of a request by Admiral D's for a Conditional Use Permit Amendment and a variance for the property located at 4424 Lake Avenue South. (08-3-Sa and 17-13-V).

Councilmember Biehn stated he is unsure whether he could support zero feet setback, but he could support 25 feet. He added he supports the rooftop patio, louver patio cover, and he is open to the retractable shade, as it is not a permanent structure. He

noted he does not want the trees to be cut down, and new trees would block the view even more.

Councilmember Biehn asked Mr. Barbeau how much space would be necessary to have restaurant deck seating next to the ordinary high-water mark. Mr. Barbeau tables could be placed right up to the railing, with an aisle, and that would require 8 feet, and another row of seating for two could be accommodated in 12 feet. He added, in fact, it would be unique and feel kind of special.

Councilmembers Biehn and Walsh stated they would support an 8-foot setback.

Councilmember Edberg expressed the importance of providing clarity for City Staff in terms of what will be acceptable middle ground, and whether that should be incorporated in the motion.

City Manager Richter clarified that 8-foot setback refers to 8 feet from the ordinary high-water level, and a 42-foot variance. She emphasized that the City Council is not bound by this discussion to a decision if a revised plan comes back before the Council at a future date.

Mayor Emerson asked City Attorney Pratt whether specifications should be added to the motion. City Attorney Pratt stated the resolution as it stands is sufficient. He added he agrees that a specific number is important for the record.

Councilmember Jones stated he can support an 8-foot setback. He added he can work with the louvered panels, and maintain the existing trees. He noted he is not thrilled with the sun shades, which seem similar to those being used on Highway 61 that are not maintained very well. The location of the staircase is a security concern, as other commercial businesses in this area are being encouraged to tighten security at their entrances and exits, and that needs to be addressed.

Vote on the motion: the motion carried unanimously, with the stipulation that the applicant does not need to adhere to the one-year waiting period.

Councilmember Biehn stated he likes the rooftop patio, but agrees that the staircase needs to be addressed. He added a different location should be found that will not impact the easement.

Councilmember Walsh stated an 8-foot or 12-foot setback would be a better precedent on a lakefront property than zero feet. He added 8 feet would give the applicant more space inside the building.

Community Development Director Kane stated it would be almost impossible to successfully build a building with a zero setback at the ordinary high-water level, while ensuring that protective measures are taken and water quality is not affected.

Community Development Director Kane stated that staff would support a number closer to 25 feet. She added staff would like to obtain the opinion of the City Attorney on whether the differentiation between commercial and residential use should be

clarified in terms of waterfront setbacks. She added requests are often received from residents, and approving this in the LVMU District will undermine staff's position.

Councilmember Edberg stated the City established that a 25-foot setback was reasonable 30 years ago. He expressed concern about bringing that decision into question. He added he is not opposed to commercial development and lakefront property owner's rights to utilize their shoreline, but he is opposed to pushing this development into the protected area.

Councilmember Biehn stated, in his opinion, the Commercial District is different and development should be encouraged. He added this is a unique property, and other properties may not need a variance in the shoreline setback. He noted he supports expansion that is feasible and reasonable.

Community Development Director Kane stated a survey of the VFW property shows 7.6-foot setback at the northwest corner, and 9.4 feet setback at the southeast corner, from the ordinary high-water level; and Tally's has setbacks of 12.9 feet at the northeast corner and 14.5 feet at the southeast corner. She added the LVMU is unique, and regulations could be crafted based on current encroachments.

Mr. McGoldrich thanked the City Council and City Staff for their deliberation. He added he is ready to move forward with the project and will work with the City and its staff in whatever direction they go, and give it the time it needs. He noted he hopes they will arrive at a number around 8 feet.

Councilmember Biehn stated he is in favor of having staff review this and provide language to change the current Ordinance in a way that recognizes the uniqueness of the existing structures in the area, and Admiral D's current footprint, which is different from the shopping center property.

City Manager Richter stated consideration of changes to the LVMU District requirements would not need to be completed before this application is considered. She added she agrees it would be beneficial to look at the LVMU District in its entirety to ensure there is direction for applicants and clear parking considerations.

7. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Nothing scheduled

8. ORDINANCES

Nothing scheduled

9. NEW BUSINESS

- A. Resolution awarding a roof replacement project and related repairs to Central Minnesota Renovations, LLC for Pioneer Manor located at 2225 Fifth Street.

Community Development Director Kane stated Pioneer Manor was developed by the City in 1993 to provide high-quality, good value housing for seniors of low to moderate income

means. As the building nears 25 years since its construction, it is beginning to show its age. Minor repairs over the years have bought additional time, but the original roof is near its end of life and in need of replacement. CDBG Grants were applied for in 2013 but the City was not successful in getting those funds.

Based on some observations and assessments of current roof conditions, it was determined that the project needs to move forward this year. There are sufficient funds within reserves at Pioneer Manor to cover the cost of a new roof and extension improvements.

Estimates were secured in 2014 for this work, including roof replacement, attic insulation, and repair of siding and shingles on the gables element. Given the complexity, it was determined that it would be best to have one contractor overseeing the entire project, so that any roof panels could coordinate with insulation replacement. Based on those estimates, staff anticipated the overall cost would not exceed \$100,000, which is the threshold for competitive building by State Statute, requiring public posting and sealed bids.

Ms. Kane reported that staff reached out to twelve (12) area contractors and provided RFP's to ten (10), and received only two (2) proposals for the City Council's consideration: SELA Roofing for \$156,630, and Central Minnesota Renovations for \$130,349. She explained that bids came in higher than anticipate due to the increased demand for roofing services following the storm that caused significant damage in the northeast metro area. Staff recommends awarding the Pioneer Manor roof project and related exterior repairs to Central Minnesota Renovation in the amount of \$130,349.

It was moved by Councilmember **Engstran** seconded by Councilmember **Jones**, to adopt **Resolution No. 12078** awarding a roof replacement project and related repairs to Central Minnesota Renovations, LLC for Pioneer Manor located at 2225 Fifth Street.

The motion carried unanimously.

- B. Resolution declaring costs to be assessed and ordering preparation of proposed assessment roll and setting hearing on a proposed assessment roll for the 2017 Mill and Overlay Project (City Project Nos.: 17-01, 17-04, 17-10, 17-13)

City Engineer Burch stated the Engineering Department is nearing end of the street reconstruction project, primarily mill overlay work, and a public hearing must be scheduled on special assessment rolls. He recommended a hearing be held at the 2nd meeting in September, and proper notice will be sent to individual property owners and a legal notification will be placed in the local press

It was moved by Councilmember **Engstran** seconded by Councilmember **Walsh**, to adopt **Resolution No. 12079** declaring costs to be assessed and ordering preparation of proposed assessment roll and setting hearing on a proposed assessment roll for the 2017 Mill and Overlay Project (City Project Nos.: 17-01, 17-04, 17-10, 17-13).

The motion carried unanimously.

- C. Resolution accepting work and authorizing final payment to Pearson Bros, Inc. for the 2017 Bituminous Seal Coating Project (City Project No.: 17-02)

City Engineer Burch stated the sealcoating project for 2017 has been completed by Pearson Brothers, Inc, and Engineering staff have inspected the work and are happy with it. He added staff recommends that the City Council receive work and authorize payment in final amount of \$305,536

It was moved by Councilmember **Biehn** seconded by Councilmember **Engstran**, to adopt **Resolution No. 12080** accepting work and authorizing final payment to Pearson Bros, Inc. for the 2017 Bituminous Seal Coating Project (City Project No.: 17-02).

The motion carried unanimously.

10. HOUSING AND REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

HRA Acting Chair Doug Biehn called the Housing and Redevelopment Authority to order at 8:44 p.m. (please refer to the minutes of the Housing and Redevelopment Authority for action taken that included the following items):

1. Call to order
2. Roll call
3. Approval of the agenda
4. Approval of the August 8, 2017 Minutes
5. Resolution establishing a revolving loan and grant program for the County Road E Corridor
6. Adjournment

Mayor Emerson reconvened the City Council meeting at 8:55 p.m.

11. CONSENT

- A. Resolution approving a single event extension to an on-sale liquor license for Boleen Enterprises. **Resolution No. 12081**
- B. Resolution ratifying the execution of a termination of assessment agreement between the HRA and Muellner Family LLLP. **Resolution No. 12082**

It was moved by Councilmember **Biehn** seconded by Councilmember **Walsh**, to approve the Consent Agenda as presented.

The motion carried unanimously.

12. DISCUSSION

- A. Dispatching Operations

City Manager Richter reviewed the potential option for contracting the City's Dispatch Operations with Ramsey County. The City operates a 24/7 Dispatch Center, providing emergency call answering and dispatch services for Police, Fire and Ambulance. Dispatch staff also fulfills other duties, including monitoring building security, alarm systems, records, and data entry. White Bear Lake is the last remaining municipal dispatch center in Ramsey County, and continues to provide extraordinary customer service.

The City has held strong to its model throughout the years but many circumstances have changed. The need for specialized protocols has diminished, and significant capital outlay is expected through the purchase of a NextGen 911 compatible phone system at a cost of \$190,000. Dispatch operates at an annual cost in 2017 of \$525,000, with \$539,000 budgeted for 2018. A 2-seat model is advised by dispatching staff and Regions EMS. In 2014, the City invested \$300,000 to replace the existing dispatch console, and that will need to be replaced again in approximately five to seven years at an estimated \$500,000.

City Manager Richter stated she spoke with other City Managers who contract with the County for dispatch, and they indicated that significant organizational changes within the County's Dispatch Center have resulted in positive outcomes. Concerns related to officer safety and Ramsey County's training programs have been raised by the City Council and Dispatchers. Ms. Richter stated, that City's Police Administration believe that there are advantages to being part of the County-wide system as everyone would be operating under the same channels. This enhances officer safety. Ramsey County has recently revamped its training program to help address recruitment and retention concerns.

Ms. Richter explained that the primary driver for this conversation is not necessarily to reduce existing costs, but rather to avoid significant future costs associated with increased staffing and capital purchases. If a 24-hour attended lobby were maintained using existing personnel, switching to Ramsey County would be cost neutral in the near term. However, staying with current model would result in approximately \$270,000 increase in annual operational costs after four (4) additional staff are hired. This does not account for additional supervisory and technological support. There would also be significant future capital costs.

Ms. Richter explained that the need for phone equipment cannot be delayed beyond this fall as there is a 6-month waiting period between ordering and installing the equipment, which has lent to the urgency of this issue.

Councilmember Edberg stated operating costs are currently \$525,000, and future additional staff would increase that to over \$775,000, as well as additional costs of approximately \$500,000 related to updating and replacing capital equipment in the next five years. Given these numbers, the City would avoid nearly 2 million in costs over a five year period. These additional resources could be used toward other necessary infrastructure or operating needs.

Councilmember Biehn stated he was previously the second in charge manager for Ramsey County Dispatch Center. He asked City Attorney Pratt to review whether he could vote on this item. He added he currently works for Law Enforcement Labor Services, the union that represents the City's dispatchers, and he also represents Ramsey County dispatch supervisors and deputies.

Councilmember Biehn stated if the City Council chooses not to go to Ramsey County, he would strongly encourage a 2-seat system as soon as possible regardless of cost. He added he is comfortable with the City moving to Ramsey County Dispatch Services as long as current City Dispatch staff remain City employees, eligible for wage increases. He noted, he does not think the 24/7 lobby needs to be open in the long run and the City would be one of the few agencies State-wide to maintain that. Councilmember Biehn sees the benefit

of having a consolidated system with Ramsey County, both operationally and financially.

Councilmember Walsh requested clarification regarding the cost savings. He added 24-hour access might not be necessary. He noted he wants to get more information from his constituents about what is important to them, and get more information regarding specific savings. He stated he is leaning towards going to Ramsey County which seems to be a financially prudent thing to do.

Councilmember Engstran stated he is 1000% against going to the County. He has been a dispatcher, and it is not easy to reach County Dispatch. He added that City supervisors don't want to do their job and don't care about the Dispatchers in the center and should be held accountable. The City should hire EMTs as Dispatchers, to diagnose better over the phone and ask the right questions. He asked whether records management is still located in Roseville and what it would cost to revert back to the County.

In response to Councilmember Engstran, Police Chief Swanson stated there would be very little cost to switch records management from Roseville to the County because records management is already integrated with the County and is shared by 4 Ramsey County agencies.

City Manager Richter stated that as the City adds staff capacity in the Dispatch Center, it would need to look at additional supervisory staff as well. A Police Captain is currently providing supervision for the Dispatch Center, and that will be reviewed.

Councilmember Jones stated the City offers a 1-stage "Cadillac" call service, while Ramsey County offers a 2-stage call service. He has observed the City's Dispatch Center, but he has not been allowed to sit in at Ramsey County Dispatch. He does not necessarily trust Ramsey County. He asked why the Police Department is not also being considered for outsourcing. He added he believes the service provided by the City's dispatch is better, although there needs to be a clear independent management structure who pays attention to recruitment and training. If a Dispatch Center costs a million dollars, then that is the cost and Councilmember Jones supports the City run dispatch.

Councilmember Walsh stated he would like to find out about the difference in response times between the City's dispatch and the County, as well as customer service levels. He added maybe that could be tracked over the next few months. City Manager Richter agreed.

Mayor Emerson stated the phone system would need to be ordered this fall. City Manager Richter stated she is hoping for additional discussion early fall if the new system is to be ordered soon. Text and video to 911 must be accepted by the end of 2019, and the City's current analog phone system was purchased 20 years ago and has not been supported in the last 12 years.

Chief Swanson reported she spoke to Century Link today, who indicated a 4-6 month turn-around on the order. The reason for this is Century Link has work orders resulting from other Dispatch Centers for the new text and video to 911. Nine Dispatch Centers will be piloting text and video to 911 by the end of 2018. We will be required by the end of 2019 to either have text and video to 911, or a contract in place with a provider that does.

Mayor Emerson asked whether there would be any equipment costs associated with

switching to Ramsey County. City Manager Richter stated the County incorporates use of their equipment into their contract.

In response to Councilmember Edberg, Chief Swanson stated the City's Dispatch Center currently provides great service. She has talked to her peers and Ramsey County Dispatch restructured in 2008 and upgraded their equipment. She added both Police and Fire Chiefs are happy with the features that are offered at the County level. She noted it would be an adjustment from the personal service the City's residents currently receive.

Chief Swanson stated Ramsey County has a policy in place that limits sit along with Public Safety personnel, but she has watched their operation and it is efficient and well-managed. She added the City's is also not prepared for the Information Technology (IT) piece to this. There is only one IT coordinator for the entire City and no specialist on staff to handle the Dispatch Center.

Councilmember Jones stated he is willing to buy the phones and commit to City Dispatch for the next few years. He asked about the timeline for a conversion to County Dispatch. Chief Swanson stated it is a 6-9 month process, and Ramsey County has agreed to assist with ensuring that protocols do not change significantly.

Councilmember Edberg stated the City would be taking on brand new technologies and the obligations to service and implement them with no IT structure. He added that is a recipe for a cost and operational disaster, and the City will be thoroughly under-financed and under-resourced to maintain and secure that going forward. He noted he would welcome another public conversation on this issue.

Councilmember Biehn stated that City residents are currently paying Ramsey County for a portion of Dispatch Services through property taxes. City Manager Richter confirmed this.

Councilmember Biehn expressed concern that postponing this decision another 3-5 years will impact 8-10 dispatchers rather than 4-5 dispatchers today. He stated it is better to address this now while the City before the City is more invested and is faced with higher technology costs - extravagant to the point that City will have no choice.

Councilmember Jones wondered what a County monopoly over dispatch would cost the City at that time.

City Manager Richter requested that City Councilmembers submit their comments and requests for information to her in order to prepare for further discussion.

Councilmember Walsh stated he would like an analysis of response times between City and County Dispatch.

Councilmember Edberg stated he would like to see a life cycle set of estimated costs for operations and capital, over 3-5 years. The City is trying to plan for a decade ahead and more. He added he is not interested in White Bear Lake not having a Police Department. He asked whether Human Resource solutions for the City's current dispatch staff could be researched.

13. COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE CITY MANAGER

- City Manager Richter stated new trees are being installed in the Highway 96 median. City Engineer Burch stated a variation of the crap apple species is planned. The new trees should be in within the next few weeks along with irrigation repairs.
- City Manager Richter stated discussions regarding the Whitaker crossing are under way with MN DOT and SEH with hopes for a 2018 project.
- City Manager Richter stated staff is obtaining appraisals for Whitaker street end as requested by the City Council, which will be available for consideration in a month or so.
- Community Development Director Kane stated RFP's for the South Shore Boulevard trail have been distributed and response is expected by September 5, 2017. She introduced Jacquell Nissen, the City's Housing and Economic Development Coordinator, who was instrumental in the Pioneer Manor roof project and the County Rad E revolving loan and grant program. She expressed her appreciation for Ms. Nissen's help, and thanked the City Council for their support for that position.

14. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the Council, it was moved by Councilmember **Jones** seconded by Councilmember **Walsh** to adjourn the regular meeting at 9:43 p.m.


Jo Emerson, Mayor

ATTEST:


Kara Coustry, City Clerk