City of Cottage Grove
Planning Commission
October 23, 2023

The Regular Meeting of the Planning Commission was held at Cottage Grove City Hall, 12800 Ravine Parkway South, Cottage Grove, Minnesota, on Monday, October 23, 2023, in the Council Chamber and telecast on Local Government Cable Channel 16.

Call to Order

Chair Frazier called the Planning Commission meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Roll Call

Members Present:	Pradeep Bhat, Ken Brittain, Jessica Fisher, Evan Frazier, Eric Knable, Derek Rasmussen, Emily Stephens
Members Absent:	None
Staff Present:	Emily Schmitz, Community Development Director; Amanda Meyer, City Engineer; Crystal Raleigh, Assistant City Engineer; Tony Khambata, City Council Liaison

Approval of Agenda

Brittain made a motion to approve the agenda. Fisher seconded. The motion was approved unanimously (7-to-0 vote).

Open Forum

Frazier opened the Open Forum and asked if anyone wished to address the Planning Commission on any non-agenda item.

Bonnie Matter, 6649 Inskip Avenue South, thanked commissioners for providing this forum, as she's now learned that this is what this is, a forum where she can actually address City Council and City staff, so thank you for providing that.

Bonnie stated in a very uncertain economic environment, there should be more attention paid to cost control and savings. The City of Cottage Grove is continuing to plan more and bigger projects. Many people think that with all the new commercial and residential development, the City has more money to spend with this expanding tax base; this is not the case. With more development comes the need for more infrastructure, more demands on finite resources like water, more streets, more people and man hours to maintain, more pollution, and destruction of the land and wildlife habitats. Older areas of the City require ongoing investment for upgrading and replacement of deteriorating infrastructure. Due to poorly planned development, our schools need more, very costly buildings to educate our children. These buildings will no doubt have increased operating costs; it's difficult to find people to provide services that are needed, like bus drivers and food service workers, to serve our children. Our wells are overtaxed due to over development and, in some instances, wells are even being shut down. There is no suitable transportation system available within the City to move residents around efficiently. We have built lovely municipal buildings that are very costly to maintain. Residents are experiencing hits to their pocketbooks from multiple areas, increased property taxes, increased School District taxes, increased City taxes, increased homeowner's insurance, increased auto insurance, food prices, gas; you know, you've walked it, too. So, we have experienced some very unusual summers, a very unusual summer with extreme weather patterns across the country, rising temperatures, wildfires, extreme storm patterns, drought, and yet there has been no climate change plan put forward or even discussed for the City. So, this will be continued. Thank you.

No one else spoke. Frazier closed the Open Forum.

Chair's Explanation of the Public Hearing Process

Frazier explained the purpose of the Planning Commission, which serves in an advisory capacity to the City Council, and that the City Council makes all final decisions. In addition, he explained the process of conducting a public hearing and requested that any person wishing to speak should go to the microphone and state their full name and address for the public record.

Public Hearings and Applications

6.1 CIP 2024-2028 – Case CP2023-017

The City of Cottage Grove has applied for a Comprehensive Plan Amendment to amend the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) for 2024-2028.

Raleigh summarized the staff report and recommended approval. She provided specific details on these four CIP categories: Public Facilities, New Parks & Improvements, Street Projects, and Utility Projects. Raleigh asked if there were any questions.

Bhat stated this is just for his reference, what do you mean when you say a development driven project. Raleigh replied as development happens in those neighborhoods, as we've seen developers interested in that, as development actually comes to fruition, we'll need to build out things like parks and Ravine Parkway for the future residents that move in there to use.

Rasmussen stated using the 80th Street project as reference, he thinks we had like a $10 million budget, and at the bottom it said half of that, $5 million; is that maybe State grants or something. Does that mean the cost is $15 million, or is it $10 million of the total project amount, with half of it being funded through the State. Raleigh replied $10 million is the total project amount, which she confirmed with Meyer, and $5 million is already paid for by grants; so, our portion will be $5 million.

Frazier opened the public hearing.

Bonnie Matter, 6649 Inskip Avenue South, stated regarding the CIP, she has more questions than she can cover in a three-minute talk, but she'll just give you some broad brush thoughts. First of all, she doesn't quite get the Comprehensive Plan Amendment: What's being amended, what do these words mean? Please be specific, walk us through it. It was pages long, it was very hard, she still doesn't know if she understands what was being amended. Are all of those items amendments? In 2023, a decision was made to spend $14 million, unplanned, for a Utilities Building, very possibly needed. Those dollars will come out of the Water Utility Fund, that's what she got out of these pages of paper, but those dollars must've been used for other needed programs in the past; what is getting cut in the future for these dollars? How much is the City borrowing at taxpayers' expense to cover that $14 million spend? The unplanned SCADA security upgrade cost $1+ million; that's the first time, but believe me, that will be an ongoing investment. It's definitely needed, we need that, and costs were paid out of the Utility Fund, but something else is not getting paid for because of it; these dollars were spent somewhere else, what was cut to cover this expense? There are huge expenditures, and the $43 million really caught me by surprise; it's the first time I've seen that number for the South District. Where will that money come from, and what are the maintenance costs moving forward? It may be time for a moratorium on spending until the City is caught up with some of these payments. The payments rest on the backs of the City of Cottage Grove taxpayers in a dicey economic environment. As stated earlier, residents are taking hits from multiple areas, I listed those. According to this amended plan, it appears there will be multiple increases in resident user fees like 3 percent Stormwater Utility increase, 3 percent rate increase in Water Utilities, 5 percent rate increase in Sanitary Sewer Utility, an 8 percent increase for Streetlights for 2024 and 3 percent increases in later years. The Park Improvement Capital Project Fund: Perhaps the City needs to cut the $3 million in park and playground renovations over the next five years until the City can better handle these costs. Remove the 2026 tax levy for $190,000. The Park Trust Fund: The City issued bonds in 2023, totaling $4.2 million for Glacial Valley Park. As an aside, I'm still unsure how that ever got into anything; I don't know when that showed up. These things seem to have a tendency to show up with residents unaware of what it is or how it will be paid for. The future identified projects will bring the fund balance to a negative $3.9 million.

The time limit bell rang, and Bonnie asked if she may continue. Frazier asked her how much longer she had, asked if she was almost done; she replied yes, she's almost done, so he told her to go ahead. Remember those beautiful municipal buildings, like the one we're standing in, like this one? The levy will go from $300,000 to $350,000 annually, an increase of 16.6percent in one year; residents, you out there are responsible for learning about what is going on in your City! I'm talking to you! Go read the minutes, attend the public workshops, watch the meetings on SWCTC.org, speak up. The proposed amended CIP 2024-2028 should be scrapped, and a more realistic plan should be presented to the residents of Cottage Grove. They deserve better than this, and while these dollars should concern residents, what I talked about is just chump change. Again, residents need to start showing up for meetings and/or reading their meeting minutes. Wake up! If you are not aware of the dollars involved in the South District and who is paying, you might want to start getting informed. Apathy and ignorance are very unhealthy for any community and your pocketbook. Thank you for listening and letting me share my thoughts.

No one else spoke. Frazier closed the public hearing.

Frazier asked a City staff member to answer some of the questions that were posed.

Meyer stated as far as the Comprehensive Plan Amendment question, she may pass that over to our Community Development Director, Emily Schmitz, to respond; she didn't know if Frazier wanted us to start with that. Frazier indicated yes, we'll start there.

Schmitz stated the CIP is kind of wrapped in a reference in the Comprehensive Plan; therefore, every year when we review and update for the next coming year, we need to make sure that we're amending that Comprehensive Plan to reflect the new polished CIP.

Frazier stated as a review, the Comprehensive Plan is the guiding document for how the City is going to develop and what land use is, policy is, for the City. Schmitz stated he was correct. Frazier stated so the CIP is a part of the Comprehensive Plan that gets updated every year to show where the plan is to spend the City dollars; Schmitz stated that's correct, we look ahead for five years.

Brittain stated just to add into that, the five-year mark at the end of the Comprehensive Plan is predicted but not as well planned as the one year out; so, as we do this one-year step, five years gets a little more clear because now it's four years, and then the next year it will be more clear. So, that gives you the ability to refine what we're doing. So, the closer we are to the date today, the more defined it will be, and the farther out is just more of a prediction that gets updated every year. He asked Schmitz if that was correct. Schmitz told Frazier and Brittain that's correct, and that's why we look out five years and make a plan, but anything can happen in five years, and that's why we reevaluate and take a deeper look every year.

Meyer stated she hoped she captured all of the questions in her notes, but she wants to first reiterate that the City went through quite an extensive process to put together a Financial Management Plan (FMP). That looks at the City finances as a whole over the next ten years, and that was part of the City getting a AAA bond rate. So, as we go through the CIP, we are ensuring that the CIP is following the FMP. What you see in that CIP is mirroring what we think is happening even in the next ten years, but the CIP is just focusing on the next five. She wanted to make note that the City is thinking long term, long range, and trying to kind of capture what needs to be improved, as well as what maybe needs to be added, as we are a growing community. As mentioned, all of the infrastructure in our City does age and needs to be improved, it needs to be repaired, it needs to be maintained. So, that is at the forefront of our mind; as you saw in the CIP, we have our Pavement Management Project each year. Each of our utility funds has annually a set aside dollar amount for that annual maintenance, and we are keeping that in mind. Unfortunately, as mentioned, rates are increasing on a lot of things. So, construction costs are increasing, we're seeing that kind of across the board. We do factor in a percent increase each year because we're just assuming that over the next five years, construction costs, maintenance costs, all those things are also increasing. Specifically, with the Utility Engineering Building and how that's being paid for and what's being cut: The City did a utility rate study to analyze current utility bill rates, and adjusted those based on what is consistent with some of the other communities that surround us. Those utility bills are helping fund the building, but she noted there is also some 3M Settlement money that we are trying to acquire for that building, as it houses some of our staff who are specifically meant for the treatment plant. So, for some of the costs, we are getting some additional funding from that source.

As it relates to the $43 million project, she believes that's the 100th Street project, and noted we already have $7 million of funding, secured by the County. We are in the process of getting another $3 million to help finish out that final design cost; we should hear more about that yet this fall. We are actively applying for both Rural and RAISE grants; she believes both of those total $12.5 million that we're asking for. We are also looking at a bonding request for additional dollars on that project. So, we are actively pursuing as much funding as possible, but this is a huge priority project, both for the City and the County. As Raleigh mentioned in the presentation, every time we've come forward with additional development in the south part of the City, one of the biggest discussions we're having is traffic; how are we getting traffic in and out of this area. This is really that crucial connection, especially with the bridge over the railroad, which helps promote more truck traffic heading out to Highway 61 along that 100th Street alignment. It is a big dollar amount, but we recognize that and are pursuing as many and as much funding opportunities as possible to help bridge that gap.

Meyer stated regarding cutting the playground projects, similar to our streets and our public infrastructure, we think our residents enjoy all of the parks and the trails and those things that we have. It would be unfortunate if we cut funding to improve our playgrounds with all of the families we have in our community. We want to promote everywhere a community where people enjoy living, working, and playing, and they can find all of those things here in our community. In our community, we are striving to maintain all of those things that we already own, but also bring in new things that are needed.

To the question of development driven, there are a lot of things in our CIP that are development driven, they're placeholders, they're a best guess of when they may come, just based on the rumblings we're hearing of which parcels may develop. Those things can push; there are properties on here that we've seen for the last four years, thinking they may develop, but they continue to push.

Meyer stated she hopes she answered all of the questions posed, but would be happy to answer any more.

Brittain asked Meyer to give a little overview of the Streetlight Fund and Water Fund; how do those work. There was a question of negative balance. His assumption is, especially with the planning documents that you've put together, that we're accumulating money for larger projects, things along those lines. He asked how all of that works together; he can't believe that you're just surprised when we've got a big project on the list, so how does that work. Meyer replied we're working very closely, day to day, with our Finance Department to understand funding on every project, as mentioned, even for something like our Pavement Management Project. So, we're in the process of doing field studies, chatting with our Public Works Department, understanding what the needs are to maintain that infrastructure. Then we go back to Finance and say here's what we're finding, here are the dollars that we're estimating, how do we ensure that we can fund these projects. So, we have Streetlights, Stormwater, Water, and then Sanitary Sewer, and there are maintenance funds to fund linings on sanitary sewer. With the 2023 Pavement Management, we had an issue where a lot of the streetlight wire had continuously been breaking and we continued to have faults; so, as it relates to that Streetlight Fund, we've had some challenges with that fund balance. We're always looking at different ways to ensure that we have the money to support the infrastructure that we have. One of the things we just recently looked at were our franchise fees. Starting in December, there are a couple of private utility companies who had previously not been paying Right-of-Way fees, based on a franchise agreement that we had set forth. Through updating those franchise fee agreements, that has now changed, and so we'll be getting some additional funds from those individuals to help fund some of those issues in the Right-of-Way that we see that are maybe being caused by some of those private utility companies.

Brittain said let's take the Water Fund: I pay my water bill, part of that goes into the Water Fund. There may not be a project today that I'm paying into for that Water Fund, but there has to be money accumulating in the Water Fund for a future project. So, it isn't just we have this project and now we have to get money into the fund. Is the apparatus such that as we go along, you're pulling money out of the fund to pay for a current project, but then there's more money coming back in; it's not just that we're going to suck out all of this money and then nothing's going to go back in there. Meyer replied that's correct. As part of our CIP planning, we are planning ahead for what is coming out of which fund so we can manage that money appropriately. It's not a last minute now we need money out of the Water Fund, how are we going to find this money we didn't know we'd need. We are planning for that and are managing that balance accordingly for those projects we see coming.

Stephens said one of the things Bonnie brought up was like a moratorium on something, she didn't know if it was development, but she thinks sometimes that's kind of a common concern, that the development is what's causing the need for these expensive transportation projects and utility projects. Maybe you want to just take a quick second and talk about the benefits of some of the developments in this City and how those funds and taxes can help us pay for some of our existing infrastructure, or just what sort of negative impacts we might see if we were to put a moratorium on future development or things like that. Meyer stated there are probably pros and cons to this situation. As we think about projects as a whole, she thinks a lot of what we see in our CIP are projects that are necessary for our current residents. So, when we talk about the Pavement Management Projects, the roadway connectivity for existing residents down in the south part of our community, when we talk about the large sewer lining project we have anticipated for 2024-2025, that's one of our oldest sanitary sewer pipes that is running quite full; it's an expensive project because we'll have to do a large bypass pumping under Highway 61. Some of these projects are just of our existing infrastructure that needs to be maintained for our existing residents. When we talk about getting new development and new residents, it's more people who are living and shopping and eating and providing into our community and our financials, its helping feed our Utility Bill system and our Water Fund, our Sewer Fund. Yes, it adds additional infrastructure that needs to be maintained, but she thinks it's a bit of a balance.

Fisher asked if she could add to that with a question; when developers come in, don't they actually have to shoulder some of the costs of actually running utility lines within? She thought we just extended a watermain for the development that's going in, just up the road here. So, don't developers shoulder some of that initial cost? Meyer replied yes, thank you, that's a really good point. So, as developers are coming in, they are bearing all of the initial costs; so, the utilities, the streets, any sort of that infrastructure, that initial cost is being fully borne by that developer.

Rasmussen stated throughout the presentation, it looks like we're getting a lot of State and Federal grant money for a lot of these projects. If he understands from past presentations, the CIP in the planning process allows us to apply for all of this different grant money. Is that correct? Meyer replied, yes, that is correct. Rasmussen said he feels like a lot of the bigger projects have a lot of really nice partners in the State and Federal grants, and he thinks that helps out substantially, so thank you for that. Meyer stated one thing that is either required or is very good to see on a grant application is that it is in our CIP and that we are planning for it. So, it definitely helps us in those grant applications to have those projects in our CIP.

Fisher stated with her job, she travels to communities all over the State and western Wisconsin, and she just thinks that the City of Cottage Grove works really hard to keep up with things, like potholes. Council Member Khambata probably can agree with me in some of the communities we both go into, just keeping roads and infrastructure working well. For all of these things, we look at this huge CIP and we see all of these millions of dollars, and it kind of blows your hair back, like that's a lot. But it's important to keep a city of this size and of this standard, this quality, running well. There are parks everywhere here, like it's such a good place to have a family; there are trails everywhere, the City provides a lot for us as residents, and it's not just for people with little kids or the elderly. I think it's really a wide range of amenities. When I moved here almost ten years ago, I thought I would hate it because I grew up on a horse farm, and this was suburbia, but I love it here, I really, really do. With the other communities that I go into, you can see that the standards are not as high and the taxes aren't as high; my job is to look at taxes and tell people, okay, if you're going to live here, this is what you can expect to pay. So, she just thinks Cottage Grove is a good place to be, and she appreciates all of this. Is it perfect? No, nothing is ever perfect, we're never going to make everyone happy, but she does think it's a good community to live in.

Knable stated he's sure he missed it in all of the stuff that's been talked about, but he'll use the Zamboni as an example, in 2027, at $120,000 cost. He asked if there's inflation built into that number, or as 2024 comes around, we see Zambonis become electric and just drive themselves now, or whatever it is; how do you build that in as it gets closer. Do you revisit every item? Meyer replied, unfortunately, Zambonis are not her forte. Generally, in our CIP, we are adding in some inflation as we go each year, and then each year as we revisit our five-year CIP, we are doublechecking those numbers to make sure that they're still reasonable, based on where we're at with the economy. She made mention for the Ice Arena projects, those are all being funded from the NorthPoint naming rights; so, that's all money that we are getting from the NorthPoint naming of the Ice Arena. So, that was another project where it's not necessarily funding coming from our taxpayers; we are actively always looking for other funding sources on all of our projects, whether at the Ice Arena or a City street project or those sorts of things.

Fisher asked with the solar panels that are going on the Ice Arena, are they going to generate enough to completely cover what the arena needs, plus some kickback. On houses, sometimes they generate enough where you cover what you need plus you get to bank it or whatever. Do you know anything about what the potential benefit is for the City, financially, to have solar panels up there? Meyer replied that's a really great question; unfortunately, she doesn't have an answer specific to the solar panels, but she'll be happy to chat with our Parks & Rec Department to understand more about the solar panels. Fisher stated it might be interesting to see what they could potentially generate, as that's a lot of surface area, and solar is getting really popular in the housing industry. She's just curious.

Rasmussen stated he believe the Oltman Middle School had some funding for maybe a lacrosse field; how does that work, as his initial assumption would be that would be a School Board project rather than a City Parks project. He asked for some help with that. Meyer replied if she recalled correctly, there had been some previous discussions about that parcel next to Oltman Middle School, and it was going to be a City project; originally, it was just going to be some baseball fields or a soccer field. Her understanding is that has evolved now into more of the lacrosse fields and sort of a complex with parking, and that project is not going to be on any sort of School Board decision making. Her understanding is its moving forward, but she'll be happy to clarify again with our Parks & Rec Department for more specifics on that project to provide some more information on that one. Rasmussen asked if she could clarify it will be a City-owned park versus a School District property; Meyer replied absolutely.

Bhat stated his question is regarding the Federal grants, if those amounts have already been applied for. Meyer replied it's a bit of both; so, there are some grants where we have been successful in obtaining those funds: The $5 million for 80th Street has already been applied for and received, Shoppes at Cottage View, that grant funding has also already been applied for and received, the Safe Routes to School for the County Road 74 trail has already been received. For the 100th Street, it's kind of a combination; there's $7 million that we've already obtained, there is $3 million we have been told we're getting but haven't quite received, and then we're in the midst of applying for additional grant funding. So, it's a little bit of both throughout the whole presentation. Bhat asked, for Ms. Matter, regarding climate change, in any of these five-year outlook projects that you've outlined, are there any considerations towards climate change, or is that something discussed while you lay out these projects? Meyer replied it hasn't been a huge topic of discussion as we talk about street reconstruction projects, those sorts of things. She knows with the Glacial Valley Park building that is currently under construction, nearly completed, there were quite a few alternative energy sources that were reviewed and actually implemented for that building, trying to make that building pretty much self sufficient. So, we have tried to look for some varying opportunities to do stormwater reuse for irrigation, those sorts of things, but she would say it's a little bit more unique for us.

Frazier stated he appreciated that Ms. Matter brought up the fact that citizens need to be involved in the process because he wholeheartedly agrees. He thinks if you asked everybody who works for the City, the process is better when everyone's involved. We don't want to be making decisions for everybody on our own; the more input we get, the better the end result is. So, the more people who work and point out different aspects or things that they think might work better, the better the end result is. So, he totally agrees with that statement, and he hopes next time we have this meeting next year, the seats are full and we hear everybody about what they think about the Capital Improvement Plan. He won't hold his breath, but he'll hope for it.

Rasmussen made a motion to approve the CIP 2024-2028. Knable seconded. Motion passed unanimously (7-to-0 vote).

Approval of Planning Commission Minutes of July 24, 2023

Fisher made a motion to approve the minutes of the July 24, 2023, Planning Commission meeting. Rasmussen seconded. Motion passed unanimously (7-to-0 vote).

Reports

8.1 Recap of August, September, and October 2023 City Council Meetings

Schmitz provided a summary of actions taken at the City Council meetings on August 16, September 6, and October 4, 2023.

Schmitz asked Council Member Khambata if he had anything additional to add or if any commissioners had questions for herself or Council Member Khambata.

Khambata commended Matter on raising a lot of really good questions. He knows there is probably another three-or-four minutes of conversation to be had; he looks forward to hearing the rest of that at our meeting in a couple of weeks when this will come before Council. It should be noted that this is exactly what it sounds like, a Capital Improvement Plan; none of these projects are set in stone. Any funds that we get from grants do not need to be paid back; so, since he's been on the Council, he's tasked every one of the directors to seek out grants and seek out funding opportunities. So, it's key that these projects are on the CIP because it gives our staff and our City the tools it needs to go and access those grant funds; without them being on the CIP, we're asking for money that we can't really justify needing. Some projects, like the 100th Street realignment, have been on year five of our five-year plan for as long as he's been on the Planning Commission. It's a placeholder, and unless or until the funds are available, that project will sit on year five, which is, in his opinion, the back burner. So, as we strive to be a fiscally responsible City, this plan is an essential part of that. To Bonnie's point, some of these numbers are staggering, which is why we are constantly looking for grants, cost sharing, or cost matching, which would be the case of the Water Treatment Facility. That is mostly 3M Settlement money funding the first phase of that; however, there's an opportunity there to get something that we all can agree on the Public Works side is an eventuality, a new building. If we can offset a large portion of the cost of that by shifting it onto an existing project, there's a long-term benefit to us in doing so. So, we're always looking for synergies and opportunities like that where we can stretch our dollar as far as possible. As these projects come to fruition, as the funding becomes available, these projects come back before the Planning Commission with, in most cases, some tweaks. Again, we try to account for inflation, but when we have 12 or 13 years of maybe 2 percent inflation and then, in the course of a year, inflation is 5 percent, 6 percent, or 7 percent, then we have to go back and sharpen our pencils, and that's why some of these changes occur. Regarding the Public Utilities Fund, that is something that he advocated for because it did not previously exist. An audit of our Public Utilities billing showed that we were far below average for a city of our size and the service we were providing; so, in order to avoid having to bond out for projects for the future, we established that Public Utilities Fund for the purpose of funding future projects.

Parks is another area where Parks only has one dedicated source of funding, and that is Park Dedication. So, when you hear the term development driven, State Statute requires that a developer contribute either 10 percent of the cost of the project or 10 percent of the gross area to the City for Park Dedication. Unfortunately, for us, as a growing City, we don't have as many established parks as we would want, so we historically have opted for the land, not the dollar amount. So, we're getting land to develop parks, but we're not getting any other dedicated funding source. In the last few years, we've had cell phone tower leases on our water towers; that is one dedicated funding source for parks. Something that he'd like to do is to find other dedicated sources through land leases or fee for service or user fees that can help to make parks a sustainable entity so that they can cover most of their own costs. Those are things where we're constantly looking for opportunities. More recently, Parks & Rec has been getting a lot of opportunities to apply for DNR grants, especially with regard to the Mississippi Dunes. The size and scope of that park, relative to the City's financial contribution, will be a huge win for us. It will be over 50 acres, of which he thinks we're purchasing 13. For the total cost of the park, because it's shared with the DNR and the County, our dollar is going to get stretched four, five times to what our actual contribution is in terms of the asset that we're getting. Again, those projects are dependent on getting those grants and that funding. Unless or until we get them, these projects just kind of continue to stay on the CIP.

On the solar panels question from Fisher, we went back and forth pretty extensively on the solar panels; he doesn't have the exact numbers in front of him, but he knows that in order to get Council approval for that, there is a cost benefit. It will be a savings with projected, he thinks in year 10, return on investment at today's rate. As you know, every so often the Public Utilities Commission goes to the State and lobbies to have their rates increased. So, at today's rate, there's a projected payoff and a long-term benefit. That savings goes to fund the Ice Arena to offset some of the cost of the maintenance at the Ice Arena. Again, Parks & Rec bears the burden of operations there, so we're again looking for dedicated funding sources or cost-saving opportunities; the solar panels are a cost-saving opportunity that will offset our long-term budget.

Council Member Khambata stated he'd take any questions, but none were asked.

Council Member Khambata welcomed Commissioner Bhat, and thanked the Commissioners for their volunteer hours, time, and dedication.

8.2 Response to Planning Commission Inquiries

None.

8.3 Planning Commission Requests

There was a request for information on Ice Arena solar panels and the Oltman Middle School lacrosse field.

Adjournment

Rasmussen made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Knable seconded. Motion passed unanimously (7-to-0 vote). The meeting was adjourned at 8:05 p.m.