

COTTAGE GROVE CITY COUNCIL

12800 RAVINE PARKWAY SOUTH

COTTAGE GROVE, MN 55016

COUNCIL CHAMBER - 7:00 P.M

February 19, 2025

1. CALL TO ORDER

The City Council of the City of Cottage Grove, Washington County, Minnesota, held a regular meeting on February 19, 2025, at Cottage Grove City Hall, 12800 Ravine Parkway. Mayor Bailey called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The audience, staff, and City Council Members stood and recited the Pledge of Allegiance.

3. ROLL CALL

City Clerk Tammy Anderson called the roll: Mayor Bailey-Here; Council Member Clausen-Here; Council Member Garza-Here; Council Member Olsen-Here; Council Member Thiede-Here.

Also present: Jennifer Levitt, City Administrator; Tammy Anderson, City Clerk; Ryan Burfeind, Public Works Director; Zac Dockter, Parks and Recreation Director; Pete Koerner, Public Safety Director; Stacie Kvilvang, Ehlers & Associates, Inc.; Korine Land, City Attorney-LeVander, Gillen & Miller, PA; Gretchen Larson, Economic Development Director; Brenda Malinowski, Finance Director; Emily Schmitz, Community Development Director; Phil Jents, Communication Manager; Samantha Pierret, Senior Planner.

4. OPEN FORUM

Mayor Bailey opened the Open Forum. As no one wished to address the Council, Mayor Bailey closed the Open Forum.

5. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Motion by Council Member Thiede to approve the agenda; second by Council Member Garza. Motion carried: 5-0.

6. PRESENTATIONS - None.

7. CONSENT AGENDA

- A. Accept the 2025 Strategic Directions.
- B. Approve the December 6, 2024 Parks, Recreation and Natural Resources Commission Meeting Minutes.
- C. Approve the December 3, 2024 Economic Development Authority Regular Meeting Minutes.
- D. Approve the issuance of rental licenses to the properties listed in the attached table.
- E. Approve Resolution 2025-22, Accept Donations for 4th Quarter 2024.
- F. Approve the 2025 Commissioner and Committee Reappointments.

- G. Appoint Terrence Woodman to the Planning Commission to a term ending on February 28, 2027.
- H. Approve the renewal of an Intoxicating Hemp License to Highnorth Dispensary allowing them to continue to sell Lower Potency Hemp products.
- I. Approve the letter to the Minnesota Department of Revenue requesting they begin Lodging Tax collection for the City of Cottage Grove.
- J. Adopt Resolution 2025-015, supporting federal legislation to reimburse body armor costs for all emergency responders, including firefighters, rescue, and EMS professionals.
- K. Approve the Accurint Virtual Crime Center SaaS in the amount of \$6,000 annually.
- L. Approve the ImageTrend Fire Investigations SaaS in the amount of \$1,500 annually, plus a one-time \$225 implementation fee for a total of \$1,725.
- M. Approve the agreement for professional services with FireCatt Precision Service Testing.
- N. Approve the two-year amendment with Squeaky Cleaners and Painters for janitorial services.
- O. Staff recommends the approval of the ImageTrend Community Health Care SaaS in the amount of \$7,500 annually, plus a one-time \$1,500 implementation fee, for a total of \$9,000.
- P. Authorize cooperative agreement with the State of Minnesota Department of Natural Resources to construct a fishing pier at Mississippi Dunes Park.
- Q. Approve the ACTIVE Net Master Agreement as reviewed by staff and City legal counsel.
- R. Adopt Resolution 2025-019 approving the 2025 Mining Permit for Holcim - MWR, Inc. - Nelson Sand & Gravel Facility.
- S. Adopt Resolution 2025-016 approving the plans and specifications and authorizing bidding for the High Zone Raw Water Main Project.
- T. 1) Approve Change Order # in the amount of \$1,100. 2) Adopt Resolution 2025-017 approving the final payment for the Low Zone Water Treatment Plant and Utility/Engineering Building Project to Castrejon, Inc., in the amount of \$68,504.70.
- U. Adopt Resolution 2025-023 authorizing the preparation of a feasibility report for Ravine Parkway from 85th Street to Keats Avenue.
- V. Adopt Resolution 2025-021 approving the plans and specifications and authorize bidding for the 2025 Pavement Management Project.

Council Member Thiede wished to pull Item R, Holcim 2025 Mining Permit, and Mayor Bailey wished to pull Item P, MN DNR Cooperative Agreement for Mississippi Dunes Park Fishing Pier, on the Consent Agenda for further comment and/or discussion.

Mayor Bailey said we'll start with Council Member Thiede, and asked if he just wanted some clarification on this one; Council Member Thiede replied yes, as there's both this permit, a 2025 permit, and then there's also been the Environmental Study. He wanted someone to just explain the difference between those and that we're just looking at the 2025 permit, and it really has nothing to do with the Environmental study that went on in the backwaters part.

Emily Schmitz, Community Development Director, stated the image before you is showing on the lefthand side Holcim's proposed mining area for the 2025 Mining Permit. On the righthand side is the separate area that they are working on with an entirely separate process for the expansion of their mining operation in the backwaters of the Mississippi River.

Council Member Thiede said so, in 2025, they're pretty much staying kind of right in that same area that they were in 2024; all right, good. Mayor Bailey thanked Director Schmitz for that clarification.

Mayor Bailey said for the public, I pulled Item P, the MN DNR Cooperative Agreement for Mississippi Dunes Park Fishing Pier, and I want to acknowledge the fact that our Park staff, specifically, does an amazing job of going out there and trying to find funding sources for our parks and our open spaces. For those who may or may not remember, we tried for a Local Option Sales Tax that did not pass this last November, but that didn't stop the fact that we're going to still go out and update parks and so on. The great news is that I don't even know that we really originally were thinking there was going to be a fishing pier, but the DNR was very excited about this opportunity

to get access into the river; so, our staff has been working different angles and processes, and so what this is doing is authorizing approval for the City to enter into an agreement to have that fishing pier purchased, paid for by the DNR. So, I thought I'd just mention that since I know that's exciting as we go forward.

Motion by Council Member Garza to approve the Consent Agenda; second by Council Member Clausen.
Motion carried: 5-0.

8. APPROVE DISBURSEMENTS

- A. Approve disbursements for the period of 1-31-2025 through 2-12-2025 in the amount of \$2,753,364.99.

Motion by Council Member Olsen to approve disbursements; second by Council Member Clausen.
Motion carried: 5-0.

9. PUBLIC HEARINGS

- A. Property Tax Abatement for a portion of the 2025A Bonds
Staff Recommendation: 1) Hold Public Hearing for property tax abatements in connection with the bond issuance for the irrigation project at the golf course. 2) Adopt Resolution 2025-018, approving the property tax abatements.

Mayor Bailey said this is a Public Hearing. Stacie Kvilvang from Ehlers & Associates, Inc. is here to walk us through this. He welcomed Stacie.

Stacie said thank you, Mayor and Members of the Council. As you stated this is a Public Hearing on the Tax Abatement portion of the bonds, which you're issuing, it's about \$1.64 million of that. This is our statutory authority in which to pay for those improvements, which are improvements to your irrigation system for the public golf course for which you're reimbursing yourself. A requirement is for us to select parcels that we will abate the City's portion of property taxes from; so, the parcels that are listed in the Public Hearing are the Aurilla Apartments and a commercial space that's on 95th Avenue. There's no nexus test required for the abating of those parcels, it's just a technicality that we have to have that we show that the City's portion of taxes will cover the principal amount of the bonds. The Public Hearing, then, for you this evening is on granting that tax abatement for this project, finding that the tax abatement equals the principal amount of the bonds, and also that it is in the public interest because it's improving public facilities and services to the residents. So, with that, I'm happy to stand for any questions.

Mayor Bailey asked if Council had any questions for Stacie at this point; none were asked. Mayor Bailey thanked Stacie.

Mayor Bailey opened the Public Hearing; this is the opportunity if anybody wants to speak on this item, they're welcome to do so at this time.

Bonnie Matter, 6649 Inskip Avenue South, Cottage Grove, said I was just wondering if Stacie could just explain how this differs from a property tax levy. Thank you.

Stacie replied Mayor, Council Members, essentially it's no different from a property tax levy because it's a levy that you're increasing to abate your property taxes to go and put those resources towards something else that you're actually bonding for; so, technically, even though it's called a tax abatement, it is a tax levy.

Mayor Bailey said I'll say what I think might be the question; so, the question is this isn't a tax on top of an already tax, correct?

Stacie replied Mayor, Council Members, that's correct.

Mayor Bailey said I just wanted to make sure that that was clear; we weren't adding an extra tax, we're just diverting, if you will, or moving the tax from that area to something specific. Stacie stated correct.

Mayor Bailey asked Bonnie if that answered her question; Bonnie said it's just a different way of looking at it. Mayor Bailey said well, that's why I was trying to say it, because it wasn't a tax on top of a tax, so it's already there. Bonnie said so it's reducing the taxes that are coming in that would be used, that's all; it's just different. Bonnie said thank you.

Mayor Bailey thanked Stacie.

As no one else wished to speak on this item, Mayor Bailey closed the Public Hearing.

Council Member Olsen said I appreciate your explanation on how the tax abatement process works and the fact that it's not an additional tax, it's simply reallocating funds, right? And the comment was made that it reduces our tax that we collect; is that accurate? Stacie replied no.

Council Member Olsen said, okay, could you explain?

Stacie said Mayor and Council Members, essentially you have bonds that you're paying, and you have a portion that you have to use your tax revenues that you get, that comes in as part of your overall tax levy. As stated, it's the same amount that's coming in, you're using that portion to pay the debt service on the bonds. The reality with these bonds is that the intent is that you'll be utilizing revenues from the golf course, so you'll likely be cancelling that portion of the levy anyway.

Council Member Olsen said okay, thank you.

Bonnie said so, you're cancelling that portion of the levy. Mayor Bailey said yeah, because it's getting paid off by the golf course. Stacie confirmed that.

Motion by Council Member Garza to Adopt Resolution 2025-018, approving the property tax abatements; second by Council Member Thiede. Motion carried: 5-0.

Mayor Bailey thanked Stacie for coming to the meeting this evening.

10. BID AWARDS - None.

11. REGULAR AGENDA

A. Lochridge - Zoning Amendment and Preliminary Plat

Staff Recommendation: 1) Adopt Ordinance No. 1093 approving the Zoning Amendment to change the zoning of 72.18 acres from AG-2, Agriculture, to R-4, Transitional Residential. 2) Adopt Resolution 2025-020 approving the Preliminary Plat for a subdivision to be called Lochridge, which will consist of 99 lots for single-family homes and 84 townhome units.

Mayor Bailey said Samantha, our Senior Planner, will walk us through this one.

Samantha Pierret introduced herself to the Council, as it was her first time presenting to the Council, stated she's a new Senior Planner with the City.

She stated that Pulte Homes of Minnesota is requesting approval of a Preliminary Plat and Zoning Amendment for the proposed Lochridge subdivision. The requesting compass is three parcels, totaling approximately 72 acres, currently zoned AG-2, Agriculture, to change to R-4, Transitional Residential District. The plat request is to plat 99 single-family lots and 84 townhome lots; the townhomes would be in groups of four and six units, situated side by side.

The property is located south of the Woodbury border, west of Jamaica Avenue, and north of The Waters at Michael's Pointe development. Outlots A & B of The Waters at Michael's Pointe are included on Preliminary Plat

documents, as there is proposed to be a recreational trail around Lake Robert; at the time of platting, The Waters at Michael's Pointe, Outlot A, was retained by the landowner and planned to be dedicated with future development to the north, which is what we are discussing tonight. Outlots B & E were proposed to be deeded to the City; Outlot B continues to be owned by the Wolterstorffs and Outlot E is currently owned by the City. Outlot B, as noted, will be dedicated to the City during this platting process that we're going through.

Some of the members of the Council and the Mayor may be familiar that multiple development and plat proposals have come forward for this property in the past, from various applicants; challenges to development have included the presence of bedrock and Lake Robert, which have restricted the buildable area.

So, the developer has submitted a landscape plan that meets our Code requirements, including the trees and the shrubs with a buffer that averages about 75 feet along Jamaica Avenue, behind the proposed townhomes. This feature will be similar to that at the Kingston Fields development, which is just south of here, on the east side of Jamaica.

Additional Right-of-Way is also included on the plat at the northeast corner of the development to accommodate a future roundabout at the intersection of Military and Jamaica. The developable area was pushed about 150 feet west of Jamaica to meet County standards. The Lake Robert wetland and wetland buffer also impacts the developable area here and an area of bedrock, which impacts the ability for utility installation and will require some excavation and blasting.

Due to all of those restrictions, the applicant has proposed a mixture of single family and townhomes; the R-4 Transitional Residential District is intended to provide these types of transitional areas that allow for that mixing of single family and townhome units along minor or major collector streets, of which Jamaica Avenue is one.

This slide shows the proposed roundabout in conceptual phase for the Jamaica and Military intersection. Construction is anticipated around 2028 for that; as mentioned, the design requires additional Right-of-Way in the northeast corner of the development. This slide also shows an aerial view of the Jamaica Avenue corridor from the Woodbury border at the north to 70th Street at the south.

An eight-foot wide trail will be constructed on the north and south sides of the new Ravine Parkway extension, and an internal sidewalk will also be constructed in the development.

Access to the proposed development will be via Jamaica Avenue, from the east; Jamaica was designed to handle approximately 15,000 vehicles per day, and currently there are approximately 4,200 trips taken per day on Jamaica. At full buildout, the Lochridge development will add about 1,500 trips per day, so adding the 4,200 and 1,500, for a total of 5,700, is well below that 15,000 that Jamaica was designed to handle.

The developer will be responsible for installing right and left turn lanes on Ravine Parkway to access Jamaica, and a northbound left turn lane and southbound right turn lane on Jamaica, to access the new Ravine Parkway.

The developer will also be required to deposit escrow funds for future construction of the trail along Jamaica Avenue, going north of the new Ravine Parkway extension; this section of the trail will not be built until that rebuild of Jamaica happens, in 2028.

During our Planning Commission meeting, there was some discussion on the difference between the Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Ordinances. So, just as a reminder for everyone, with the Comprehensive Plan and Land Use, the difference is that the Comprehensive Plan does guide the actions of the community by presenting a vision for the future, as well as the permitted density ranges for each Land Use type. All Land Use decisions must be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, while the Zoning regulations specifically define how land can be used to implement the City's vision found in the Comprehensive Plan.

On this slide, it shows that the Comprehensive Plan designates the property as Low Density Residential and Parks and Open Space. The Parks and Open Space will be achieved by a proposed park on Outlot G of the Lochridge Development and that proposed trail around Lake Robert. The Low Density Residential will be achieved with the proposed density of 3.2 units per acre; Low Density Residential allows for 2-to-4 units per acre, as designed in our Comprehensive Plan.

As a comparison for the Council, the Summer Valley Development was approved in 2024 with a net density of 3.14 units per acre, and the Graymont Village Development had a net density of 3.47 units per acre, so very similar to this proposal in front of you today.

The Preliminary Plat is not requesting a Planned Unit Development (PUD); it is intended to meet all of the standards found in the R-4 Zoning District. Pulte Homes will construct the dwellings north of the new Ravine Parkway extension, lots south of Ravine Parkway will be retained by Rachel Development with a builder yet to be determined.

The developer must also design the site so there is no increase in the 100-year high water level of Lake Robert. Stormwater from outside the development does flow onto the site, but it will be accommodated by the proposed ponds and storm sewers.

Outlot G, as I mentioned before, will be established as a new neighborhood park, which will include play equipment and a shelter and parking lot; the parking lot will be constructed during Phase 1 of development construction. The timeline for all the amenities is dependent on funding, of course.

Planner Pierret stated kind of getting into the history of the trail going around Lake Robert: In 2007, The Waters at Michael's Pointe was approved for a Preliminary Plat, and at that time the City was operating under a 2020 Comprehensive Plan. Conversations at the time were being had to include the trail around the lake, as seen in the 2007 Staff Report excerpt on the screen; one section of the report does state that a trail around the Shepard Woods Pond, as it was known at the time, was not proposed. However, later in the same report, it was recommended that a future public trail be constructed around the pond. At that time, the property owner wanted to retain ownership of Outlot A, which restricted the City's ability to plan for a future trail around the lake; however, the City did know that a trail would be planned for construction at the time the land to the north would be developed.

Continuing the Final Plat for The Waters at Michael's Pointe was approved in 2011, after a few extensions were approved. At that time, the City was operating under its 2030 Comprehensive Plan, which then showed the future recreation trail around the lake. Today, we are considering the Lochridge Development under our 2040 Comprehensive Plan, which also still shows that planned recreation trail around the lake.

Just as a few examples of similar trails in Cottage Grove that do get kind of close to some of the dwellings, we have Rolling Meadows, Hawthorne Pines, and the Calarosa 2nd and 5th Additions, and a couple of those are on the screen for you. The trail locations closer to dwellings around the City are the most practical locations to meet the needed trail connections.

So, after the Planning Commission Meeting, staff did investigate various trail alternatives, as seen on the screen:

We have the blue line, which is Alternative 1, constructing a bituminous trail on the east, west, and southwest sides of Lake Robert, with a boardwalk in the southwest corner. Instead of continuing the trail behind the homes at The Waters at Michael's Pointe, the trail would continue to the existing trail and sidewalk system on 67th Street Bay South; users would then continue using the sidewalk system there to Jamaica Avenue, which would facilitate a connection to the Lochridge Development and the new park.

The green line on the exhibit shows Alternative 2, which continues the trail on the east-west and southwest sides of the lake; instead of running behind the dwellings, it would include a boardwalk being installed within the wetland to construct the trail that would connect to the east side of the lake.

The red line shows the approximate location of the trail, as it was originally proposed. The original intention of the development was for the blue and red lines to be constructed.

During the Planning Commission meeting, it should be noted a few of the members did only support construction of the blue option.

It should be noted also that construction of boardwalks does come at a cost; boardwalks can cost up to six times more than asphalt trails, per linear foot, and they cannot be maintained year round, since plow trucks cannot drive on the boardwalks. Staff also acknowledges the impacts of the original trail location on the westernmost lot, where the lot would have had a public trail on three sides of the lot; so, staff has shifted that trail from directly behind that lot, instead to run diagonally from the existing trail stub to the blue trail, as seen.

Continuing to discuss the proposed trail, there was a boardwalk proposed on the northwest side of the wetland as well; staff would prefer to see that this not be a boardwalk in this area, and instead have the trail constructed around the wetland, within the wetland buffer. The trail around the wetland would avoid directly impacting that

wetland and, as discussed previously, would be a less-costly option. No wetland credits would be needed to construct the trail on the land around the wetland.

The boardwalk on the southwest side of the wetland that I mentioned a couple times will need to be constructed to avoid negative impacts to the wetland; the alternative here is to obtain wetland credits and permits to fill the wetland and install a bituminous trail in that area.

This image shows the existing neighborhood of The Waters at Michael's Pointe with the proposed trail in gray. I will acknowledge that the trail does show behind the westernmost lot; however, that would be situated differently, as discussed earlier. There are some distances in red that show the proposed trail would be no closer than 10 feet from the nearest rear property line. About 16 trees will need to be removed for trail construction, mostly consisting of unwanted species, such as Ash or Boxelder. The Parks Department does typically remove trees within 5 feet of a trail; however, the path may be able to be adjusted to save some higher-quality trees.

During the Planning Commission, there was also some discussion about possibly adding some screening to City property or private properties to minimize the visual impact of the trail on these existing residences. Coniferous trees or coniferous shrubs could be added behind these lots, either on City property or private property, depending on the distance from the trail. The City and the developer will work with individual property owners on the best options for location of screening.

There are some small sections of the trail that are lying in areas that are low lying that may be inundated with water for short periods of time with storms of 4 inches or more; this is also not uncharacteristic of other trails in the City, such as those at Hamlet Park, Pine Tree Park, and Pine Tree Valley Park.

Various personal property has also been added to Outlot A over the years, as allowed by the property owner. The City will not accept Outlot A for public dedication until all personal property is removed.

The development is also adjacent to the Shepard Woods Farm and its wooded trail system; there's currently not a planned trail connection, hikers may wander through the Shepard Woods Farm to connect to those trails. At just under one mile long, the trail around the lake will be a great asset to the City of Cottage Grove and will facilitate a connection to the trails along Jamaica Avenue via Ravine Parkway. It should also be noted that the City acquired Outlot E at The Waters at Michael's Pointe in 2012, with the intention of constructing this trail around the lake.

Just one last slide about the proposed development for everyone to see. The townhomes will be slab-on-grade; single family homes would be a mixture of walkout, split walkout, split lookout, and a full basement.

Planner Pierret said with that, it is recommended that the Council Adopt Ordinance No. 1093 and Adopt Resolution 2025-020, and I will stand for questions.

Mayor Bailey said thank you, Samantha. He asked if Council had any questions:

Council Member Olsen said sorry for my voice, everybody, I'm fighting the grunge like about half the public right now in the State of Minnesota. So, if you didn't hear what I said, I'll certainly repeat myself. First, I have a question for Kori, as it relates to the slide that we saw that stipulated in one portion of the slide that there would be no trail, and then later on, stipulated there would be a trail. So, how do you reconcile that?

Attorney Land replied Members of the Council, I actually had to read that several times. And, as you know, Planning reports are not always written precisely, and so I think the way I would have interpreted that is to insert, which I think makes the most sense. There is no trail planned yet, because then in the following paragraph, it said we do plan to have a trail around the pond, we just don't know when; and then it was followed up in the Comprehensive Plan with a proposal that there would be trails around the pond. So, this clearly was intended for a future trail, it was not articulated as well as it could have been in the Planning report, but it just wasn't planned yet is, I think, the only way that interpretation makes sense.

Council Member Olsen asked and was there any signage that the City put out in the portion of this property that's City owned indicating future trailway, or anything like that? Because when we do road stubs, as an example,

we put signage that says this will be a future through road, it kind of lets people know at some point this will happen. Did we do that with this area? Does anybody know?

Director Schmitz replied no, we did not.

Council Member Olsen said we did not, okay. All right, so it was in the Comprehensive Plan, which maybe 18 people read, but it wasn't signed; that's a little bit of a challenge for me, frankly, if I'm a property owner.

Council Member Olsen said the next thing I wanted to ask is you showed a slide with an alternate route. Would you please go back to that slide? Okay, so, it might be the cold medicine, I want to make sure that I understand what I'm looking at. So, down in the lower left, I can see there's a trailway that connects with the red area, okay? And that red area is the original proposed trailway, right?

Planner Pierret replied correct; the red one and the blue one were originally proposed.

Council Member Olsen replied okay. So, the green, which is boardwalk in the wetland, I know that that came up in the Planning Commission meeting, too, and I think we all know those are incredibly expensive. They're very difficult A, to put in, and B, to maintain, so it probably doesn't make much sense. And now I've got Emily up, so oh, oh. I don't feel well, so don't beat me up. So, what is this blue that instead of connecting with the red, we've got the blue. What is that?

Director Schmitz replied we still trust your judgment, whatever cold medicine you're on. So, the blue is identifying a potential option that would connect to the sidewalks up at, that comes through this cul-de-sac. So, as Samantha had identified, we recognize that we needed to be cognizant of that proposed connection heading, I'm going to call it north-south, right?

Council Member Olsen said so, then this would take the traffic away from those back yards, is that what I'm seeing?

Director Schmitz replied exactly, correct, by connecting to the stub, as opposed to running the asphalt trail behind the properties.

Council Member Olsen said okay, so, what conversations, if any, have we had with the property owners, the developer, staff, etc. about this as an option?

Director Schmitz asked as far as extending or connecting the trail to be the sidewalk? Council Member Olsen replied yes. Director Schmitz said it's been a topic of conversation that it is an option.

Council Member Olsen replied okay, all right. So, that could potentially be a compromise to some of the folks who are concerned about traffic in their back yard, is what I'm hearing. Is that accurate?

Director Schmitz replied that's accurate.

Council Member Olsen said okay, I just want to make sure the Benadryl's not talking to me. One other thing I wanted to ask is when you look at this body of water, it's not really like a super awesome body of water; and this might be a Ryan question, but I know that the Watershed is going to have to change some things in order to move water through this property, and with the bedrock, that can be somewhat of a challenge. What are they proposing to do here? I saw some of the ponds that were proposed, but would they also utilize this body of water as a holding pond, or what is their thought?

Director Burfeind replied so, with this development, like Sam mentioned, there's several points of water that come in from the Calarosa Development, to the west, to Woodbury, to the north, so it's a big challenging. They do have a series of ponds and larger storm pipes that get that offsite water to this lake. It goes to the lake today, and it'll continue to go to the lake in the same fashion; they won't rate control it because that's not a requirement. Developers don't have to take offsite water and slow it down, that's just not the way development happens. Their water, this property, also drains to this lake completely today, so, everything goes to Lake Robert; and then the City, probably in about 2021, constructed an outlet. This was always a landlocked lake, there was no way for water to get out. If residents are here that butt up to that lake, they remember when that lake kept going up and up and up and there was water in their back yards, and it eventually used an emergency overflow to the east. So, the outlet's been constructed, so we now can control that 100-year high water level; and the developer has to meet all of the City, State Watershed rules for their water, and then they would just simply allow the water to move through their development to the lake. Future developments of Woodbury and the Kemp property would have to do the same rate control that they're doing to make sure they don't negatively impact the lake or the property owners around the lake.

Council Member Olsen said yeah, you actually read my mind because we do share the pipe with Woodbury; so, I was going to ask that question. So, I think what I hear you saying is in the event of a "100-year flood," we have planned for enough distribution of overland water, underground, using piping, that will eliminate the possibility that this water would come up right into the back yards or over the trailway. Does that sound about right?

Director Burfeind replied so, this trail; if the trail were to be built behind the homes, it would go underwater in a 100-year floor, which would be expected. At the Planning Commission, there was discussion about the modeling showing the high water level coming up about 6 inches. Now, I think that's a little deceiving because there's multiple models and multiple phases of development; and I won't get into that, but really this development, specifically, actually shows about a 1-inch increase, and we would continue to work with them to get that to no increase. That 6-inch increase was actually based on full development of Woodbury, but we would work with Woodbury to make sure that doesn't happen. And I think there's a lot that goes into a stormwater model, they're very complicated, and this is a very large Watershed.

Council Member Olsen replied I'm sure, and you've got to really be precise about the size of your pipe and where you put it and all the rest of it. So, and that did come up at the Planning Commission meeting, Emily Stephens brought it up.

Council Member Olsen said two other things, real quick, one you can help with, and that is Jamaica Avenue. Now, oftentimes when we have new development, we will hear main street is a collector road and it can handle this many cars and all the rest of it. While that may technically be true, the reality is there will be a change for people who utilize that road to get to and from wherever they're going; and that change is going to create a little bit more difficult ability to maybe pull out and take a left, which is already hard to do over there. It might be a little more difficult for people to cross over, I know we've talked about that before, doing a crosswalk and some different things. So, as we're looking forward into the reconstruction of Jamaica Avenue, which has been on the books for quite some time, are we confident that they're going to go back to the two lanes on each side? And the turn lanes in order to accommodate that additional traffic, and hopefully help people who currently live in the development still be able to use that roadway effectively?

Director Burfeind replied so, in terms of Jamaica Avenue, I think what is really important is like you said, it is in our CIP, the County's CIP for 2028; they do have an RFP out right now to start the consultant. So, that's very much moving forward, that's very solidified. In terms of what that road's going to be, the County will do a full buildout traffic study, and they'll build the road to what it needs to be. In terms of the number of lanes, that doesn't add any convenience for the side roads; that's just making sure you have the right amount of lanes to move the through traffic. Obviously, we did build a 4-lane section from 70th to Rose of Sharon Church, that was so preliminary, we didn't want to be shortsighted. For the rest of the road, the County will look very closely at that, it could be there will be a 3-lane section with a dedicated left-turn lane; because, frankly, a 4-lane could just be way overbuilt and way too costly, which has an impact on City and County ability to build that road. So, like I said, they'll do a full buildout traffic model, they will build exactly what they need to build. It will include turn lanes, and it will include a right-turn lane into 67th Street that doesn't exist today; I know that was also brought up at the Planning Commission. That's a new standard, that we add those right-turn lanes. Even though it can have the feeling of I can be rearended, at a 45 MPH road, they aren't required and they're not a mandate, but it is a County standard now and a City standard. So, that right-turn lane would be added at that time. This development would build the right and left turn lanes with the development.

Council Member Olsen replied good, and I think that'll give people some additional comfort, similar to what we had to do down at the golf course, etc. You want to give people that sense of security that when I pull out or pull in, I'm not going to have somebody right in my trunk. So, that's great, thank you for that.

Council Member Olsen said and the last thing I want to ask, and I'm not sure who wants to take this, is with regard to the screening trees, would the intent be to utilize like arbor vitae or kind of more of a narrow, taller tree to screen? Because there's not a lot of space there, to be honest with you. When I went out and looked at the space with a couple of the neighbors over there, it's a little tight; so, I'm just curious what kind of plant species would be utilized or best to give them that sense of security and comfort.

Director Burfeind replied I can speak to that, initially, if there's anything that Emily or Sam would like to add, they could, but we would want to use a coniferous-type tree so it has the year-round screening. And it is true that it does get, the trail will get closer to those homes, but the intent was to work with the developer, with the

homeowners, right? If we do want to keep it on private property, it would have to be a smaller tree, which would provide a little less screening, or we could work with them to plant it right on the back of their property so you could have more of a standard coniferous tree; but I think that's something we would just work closely on with each homeowner.

Council Member Olsen asked and would we still do that for the other homes affected by the trailway if we went with the option that's blue?

Director Burfeind replied yep, so, if there was, let's say just the blue trail, certainly that blue trail is behind some homes, so I think that's something we could look at; I think the focus has been next to the lake, as Outlot E was always owned to connect to that cul-de-sac, I think even with or without the red trail. But that's certainly something we could look at.

Council Member Olsen said all right, thank you very much. I'm sorry I took all that time, but I know that this has been bandied about for years and years and years and years with different plans and different specs and different developers, and it feels like this one might be a little more real than the others; so, I certainly want to make sure if we do it, we do it right. Back to you, mayor.

Council Member Clausen said I have nothing to add at this portion, but I do want to discuss, back and forth with us, when that time comes.

Mayor Bailey asked, any questions down here at all?

Council Member Thiede said yeah, just one, and I do recall seeing in the packet that there might be a little bit of wiggle room on the red trail going back there, that it might be able to, in some spots, be moved a little further from the lots?

Director Schmitz replied it's possible that that can adjust a bit here and there, but this trail segment was kind of chosen to preserve as many trees as we could. The intent as they physically walked this trail corridor, was with the intention that we could preserve some of the trees with this particular alignment.

Council Member Thiede replied, okay, thanks.

Council Member Garza said so, after I went and walked the area and got a sense of what it looked like over there and how the homes bumped up to the back of there, I started doing some digging; and because of what I do for a living, I was able to access a lot of records from 2011, when the listings were first put out there, when it was just land and not even the homes yet. And in those listings, it stated that there was a future trailway to be brought there. And what I thought was interesting, so, in 2011, when these plots were first advertised, they were advertised as a future trailway to be put there; but then, after it got sold, a couple of them were sold in 2011, 2012, and they were sold as land, that verbiage was taken away by whoever purchased the land. So, I thought that was interesting that when it was originally proposed and these lots were there, this trailway was there in 2011, it was proposed; and the developers then stated that to whoever would buy that land. But then after it got sold, and it started being developed and homes were put on there, that mention went away. And what started happening after that, I noticed, from being just a simple plot, a box, it turned into lakefront property. And, so, as 2015, and so on, those listings started changing, depending on who the listing agent was, and it started advertising it as lakefront property. But in 2011, it was not advertised as lakefront property. So, I just thought that was pretty interesting to mention, and that was just looking back at the MLS records of the listings and the different homes that were sold there.

And then, while I was out there, I ran into a neighbor that was there as well, and they were shoveling, and they took me on a tour around that area. And they said when they purchased in 2011, they were told that there would be a walking trail put there, and they thought that idea had gone away because so much time had passed; so, they just thought the developer wasn't able to do that. So, I just thought that was interesting that this had been told and people were aware of it, but not everyone was aware, and then anybody that bought after that initial development were sort of not told the truth, I guess.

Council Member Thiede said, so as a clarification, the listing agent or whoever that was, was who is responsible for taking that out, right?

Council Member Garza replied that's what it looks like to me. When I did the digging initially, like I said, when they were initially advertised as lots and land, they were advertised as with this verbiage of a trail; and I have it saved on my computer, but that a trail would potentially be put back there. But then, as it got bought by different developers, that line just went away, and then when the houses were actually put on there, the listing changed to waterfront property.

Council Member Thiede said so, it was the marketing.

Council Member Garza replied, yeah, that's what was interesting because those homes are still paying the same taxes as the rest of the people; so, they're not increased for waterfront property, and that's a notable thing as well. So, these are the little things that I found while I was digging.

Mayor Bailey said I have a couple quick questions or maybe a comment, but one of the questions, Ryan, on that newer development where that pond is, I'm assuming if I saw right on the main development, that is going to have access for us to get back there, correct?

Director Burfeind replied yep, that's correct, Mr. Mayor; any of the development ponds, they all have to have a City Outlot access. So, there's requirements on how many, based on the size of the pond, and it's City-owned property to get to them.

Mayor Bailey asked and do you know, because this has come up in other developments, too, do we know if that particular pond is actually going to hold water?

Director Burfeind replied yep, that's correct; so, the ponds in here do all have to hold water because its in our wetland protection area, so they're not allowed to infiltrate. There might be some filtration cells that don't have it, but in general, they do. And you're probably bringing that up because we've had issues over the years; we've made changes to our standards to help address that in some simple but pretty cost-effective ways, like actually putting topsoil down first, then the clay liner. So, we've been trying to make some small changes to help make sure these ponds are actually holding water.

Mayor Bailey said okay, sounds good. And then on the picture, I don't know if this is for Sam or Emily, on the picture with the blue trail that you were referencing, our intent all along, I'm assuming, please tell me if I'm wrong, was to go with the red; but the point is that you were saying that if we decided not to do something in the red, you could do the blue. Is that correct?

Director Schmitz replied that's exactly it, we wanted to provide some options.

Mayor Bailey said okay, the second question I had for you, though, is all of the land behind these homes will be park property, correct?

Director Schmitz replied mayor, that's correct.

Mayor Bailey said and so, we'll be putting our markers or whatever that we normally put in to identify that this is a park?

Director Schmitz replied yep, as the Outlot would be dedicated to the City, we always place those markers on property corners to make it very clear its park and open space.

Mayor Bailey said okay, and so, that means on some of those other slides that you showed where there is encroachment items, those will be removed one way or the other, they'll have to be?

Director Schmitz replied yep, prior to the City accepting that Outlot as dedication from the developer, the developer will be responsible to work with those homeowners to get any of those encroachment items off of that Outlot.

Mayor Bailey said okay, and I know we've been having, as Zac is keenly aware, we have these issues in park property all around the City that we require; I mean, we literally, if I recall one particular situation somebody had to pick up a slab shed or building and move it off of the park property because it was in park property, it was required by law. And, so, I just throw that out there for anybody that has some of the extra stuff back there; no matter what's decided from a trail standpoint, we can talk more about that individually, as a group here in a little bit, after we hear from the public. But I just wanted to make sure I was clear on that.

Mayor Bailey asked any other questions from Council for staff? None were asked. Mayor Bailey said I know the developer is here, does Council have any questions for the developer? There were none.

Mayor Bailey said though there was a Public Hearing at the Planning Commission, I definitely appreciate hearing from the public on any of these issues. So, what I would ask, I didn't get the sheet, so I don't know if everybody signed up on the sheet. What we'll do is if you want to speak on this item, I'll just ask that you come up to the podium, just state your name and address for the record; please limit your time to 3 minutes. And then what we'll do is if there's certain questions that come up, what we like to do in these situations is to have our staff take notes, and then we'll like answer all of the questions at the end. So, we can kind of hear, there might be some of you that have the same question or same comment, so, we'll kind of go from there. At this point, if someone would like to come up and speak on this topic, they're welcome to do so at this time.

Jason Johnson, 8714 67th Street Court South, Cottage Grove, said Mayor, Council, you know, we purchased our house; to make it clear where I am at, I'm off of the block there, E, whatever you want to call that, so, we back up to that. When my wife and I purchased this property, we did our due diligence, we did notice its on park property, and we started making some phone calls; you know, is this actually going to have a trail? What is the use of this back here? And we were told, you know, from the City, I can't tell you who, but hey, there was not going to be a trail back there. We're like hey, this is the perfect home for us, you know, so we purchased it. And it isn't because of the lake, I mean, if you guys, if anybody has spent any time near that lake, it's nothing special. So, we didn't buy it to look at the lake, we bought it because of the privacy and what we got for the money we paid to purchase that home. With this happening, this really changes everything that we've saved for, worked for, and wanted to have. So, that trail, even though it is park property, Cottage Grove property, it's still something that's, you know, we did our research and thought, hey, we were told by the City, I don't know if they looked at the same stuff you did, Garza, but I don't know. Somebody said it wasn't going to be that, and now it's changing. So, that's really a big kick to what we've wanted here. So, I ask that people really think about what we're spending the time and money to build a trail around, and what I find interesting about this whole deal is, you know, it's about the development that's going up there, and this whole thing's really been focused around a trail. You know, and I get that's part of the development and how to get things paid for, I don't know how it gets paid for, I don't dig in that deep. All I'm asking is to think about the homes and stuff that you are affecting in the neighborhoods and the privacy and the security that we do have; because it is a pretty, the loop is going to go back through the woods there, and you know, anybody can get back there. So, that's our back yards that butt up to the park property, I'm well aware of that, but you know, it's just something to think about, and my 3 minutes is probably up, so. Thank you very much.

Good Evening, I'm Kristel Rogers. My husband, Eric, and I live in the development, and if you actually could pull up the slide with the housing, because I think it would be easier to just point it out; I'm a visual person, as an optometrist. Our house is 8844 67th Street Bay South, so, we're the house on the furthest, down on the left side here. We're by far impacted the very most of all these homes. We purchased our home in 2021, shortly after COVID and a lot of stress as a business owner in Cottage Grove, and trying to survive all of that; we decided that we were interested in putting a swimming pool in our back yard, which originally was supposed to be in our house in Cottage Grove, in a different neighborhood. And then, all of a sudden, we found out from a friend of ours that lives in this neighborhood that this house was going up for sale, and so we looked at it, and within 48 hours we had put an offer on it and had a house to move into and had to get ours sold immediately. So, doing some research after moving in on the lot and where the lines were, we did come across this proposed 2040 Comprehensive Plan and called the City at that time and asked them, is this actually going to happen, that this path here could come up? And they said, I don't know who I spoke to, it was a female, and she said no, that land isn't conducive, due to flooding that's happened, for a trail there, so there's no plans for that. So, that was just 3 years ago, 4 years ago now, and so, I mean, we did know that there was that path that already kind of started by our driveway there, on that south side, southwest side, but there could be a path eventually going through the wooded area; but there was no inkling in our minds that there was going to be a path literally within 10 feet of our property line, which is what the proposal is, I think, 10-to-15 feet from the start of the path to our property line. So, we would be significantly impacted if that red line proposal went in because three sides of our home would be visible. So, Eric and I, we understand we do have to come to a compromise on things; as a business owner, I've learned that over the years, you've got to compromise on things. We are okay with the path going along our driveway and along the existing 67th Street Bay South, usage of the existing sidewalk, I think the color on there was blue, if I remember

correctly. But we really, really, really, really ask you to consider the privacy of our home with our children, teenagers, and a lot of people coming back and forth on that pathway. I know that there are paths in the area, and there's other houses that have been developed on paths, and it's not necessarily a bad thing; I think the difference is that we didn't purchase the house knowing that there was going to be a path vs. if you do, and there's already a path existing there, you've accepted that as a homebuyer, and that was not something that was on our radar as being in the plan. So, I guess I would just ask you to kind of consider the houses that are already there and have been existing a long time, and think about it if it was your own property that you'd invested in for some time. So, thank you for hearing us out, and I hope you consider that when you guys make your vote, so.

Mike Miller, 8860 67th Street Bay South, I have enough to go for about 20 minutes, so it'll be hard cutting it to 3, but I live right on the lake. I was told directly by the developers I know who told you or put it in the records to change that to say lakefront property, we were told by the realtors, by the developers, that this was lakefront property. We were told there will never be a path. You can tell by where the trail butt ends are, that's where we were told the path would go, it would come up our street, along the park, along the sidewalk, and go through. The path directly behind our houses takes away our privacy. We did pay, we do pay more taxes because our houses are worth more because our property, the land we bought cost more; so, we are paying more taxes than most other people in the neighborhood. This is not a destination path, that was sold at the Planning Commission that this is a place where everyone in Cottage Grove is going to walk around this lake. You've all walked the lake, it is a swamp, it's covered with Lily Pads almost the entire summer. So, I would say if this is going to be sold as a destination, then the City needs to work on improving the quality of the lake water, removing Lily Pads, potentially dredging the lake because its, I mean, I do an ice rink on the lake, and gosh, it's probably 5, 6 feet deep at best. The waterfall no longer comes to the lake, we used to have it when we first moved in, in 2014; there were all kinds of Wood Ducks, and I mean, we'd see Bald Eagles and all that stuff, that stuff is no longer present in the area because the lake is overrun with Lily Pads. So, I'd strongly, my preference would be like the Rogers, the original path that we were all told that it was coming out around the, on the sidewalks; you know the difference between our path and the path in the rest of the community is, when they bought their property, it's in their plat, they see where the trails go. When we bought ours, we were told there's never going to be a path here. It destroys our privacy, which is why we live where we live. Thanks for listening.

Good Evening, Mayor and Council, Kim Sommerland, 8710 67th Street Court South. A lot of the focus has been on The Waters at St. Michael's Pointe, and just to be clear, it is also impacting our homes that are in The Preserve. So, right now, our home butts up to the property on Outlot E, but it also has some of the same impact, right? I mean, we have lived there without a trail for over 12 years, and again, as some of our neighbors have alluded to, you know, it's different if you're building a development and putting in a trail, and people are buying that, knowing its there. We have bought that and lived without that amenity for over a decade. Other concerns that neighbors have brought up, too, are the privacy and the safety. I mean, the area, and again, all this focus has been on just that portion, there's been no discussion, really, about how the trail comes around on the west and south sides, which would be more of our property, and how secluded it is out there. And what's the cost, too, to put a path through all of those trees? There's a number of trees, I looked at some of the information provided by the developer, and I have to imagine that's going to be pretty costly; and if you are going to make a decision to put that path through that area, that you know exactly what that cost is. Maybe the developer gets credits, but it's still at a cost to the City, it's not like it's free to us as taxpayers; it just means that they're giving us less, maybe it's less or more park dedication money or that sort of thing, so the park's going to take longer to build. Another thing that I noticed when I was looking at some of the information is yes, in the Comprehensive Plan that it indicates that there is a path around a lake, and not that it helps my argument because I don't really want it to go on the south side of the lake; but alluding or going back to the Planning Commission, they talked about wanting to have a loop immediately around the lake, that's not what the Comprehensive Plan shows. So, I mean, there's alternatives, right? You don't have to follow it per se, and even if you were following it exactly as it shows in the Comprehensive Plan, that is not immediately around the lake. So, you know, there's other alternatives. I guess I would just ask the Council consider some of those alternatives. You know, maybe the path goes along the north side of the lake and up into the neighborhood and loops around that way, so, you can still have a loop, but it's not going through the woods where

it's going to be very costly. So, I would just ask that the Council really consider and explore other solutions with respect to the established character of our community and be fiscally responsible. Thank you.

Mayor and Council, Kevin Sommerland, 8710 67th Street Court South. My wife just spoke, she speaks a lot more eloquently than I, so I apologize. She certainly addressed all of my concerns as well. One thing I would like to add, or a couple of things, actually. In addition to, quite honestly, opposing that trail going through the back of our lots, not only in The Preserve, but certainly here on Michael's Pointe as well, and this is a very good alternative, I think, to utilize the sidewalk and avoid the back yards of those lots at St. Michael's. Unfortunately, there hasn't been an alternative proposed for us on The Preserve, which I would ask that the Planning Commission look at and bring to you. But, also, I want to address the larger proposal and plat; that area that they're looking to put in upwards of 160 homes, I believe it is, 99 single family and then the 84, whatever it was, townhomes, that's a huge influx of people. Those lots are very small, it really should be, in my opinion, looked at, just the density of it is overwhelming in my mind for an area that right now has been preserved and protected. But with that influx of people, I know they talked about the turn lane that would be created into that new development, but I don't know if it was made clear whether or not that turn lane would be extended down into 67th Street now. So, I would ask if that isn't part of the proposal, that that be added as well to accommodate our access onto Jamaica Avenue. Thank you.

Bonnie Matter, 6649 Inskip Avenue South, Cottage Grove, Minnesota, 55016, said thank you very much, Mayor and Council Members, I just have a few questions, and I think it's more for the developer. Question #1 has to do with the blast plan. I know that there's bedrock up there, I don't know for sure where it is, maybe someone can put up a map when they answer this. I'd like to know how often they will be blasting, and how will we be notified up on our end, and when's it going to happen, how often will it happen, etc., where will it happen? Secondly, I'd like to see where the wetland is, and I would strongly oppose any purchase of credits to mitigate that wetland. I would hope that that wetland could be kept. I'd like to know where the two exits are to get in and out of this development, because it's my understanding we require two exits to get in and out. And I don't understand yet, after all the discussion tonight, maybe it doesn't have to happen tonight, and I don't need to know, but which trail are you picking or aren't you picking, you're just talking about it? Those are my questions, thank you.

Good Evening, Tony Khambata, 7515 74th Street South, Cottage Grove. As I look at the possible options for trail, I guess my question is the cost of the boardwalk, right; so, is the alternative option more expensive, and would you make similar considerations for any other neighborhood? So, I would want, if I was in any given neighborhood, I would want to be treated equally. So, then I have to ask, you know, if this was any other neighborhood, would we make an exception for them? Because, you know, if you make an exception now, or for this one, then that sets a precedent. So, and then there's the cost factor, right? So, does the other option, is it less expensive? Because then that might, that's a legitimate reason without making an exception for, you know, aggrieved property owners, that's a justifiable reason to go with an alternative plan, I would think. And then, lastly is, it appears that whoever owns that land now, prior to that Outlot being dedicated, they're land is being trespassed upon. So, you know, I think while, if I was in this neighborhood, I would be frustrated by this. You know, I think the property owner who currently owns it, you know, if they had wanted to could have, you know, made similar, you know, like they could already have a trail back there, they could be riding dirt bikes back there. So, I don't think the City wanting to put a trail in there adversely affects these property owners any differently than if the current property owner were to be using their land in a legal way. That's all I have.

Mayor Bailey said with that, I'm not sure who wants to; there were some questions, some more just comments, but I don't know who wants to take what piece of it before we talk some more.

Director Burfeind said I'll go first with some of the engineering questions, and then I think Emily can cover the density question as well.

So, in terms of the cost, there was some discussion about the costs of the trails if we did pick or go with the red alignment, while there certainly is cost if you're going to go through a wooded area, there's tree removal, that's not unusual or different than any other trail that we build; they cost about, in general, \$60 a foot for construction;

so, if this is 600 feet, you know, you're \$30,000 or \$40,000, so that's your scale, right? But that is the cost to build trails, right? If we want to have trails to use in our town, there's a cost to build them; nothing here is unusual or different. The boardwalk would be, right? So, there was a question of what is that; it's 6 times more expensive, so, you're looking at \$180,000 to \$200,000, just to have that section of trail, and not any of our boardwalks today really cross something, like it crosses Hamlet Pond, right? That's the only way to cross a pond is through the boardwalk; so, it is a very much more costly endeavor to have that boardwalk in that situation.

Director Burfeind said the other, I think more specific, question regarding traffic and the turn lane; so, like I'd mentioned before, the turn lanes would be built, that is standard, we can require developers to build turn lanes into their development, which we would do. They will be reconstructed in a matter of three years; that's not something that's proposed for 67th Street right now. That's not something we can really force the developer to build a different turn lane at a different intersection down the road because, like I said, the right turn lane, while it certainly has safety benefits, it's not a standard or mandated or like a safety requirement. You can go all over Cottage Grove, Woodbury and find 45 MPH roads without the right turn lane because you have the Right-of-Way, right? Unless there's a person in a crosswalk, if you're taking that right turn, you're not waiting for anyone, you're not coming to a stop at an intersection, like you would if you were doing a left turn, which is why there is a left turn, and even back then, there was that left turn built into that development. So, for 67th Street Bay, it would be in 2028 that a right turn lane is proposed.

Mayor Bailey said and that's why I think I wanted to make sure that that message got across; so, there is a plan for that turn lane, but it will be as part of the reconstruction of Jamaica.

Director Burfeind said and I spoke with the County Project Manager and just discussed that I'm speaking correctly, and they do agree that is something that they would plan to have in the scope of that project in 2028. Director Burfeind said I'll let Emily speak on the density.

Director Schmitz said Mayor, Council, I just wanted to go back briefly to where we talked a little bit more about density, and I thought Samantha did a good job, but I thought it should be reiterated. When we look at properties, she had a good image in here; it might look a little bit more dense because it's scrunched due to the additional Right-of-Way, we've got a large portion of park, right? But when we use the Land Use Density that's outlined in our Comprehensive Plan, it's important to note that's how we guide our development, that's how we guide the number of units that are permitted on a certain property as a part of development. So, comparing to a Summer Valley project or a Graymont Village project, which is all single-family homes, right? But that density equals out between this project and those other two projects.

Mayor Bailey said Emily, I don't know if this is for you or who it was, I think there was a question about blasting. Who wants to? I know we've had this at least one other time in Cottage Grove, it's where I grew up.

Director Burfeind said Mayor and Council, I can speak in general, I don't know if there's really any more details at this time on blasting. Blasting only sounds scary; it is a very common practice to deal with bedrock, we've done it multiple times all over the community, many developments recently. Developments in actually much closer proximity, Hamlet Heights, for example, that was down at the dead end of Hamlet Avenue, right next to existing homes, Pine Hill Elementary, all blasting to do their work. We actually did blasting when we put the box culvert in, under Jamaica, with the flume, we call it, right by Renewal by Andersen; so, right next to the glass facility, that was all blasting. There are proximities, right, for homes; we would work and the developer would work with a Geotechnical Engineer. Given where the bedrock is, there might not even be notifications needed because the vibrations that anyone even could feel would likely be further away. With those other projects I mentioned, there were homes within 100 feet of the blasting going on; and, actually, blasting is a much lower impact than the other option, which is a hydro hammer, where they're banging away all day on that rock. That's actually more impactful, it doesn't sound as scary as blasting, but blasting is quite often the better, quicker way to go because it's one impact and then they're done, so. Like I said, I can't speak to the details of what this will be, that would be further on, in the Final Plat stage, but it's a very common practice.

Mayor Bailey said okay, sounds good.

Director Schmitz said Mayor, Council, I had one more note that I wanted to make; there was a question about which trail alignment per se this evening is being determined before you, and the plans that are in your staff report as a part of this resolution identify that trail to be behind the homes, that red segment that you saw before you. So, I just wanted to make note that is what's in the plans as part of this development currently.

Council Member Olsen asked can you explain the cost differential between the two options? Does that number even exist at this point?

Director Burfeind asked is this the difference between a boardwalk and trail, or between the blue and the?

Council Member Olsen replied no, between the red and the blue. Director Burfeind said I think one thing that's important, unless the City Administrator would like to add.

Administrator Levitt asked staff, could you go back to the original slide with the aerial photo on Michael's Pointe on 67th Street? Mayor and Council, one clarification, as staff has shown you the blue alignment as some of the residents have indicated, you can see that the concrete sidewalk is in place; that was actually constructed during the Michael's Pointe development, so that sidewalk already exists and it connects out to Jamaica Avenue today. So, as you can see, and I think the resident noted it, where the sidewalk ends at the end of the cul-de-sac, where it ties into Outlot E, it's very clear that it was to connect there. The resident was absolutely correct. So, if we go to the other slide that shows the shape of the Outlot, you can see the unique shape of Outlot E; you can see how the trail was designed to connect to the blue line. The intent was always for Outlot E to connect via the blue and the red because you can see we constructed the sidewalk, already fully in place; so, the only thing we have to do is connect that stub. As the resident indicated, it caused a lot of hardship for that trail to be immediately adjacent to their side property line; and so staff is indicating that we would be happy to relocate the trail and find a path more on that angle, but we also recognize that still may be providing some sight line challenges and lack of privacy. We would be happy to work with that resident to ensure that those trees of their liking are aided to screen their property. So, for clarity, 90% of the blue already exists and was always intended with the lay and the shape of the Outlot for it to connect. So, it's interesting, when you look at this exhibit, look at the shape of Outlot E, at the water's edge; that is no mistake for that shape to be notched out because the trail was intended for it to go behind those property lines as part of that plat. So, you can see that it was designed to go there, it was just a time until the developer and landowner could come to terms to be able to deed this to the City to facilitate that development.

So, the decision before you tonight isn't if its red or blue, the blue already exists and was already always intended to be there. I think the question that you're asking yourself tonight is, is it the red trail, is it the boardwalk, is it no red trail? So, I think those are the decisions you have to make tonight, so I want to be clear the blue already exists out there.

Council Member Garza said so I'm just wondering if the homes that are along the red trail that we are putting it forward, does anyone have a fence that is already built that is outside of their property lines? Is there any irrigation that is outside of their property lines that they've already installed?

Mayor Bailey replied I don't know about fence, I know somebody had reached out to me that had irrigation.

Council Member Garza said one irrigation, and I ask this because when we bring in people to put up fences and irrigation, all the things, we usually do some type of survey so that we know what our property lines are. And, so, I'm just wondering how that happened that they were even able to get an irrigation outside of their own property line? So, that's just a question, I just wonder because I know that's expensive, right? And then I see we have jungle gyms out there and some docks and those types of things; and even how the dock got there, I'm so puzzled with that, that someone would install a dock without contacting the City to say hey, is this permissible? And that was an expense, so these are my questions and I just wonder about that; and because these are homeowners and they've been there as long as they have, and they've put money into these things that they have in their back yard, I want us to be understanding of that, too. But still with the understanding that if I were to install anything in my yard, I'm going to call you guys to make sure I know if it's okay or not, you know? So, these are my thoughts on it, that's all.

Mayor Bailey said yeah, and my question that I'd maybe have for staff on the irrigation, do we permit for irrigation?

Administrator Levitt replied we do not issue permits for the irrigation.

Mayor Bailey said that's what I thought, okay. So, they could put it, and that's happened where people put their irrigation onto the; Council Member Garza said right outside, and Mayor Bailey agreed.

Council Member Garza said and the fencing, though, they wouldn't permit for that, right?

Mayor Bailey said no, so, it's up to them and whoever is doing the fence; Council Member Garza said to make sure that they figure that out, okay.

Council Member Olsen said in response to Council Member Garza, when I went out to visit with some of the neighbors out there, I did see one fence for the property with the swimming pool, but it wasn't a large, what I would call a privacy fence or anything like that; it was very nicely manicured, looked great, but it was a lower fence.

Council Member Thiede said it appears to be by the lot line, not extending beyond it; Council Member Olsen said no, it's not, they're in their own lot line.

Mayor Bailey said but I think they're required to have it around, so you have to have a fence around a pool.

Council Member Olsen said but they did invest in that fence; Council Member Garza said exactly.

Mayor Bailey said okay, so, we can just talk amongst ourselves, can't we? I know we have to do a motion, thank you.

So, I guess what I'll just throw out there for the Council is, and I think our Administrator brought it up fairly succinctly about the choice. It's funny because we're here talking about a trail on the south side of a lake while we're putting 100 and something homes on the north part of the property, which, frankly, I think some of us on the Council have been here for many, many years and seen different reiterations of what was going to be proposed there. I will make a couple comments for the homeowners: One is every development that I have seen come forth from Wolterstorffs up to this point had the trail there. Now, I will tell you this, Wolterstorffs could have easily cut those pieces out and sold them as part of the property. So, I think somebody made a comment about a realtor or whoever made a comment that these were going to be lakefront properties, and I'm sorry that that happened. I'll just say that because we try as much as we can to put road extensions, maybe we'll have to start looking at doing future trail extensions to adhere to that.

With regards to the red trail, being that the property behind you will be park land, as this development moves forward. So, as I mentioned earlier, I want to make sure that was very clear; so, anything that's back there, that you have out there, will have to be removed, one way or the other.

The other thing that I'm going to share with you, and I've been doing this for a long time as mayor and have seen different developments. I kind of alluded to one of the blasting from my old neighborhood, where I grew up, everybody on our neighborhood thought that road would never go through, and there are homes down there. When I grew up down there, there wasn't a trail directly behind my house, where I live. There is now a trail that goes from the street, directly behind the homes at Hamlet Park and works its way around.

What will happen in your area, there is no way that there is going to be a person from those developments that are going to walk down to the blue, go through your neighborhood, and then cut back up to go to the trail. Because it's going to be deemed as park property, they're going to walk behind your house; we've seen it before, and I can give another example personally from me, Pine Tree Pond Park on the south side of 80th Street, we never had a trail there. It was kind of a trail because people made it a trail, and we ended up putting a trail there, and I got my phone blown up, people were upset that we were going to put a trail behind their house. We ended up doing it because it was the right thing to do, from a trail connection around that pond, and after the fact, the majority of those people, and I know Zac, you were there, were saying it wasn't as bad as we thought. They liked it, they were actually appreciative that they got this access point. So, I know there were also some comments about possibly crime or something within the woods. I would just state anywhere in our community, we have numerous trails that go through wooded areas; Woodridge Park, up there, I can't remember, what's the one up above the hill, the development? It's between Woodridge and above the hill, and so we have trails that go up and through there. I'm just sharing with you that this is going to be unique, having the access around with the new park that's going to be there, it will be more than just your neighborhood, I get it. But I also don't want you to think that if the decision was to not go with the red trail, that people aren't going to be walking behind your house, because I guarantee you they will; because they did at Pine Tree, they did at Hamlet, and we ended up putting the trail in so

it actually got people to stay on the trail and not be wandering into people's yards. So, I just wanted to throw that out there as a comment from me, so.

Mayor Bailey asked Council, any other comments?

Council Member Clausen said well, I have a little different opinion from the way I think the Council's going, but I did walk that area back there and many people have. And the difference here is that there were plans to do the trail back in 2011, and we're now 15 years later. And you can look at all this property on aerial photos and you look at it on maps, but it's very different when you get out and walk it. There are some great trees back there, they've lived there many years, and you know, there's been some talk of it was in the plan, it wasn't, let's move on from that. But back in 2011, all this went to the various Planning Commissions and there were no objections back then to this, probably because no one lived there. I'm concerned about the removal of a lot of very mature trees that have been back there, and this was not a unanimous decision by the Planning Commission, and that never happens, I mean, it's very rare anyway.

The neighbors here have offered some alternatives, and I think it's up to us to give that due diligence, and I think that we should consider an alternate route than what was originally planned. I want the overall project to move forward, but I think we can do something with that trail to appease everybody. Thanks.

Council Member Olsen said yeah, so, I appreciate Council Member Clausen's thoughts, and again, I had mentioned I had gone and looked as well. And you're right, it's different looking at a map than it is when you're standing there. So, what would you propose in terms of an alternate or some sort of compromise?

Council Member Clausen replied well, the neighbors brought forward a proposal of let's call it the blue route, and they seemed to be, if there's going to be a trail, that seems to be the best alternative that they can live with and I think the City can, too. So, I would propose that we consider the trail to meet up or connect at the east and west ends of 67th Street.

Council Member Olsen said so, then based on what Jennifer told us, our decision point is tonight, I think what I'm hearing is you are in favor of no red trail, is that right?

Council Member Clausen replied that's correct; Council Member Olsen said okay, all right, that's what I needed. Thank you.

Council Member Thiede said so, I have seen that area back there before. One of the things that, a couple lessons learned that I learned a long time ago is number one, if it's something important to you and you're calling somebody, like when I have to call the City or somebody like that and get something clarified, to actually find out who you're talking to. I know that was a long time ago, but, you know, you kind of need to do that because things that are on paper appear to be showing that there's a trail there. And there's, even when I bought my house, it was a spot where the neighbors had actually finished like 10 feet into that lot; so, to most people looking at it, it looked like this scraggly, skinny, old lot, right? But so, they did that, though. I mean, for a certain period of time, we enjoyed a little bit bigger lot, right? With the way this development has gone, you know, you guys have been able to enjoy some of that property for over, probably 10 to 15 years longer than what was originally thought that might be. So, the other thing that I want to just make a point of is that this resolution if a Preliminary Plat, and you know, number one, you get that Lochridge Development moving and the planning associated with that. And like I mentioned before, we do have some time to kind of take a look at what kind of different alternatives that could be done and so forth for that trail. So, at this point, I'd probably be voting to move the resolution forward.

Council Member Garza said so, Tony, when you came up and you had some words to say, it made a lot of sense. And I guess I don't know the answer to that question, if we have made exceptions. And, so, I'm intrigued to see because we have so many trails that connect our entire community, and we have existing communities, and then we weave trails through them, as you said, and they were established homes. And, so, you've had some pushback before from our other community members as well. Have we deviated from that, or have we made exceptions? Or, like you said, we put those trails in, and people were happy once they were there. Again, we walked this land, and I've seen the back yards, and I can understand not wanting to have a trail bumped up to your house; but on the flip side of it, I've walked plenty of trails in Cottage Grove that are backed up to people's fences, no fences,

pools, all the things. And, you know, I walk with my daughter, and we feel safe, so, I've not had any concern of these trails or walking through them. But I'm just wondering if this is something that we normally do, would we normally deviate or make exceptions this way? Or if there's not something else substantial that could really change this development?

Mayor Bailey said I'll answer, and maybe staff will know this better. I am not aware of any. We went in back afterwards where there wasn't a trail there, like Pine Tree and a couple, Hamlet, the ravine thing that runs down from Kingston, behind that. So, I just, and we've talked to the homeowners and such in some of those areas and you know, kind of got it in, along. So, I'm not aware of any that we've deviated and said that we're not putting a trail here.

Council Member Garza said thank you.

Administrator Levitt said Mayor, Members of the Council, and maybe staff can bring up the image of the northern part of the pond because I want to make sure we're talking about equity, right? We had talked about that, it was referenced. See the green trail there, it says preferred trail route, where does that trail go? It goes behind the new homes. One, the developer was interested in putting in the purple trail, which A, would cost more money, but they were willing to foot the bill; staff is saying no, for equity, we're going to put the trail behind the homes, the new homes. So, when you think about equity of the neighborhood, that northern portion will have the trail behind the new homes, same as what was intended on the south.

Now, Mayor and Council, you know as we've been talking here tonight, when you've been here as long as I have, you start remembering a lot of different examples, right? I'm sure you guys are running through your mind; I remember the time where we got this crazy idea that we were going to build a parking lot at Pine Tree Pond, right on the north side of 80th Street. Do you remember that? That was a crazy idea; who would've thought with that slope that was there that we could actually build a parking lot? And we were going to build a trail from 80th Street to Indian Boulevard. Do you remember? There were hundreds of properties, and there were numerous connections into those neighborhoods that had never had connections before, because, mayor, as you described it, there were all those footpaths through there, right? And can you remember when the bulldozer started pushing dirt down through that corridor, between 80th and Indian? Those residents were in absolute shock as we built that trail. And you mentioned it, mayor, who were some of the first people to reference the use of that trail? It was those very neighbors that had said we don't want the trail, but yet, they were the first ones out there as their kids were learning to ride their bikes without training wheels, they were back on that trail. You saw them walking their dogs, you saw them enjoying the absolute amenity. But here's an interesting thing, the mayor also mentioned this, Zac can tell you stories; when we did this, there was tons of encroachment, and there were hundreds of properties, and I'm not exaggerating, so if you look at an aerial photo between 80th and Indian, you'll know there were hundreds of encroachment. Now, at that time, they all had to remove their stuff; the City did not offer to screen their properties, to provide trees, or to accommodate them. So, we provided nothing to those residents. Mayor and Council, what we are doing tonight is going above and beyond, A, to create equity in the neighborhood, as you see in this northern part, and number two, we are going the extra mile to help ensure that that screening and their privacy is maintained, which we have not provided for hundreds of other residents in our community. So, I know that you guys have lived through a lot of trail construction in your day and can remember a lot of those conversations, but we also remember that we are building trails and amenities for the 41,000 people that live here and enjoy those things. And those trails are what make Cottage Grove an amazing recreation destination.

Mayor Bailey said okay, so, at this point, Council, I don't know if you want to switch it back to the two items. So, as it was mentioned, I think if I'm hearing right, at least, I don't think from a true development standpoint, if you will, that there's really any angst from the Council as it relates to the development. The only piece that was whether it was blue or red, and so, I guess at this point, the trail itself is tied up in the two things that are before us, in essence, correct? Well, not the zoning, the Preliminary Plat would be, is that correct? Okay.

Council Member Thiede asked do you want me to make a motion? Mayor Bailey replied well, yeah, if you want to; yeah, go ahead, that's fine.

Motion by Council Member Thiede to Adopt Ordinance No. 1093 approving the Zoning Amendment to change the zoning of 72.18 acres from AG-2, Agriculture, to R-4, Transitional Residential; second by Council Member Garza. Motion carried: 5-0.

Motion by Council Member Garza to Adopt Resolution 2025-020 approving the Preliminary Plat for a subdivision to be called Lochridge, which will consist of 99 lots for single-family homes and 84 townhomes units; second by Council Member Thiede.

Mayor Bailey asked if there was any further discussion.

Council Member Clausen said Council, I'm just wondering is there a way to move this forward without the trail location, or does that muck things up, so to speak? Does that put a wrench in things?

Mayor Bailey replied well, I think what we heard, and I'll let staff bump into this, is that it obviously, the whole development proposal, though, is part of what the plan is for the trail. So, where they stub everything in from the new development on the Preliminary Plat, where its going to come around the lake into our parcel, is all kind of tied together, so that's why its in here. That's kind of what I was getting to a little bit earlier is the first one is simple because it's, we're saying the development, the second one has that in there. So, we do have a motion and a second. The one thing I wanted to mention before the vote, one way or the other, is since we're doing the Preliminary Plat, at some point you're going to have the, should it pass, you'll be able to have the conversation with the homeowners out there, looking at tree placement, whether it's on their property, off of their property. The one that has the pool, who's the one that has the pool? The Rogers, also in their particular case, if there's something we can do around the side, even though we're going to take that trail, should this all, one way or the other, we're going to take that trail that way, but if we could do it at that angle, I like that compromise that we did there. But if we can also look at some of the tree situation to see if we can make that happen. I will mention to the homeowners, real quick, is we have done this before where we have done some plantings on private property; we go in and talk to the homeowners, we did it with the development of Walmart, we did it with the apartment building along Hardwood where we'll actually go put trees on property, but we also do it on open space, too. So, I just want to mention that that is not unique, we've done that before in order to help any concerns with screening and such, so.

An unidentified female asked what is the dire need to have that trail like right, literally next to the water on that south side? Is it the hill to die on to have that path when there is the sidewalk option? Could we ask staff why that is necessary?

Mayor Bailey replied yeah, well, I guess what I would share with you is, and again, its been around for a long time, its been in the Comprehensive Plan, and its always been meant to have a trail that actually goes around a lake; or, I know some call it a pond, frankly, I think I'd call it a pond. We don't really have many of these options around our community right now, eventually, maybe more as we jump across County Road 19 and get out more towards the ravine, there's a lake back there. And, so, it's a unique feature, along with the wooded areas and such like that back there. So, it is very unique, that we don't have a lot of options in Cottage Grove for residents to be able to go walk in an area that's as beautiful as that area is by; and I know you guys are, it's beautiful, I know the area behind you, I've been over there, I've seen it, I know Council Member Thiede has skied it, behind that area, so that's the reason. There's been a plan for it all along, the goal is to connect directly around the lake. And as I mentioned to you earlier, and I'm very sincere about this, you will have people walking back there if you do not have a trail. They will walk it because I'm just telling you if it's me and the trail is going to cut this way, and I know that that's park land, I'm going to walk the park land because I want to be by the water.

The unidentified female said are you still going to dig up all those trees? Mayor Bailey replied no. The unidentified female said but that would be by our house, though. Mayor Bailey replied yeah, it would typically be similar to what you see like at Hamlet, there's still going to be some trees back there, but you're going to see the water anywhere that you go around there, so I just wanted to mention that, okay?

Council Member Olsen said with regard to the tree thing, one of the things we have in our ordinances is a Tree Mitigation Ordinance. So, whenever a development goes forward, there's an inventory done on all the trees, and they're given a value. Some of that stuff is pretty scrubby, some of it is pretty nice. So, they'll all be given a value, and then the intent would be for tree removal to really focus on the not very high value stuff, and then when you

plant new stuff, you plant good stuff; and we have a list that our City Forester can share with developers and property owners, etc. about this is what we recommend for our urban forest, as opposed to what we prefer not to have. Ash trees are an obvious answer to that because of the Emerald Ash Borer, but that's how that works.

Mayor, what I was hoping for is maybe Emily or Kori can talk about the difference between Preliminary Plat and a Final Plat and kind of how that process works.

Attorney Land said your honor, members of the Council, this is one of the stages. The Preliminary Plat is obviously something that is a precursor to the Final Plat; there can be changes between the Preliminary and the Final Plat, the developer may make changes. Obviously, with some of these conditions, they may have to go back and make changes before you see it as a Final Plat. This isn't the Public Hearing; the Planning Commission held the Public Hearing, so there isn't another Public Hearing, although you are always so kind to open it up to comments from the public. So, if this still happens to be an unresolved issue, there's always another opportunity to talk about it at the Final Plat.

Council Member Olsen said okay, perfect. And I think it's important for the neighbors to know that their voice will be heard throughout this process to help mitigate any concerns that there may be, etc.

Ryan, you mentioned that the pond, which I think one of the pond neighbors talked about, it kind of gets Lily Pads and its kind of gross. Its going to get more water in it now because of the overland drainage field is going to become a piped drainage field. Will that have an impact on the quality of the pond?

Director Burfeind replied in terms of the lake itself, or the pond, there was reference to dredging the Lily Pads; it is a public water that is permitted by the DNR, so, some of those improvements are not something the City would be able to do. This development, specifically, does have to reduce the phosphorus that goes into the lake. Council Member Olsen said, so, less algae, less green stuff. Director Burfeind replied yep, so, that's the main thing is developments have to leave it in a better state than it was. So, that does help over time to have less algae, things like that. I don't want to make big promises, but they are required to reduce that into the lake.

Council Member Olsen said and I know the Watershed District gets involved in this as well, and there's a lot of science behind it, but I just wanted to ask if it is going to get more water, is it going to be better, in general. So, thank you for that. That's it for me, mayor.

Mayor Bailey reread the second motion. Motion carried: 4-1 (No vote by Council Member Clausen).

After the motion, Mayor Bailey said thank you, everybody.

12. COUNCIL COMMENTS AND REQUESTS

Council Member Garza said so, it looks like we have some fun stuff happening, but I will not steal Strawberry Fest thunder, and I will only talk about our 2025 Easter Egg Hunt that's coming up on April 12; that's going to be at the Cottage Grove Ice Arena, and it looks like you can grab your tickets online, on our City website. So, that should be a lot of fun happening in the neighborhood in the next couple of months.

Council Member Thiede said yeah, I guess I'll go ahead and mention the Strawberry Fest. We had mentioned this at the last meeting, too, that there's a purse Bingo fundraiser on February 22 at River Oaks at 11:00 a.m.; there are tickets online at strawberryfest.com.

There's also a Strawberry Fest Ambassador Scholarship Program candidate informational meeting on March 4, at 6:00 p.m., at Carbone's. Again, the ambassadors represent the City of Cottage Grove, we provide a scholarship for them, too. They go around and represent the City at a lot of different parades and festivals and things of that nature, so that's always nice.

Council Member Olsen said for those who are not aware, tomorrow night at the Cottage Grove Ice Arena, the Park boys' hockey team has a home sectional playoff game. They'll be playing Two Rivers, it starts at 7:00 p.m., and you can get your tickets online, if there are any left, going through the Ice Arena's website. Last year, I had the

opportunity to go to the Cretin-Park playoff game, and I gotta tell ya, it was pandemonium. The place was packed, Zac and his entire team, including Molly and Jordan and everybody else, were working really hard; mopping floors, working the concession stands, making sure that people were getting taken care of, making sure that the event went as well as could be expected. There were a lot of long lines and that happens when the place gets super busy. So, if you're going to go, I would encourage you to get there a little early, but if I can shake this nasty cold enough, I've got my two tickets, so I'm planning on going. Let's go support our Park boys' hockey team; second year in a row they've been in a playoff game, and prior to that, it was not often, if at all, for like 20 years. So, this team is really coming together, Coach Corkish is doing a great job, so let's support him.

One of my favorite times of year starts February 28, over at River Oaks, and that's our Annual Fish Fry. You can imagine I don't look like this because I miss many meals, so, definitely get in there and enjoy the opportunity to connect with your friends and your neighbors, etc. River Oaks is a great facility, we've got a really good chef, and good service staff there. So, get out and enjoy the Fish Fry, and I will encourage you to make your reservations early because if you walk in, you won't find a spot; you need to either call the golf course or make your reservations online. Again, that starts on February 28.

Somebody mentioned scholarships earlier. If you have a senior who lives in Cottage Grove, from either Park High School or East Ridge High School, I would strongly encourage you to let them know that the Cottage Grove Lions Club is giving away five \$2,000 scholarships this year. We love to support our local youth, and the application deadline is April 4, I believe, for that. So, please let people know to apply. It was a lot of fun last year standing on stage at Park High School handing out scholarships to kids who had no idea they won; we called their name and they walked up.

Additionally, at our first meeting in March, we will be doing the annual donation here to the Craig Woolery Scholarship for Public Safety. Craig unfortunately won't be able to join us this year, he's going to be somewhere in Colorado, skiing. The Cottage Grove Lions approved the donation of \$2,000. My wife and I started this scholarship several years ago, when Craig retired, and we'll be making a donation of \$1,500. All of these donations go to the Cottage Grove Public Safety Board, and then they choose the winners. I believe last year it was three winners of \$1,500 each, and these are for young people from our community who want to go into the world of Public Safety, whether that means being a police officer, a firefighter, or working in EMS as a medic, as my colleague did here for many, many years. So, again, make sure that they go talk to their guidance counselor if that's something they're interested in. We need good people in our Public Safety Departments across the state and across the country. And this scholarship is intended to help people who are interested in that, maybe get a leg up with books and those kinds of things. If you're interested in contributing to the Craig Woolery Scholarship, you can certainly reach out to me, you can reach out to anybody here at City Hall. I know our Public Safety team is keenly aware of it or the Public Safety Board.

Mayor Bailey said I just have one item I want to mention, which is kind of exciting. I'm just going to read my statement: "I am honored to have recently filmed the 2025 State of the City Speech, highlighting obviously some of the key accomplishments from 2024, and also providing an update on where the City is regarding our overall Strategic Plan and giving a vision of the City's priorities, both in 2025 and beyond. I will say no one speech could ever fully encapsulate all that the City and our community does, but I'm always humbled by the work our staff and our dedicated residents do to make our City a wonderful place to live, work, and play. That video will soon be available, I think it might even be out there tonight on the City's website at cottagegrovemn.gov/stateofthecity, but I'll also let you know that there will also be a link in the upcoming edition of the *Cottage Grove Reports* newsletter and obviously on social media. So, there'll be a variety of ways for you to view it. And, again, I want to thank all of our residents, our commissions, our staff, my Council colleagues up here, and all the partners, both elected and outside of our City, and obviously, the citizens of Cottage Grove for your dedication to our amazing community. It has been an honor, obviously, to serve alongside all of you here, and I'm absolutely looking forward to our work together in 2025 and beyond."

So, I just thought I would share that with you, and it is out, I got a chance to view it today, and so, hopefully, you'll like it. If there are questions, obviously you can bounce those off myself or one of our Council Members here; if they can't answer it, I'll try to.

13. WORKSHOPS - OPEN TO PUBLIC - None.

14. WORKSHOPS - CLOSED TO PUBLIC - None.

15. ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Council Member Thiede, second by Council Member Garza, to adjourn the meeting at 8:50 p.m.
Motion carried: 5-0.

Minutes prepared by Judy Graf and reviewed by Tamara Anderson, City Clerk.