

Brooklyn Park Charter Commission Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, May 14, 2025

1. Call to Order/Roll Call

Present: Chair Dennis Secara, Commissioners Sunday Alabi, Barbara Bor, Shamara Freeman Amy Hanson, LaDawn Severin, Gregory Szach; Paula Weakly, Sheldon Willaims; Council Liaison Amanda Xiong and Staff Liaison Devin Montero

Absent: Susan Maberera (excused), Peggy Larkin (excused)

1.1 Welcome Budget Advisory Commissioners

Chair Secara and Commissioners welcomed the Budget Advisory Commissioners (BAC)-Chair Henry Blake, Vice Chair William Petty, Staff Liaison Molly Lopez, Commissioners Erica Walker, Mike Mattox and Amy Meuers.

Attending via interactive technology: City Manager Jay Stroebel and Finance Director LaTonia Green.

2. Public Comment – None.

3. Additions/Approval of the Agenda of April 9, 2025

Chair Secara stated he would like to move Item 5.1, Mayor/Council Salaries, ahead of Item 4.1. He stated the Commissioners would be referring to Attachments 5.1A through 5.1E. He stated after they concluded with Item 5.1, they would pick up with Items 4.1 through 9.

Motion Chair Secara, Second Commissioner Alabi to approve the agenda as amended. The motion passed unanimously.

5. Old Business

5.1 Mayor/Council Salaries

Chair stated the Commissioners would like to be able to offer compensation to the mayor and Council Members, commensurate with their responsibilities but also within the constraints of the budget resources. He stated it would be helpful for the Charter Commissioners to understand what those constraints and resources were and discuss what they thought was equitable within those guidelines and parameters. He asked if the senior Member of the Budget Advisory Commission would like to address the Commissioners.

Budget Advisory Commission Chair Blake thanked the BAC Members attending tonight: Vice Chair William Petty, Commissioners Erica Walker, Mike Mattox and Amy Meuers and Staff Liaison Molly Lopez.

He stated the mayor/Council salary adjustments came out of one of the Council meetings and the logic behind it was the BAC to work with the Charter Commission to find out what needed to be done and how they should go about it. He stated making adjustments to a salary was one thing but to be sustainable was another thing. He stated those were the things they wanted to look at and if it was going to be an annual incremental item. He stated those were all the kinds of parameters they wanted to look at along with the Charter Commission. He stated it was good

to have the finance team who could play with the numbers and money and understand so they had firsthand experience as to what was happening in real time. He stated they would advise them as to how to proceed but thought they needed to have more information to make decisions.

Chair Secara stated a good place to start was to get an overview of what the Charter Commission had discussed. He stated they had been looking at what the mayor and Council Members earned compared with neighboring communities, Bloomington which had an identical population. He stated they also wanted to consider factors such as a strong mayor versus mayor or city manager and what the duties and responsibilities of other city Councils were compared to Brooklyn Park and were they expected to do more hours, more meetings, less meetings, etc. He stated they would also look at what would be equitable commensurate with the comparative responsibilities. He stated that was why they had a lot of attachments (5.1A through 5.1E), and showed the salary comparison data for 2025 on various cities.

He stated that for Bloomington, they would see their budget, size of their staff and those were the numbers they were using as reference points. He stated they didn't want to say that Bloomington was the same size as Brooklyn Park and should be making the same as they did or more. He stated they wanted to have a sum that really reflected the responsibilities for the community. He stated they were not looking at any one factor and were trying to pull together all those factors and come up with something. He asked if any Charter Commissioner would like to add to the discussion.

Commissioner Alabi stated that the BAC Members were present tonight, whatever they decided and however they decided to move forward on, it needed to be sustainable. He stated he saw the city's budget but asked the BAC Members if the city was running the budget on a shortfall, if it was over a period of time, a consistent budget or was just for this year. He asked if the expectation was the budget going to go up next year and if it did, was that consistent that every year, the budget went up by "X" percent.

Chair Secara stated he thought what Commissioner Alabi was saying, was there a sort of an automatic increase, automatic mechanism or formula. He stated to his knowledge, there wasn't, and they had been charged with recommending a salary for Council Members and the Mayor because the Charter Commission was the only Commission that was not appointed by the Mayor and Council Members.

Commissioner Alabi stated when looking at the budget, the budget didn't tell him anything in terms of whether the budget was at a break even or was it running at a surplus or shortfall. He asked if it was a surplus or shortfall, asked how long it had been and what was the framework on the budgeting process. He asked if it was every year, they built into that it would go up or down by an "X" percent. He stated if the Commission decided on 1%, how was that going to play into their report.

Finance Director Green stated the city had a balanced budget and state law required the city to have a balanced budget every year. She stated they had to have their revenues match their expenses. She stated that didn't mean they had to have 100% new revenues coming in and it could be they could be using the fund balance for some of the costs they had in the city. As it related to the expenses on a yearly basis, it depended on what the inflation was, contract costs they had, and the contract costs could be information relating to labor negotiated contracts, professional contracts, and it cost more to do business daily. She stated they tried to determine what that was and also gauged with Council what would be an acceptable rate increase as it

related to levies. She stated if they had an increase or decrease in revenues, that also affected the revenue sources that could impact the levy.

Commissioner Alabi stated Director Green answered the question that the city was obligated by state law to have a balanced budget. He asked what the mechanism was as they planned on what next year was going to be. He stated that as they planned for the next year, they took all that into account of what could have an impact on what the budgetary requirement and the expected revenues were. He asked if they did something, like giving a raise, and if that was going to be accountable every year without having any negative impact on services the city provided to people that were paid by the people living in the city for a salary of a staff and Council Member. He asked if it would have any impact and gave an example, if raises were given, then maybe pick up garbage every month instead of every week. He asked if they were to shop, where did the city go so, they could maintain the balanced budget.

Finance Director Green stated they looked at what every department requested on a yearly basis but it was a two-year budget. She stated on the question about an increase to the mayor and Council Members having an impact on the budget, she stated it could have an impact depending on what the Commission decided on where they landed on the salary. She stated if they wanted to establish a salary for two or four years, they would incorporate that into the entire city's budget. She stated they were not just talking about the general fund, because that was what was mainly impacted by the property taxes. She stated that was where the elected official's budget was budgeted, in the general fund and had an impact. She stated that in addition to looking at the elected official's budget, it could also be the traveling costs and could be rising. She stated if they looked at the entire budget to determine what that impact was, they could also decide on a non-election year to have a budget increase for the elected officials, for two years or revisit it every couple of years. She stated that was if the Commissioners said, it was going to be one amount for one year, another amount for the second year because the city had a two-year budget. She stated then, they were busy determining if the Commission wanted a percentage or a dollar amount.

She stated once they went through the entire budget and if the Council came back and said to the city manager and Finance Director, they didn't want a "9%" levy increase but a "5%" levy increase, then everything is looked at all over again. She stated sometimes they would have to do wage reopeners to see if they could negotiate some contracts to reduce those dollar amounts with the labor contracts they already had. She stated she was only talking about the personnel piece because that was the biggest portion of the budget.

Staff Liaison Montero briefed the Commissioners about the last ordinance amendment regarding the mayor and Council salaries and what the Council was currently being paid. He stated that it was reviewed every two years.

BAC Member Walker asked when the last time a salary adjustment was made.

Staff Liaison Montero according to the ordinance, it was on January 1, 2024.

BAC Chair Blake asked what the percentage increase was.

Staff Liaison Montero stated the Commission recommended a 20% increase for the mayor and there was no recommendation for the Council Members.

BAC Member Walker stated that according to the staff report, the Council Members received a

3% increase per year and asked if that was automatic.

Commissioner Weakly stated it was supposed to be automatic because they had set forth from the Charter all the increases, but it looked like the one for 2024 was missed and had to go back and adjust it.

Commissioner Severin stated she looked over the numbers in the different cities and felt a 5% increase effective January 2026. She stated a 5% increase for the mayor's salary would be about \$1,100 per year additionally. A 5% increase for all the Council Members would be less than \$4,000 a year. She also liked how some cities did the \$50 per Commission meeting they were attending and felt there should be a cap on that because that would actually be more substantial amount of money total. She suggested capping it at \$2,400 a year, a couple hundred dollars a month or a few meetings each month. She stated it would be around \$17,000 a year if everyone was maxing that out.

Commissioner Weakly stated the \$50 per meeting or travel day had to be approved by the Council in advance and was not up to the Commissioners as far as capping things.

Commissioner Severin stated she liked how some cities did it where they weren't traveling, it was like the Commissioners coming to tonight's meeting and got \$50.

Commissioner Weakly stated the ordinance was changed or amended to going to the state or doing something else.

Commissioner Bor stated that it was clear, the Council did approve that expense of \$50 requested. She stated they also knew historically it had been low utilization in the city and to keep that in mind as they looked at it. She stated it was available and was defined and there had been refusals. She stated where an organization invited someone, and the individual would benefit from a knowledge base but not directly related to a city activity that was deemed \$50. She stated that it was out of their scope and the Council approved the \$50.

Staff Liaison Montero provided the total amounts requested of \$50 supplemental compensation. In 2023, the total was \$900; in 2024, the total was \$500; and in 2025 to date was \$100.

Chair Secara stated the total increase they were looking at for the Mayor and Council was \$5,000. He noted that it happened to be the difference between what the Mayor made and what the Bloomington Mayor made. He stated he was thinking of something similar and taking \$5,000 and distributing it and that would be about \$700 per Council Member and \$1,000 for the mayor.

Commissioner Severin suggested 5% across the board.

Chair Secara asked if that 5% would be over two years; two and half and two and half for the two-year cycle or 5% for one year and 5% for the final year for a 10% cycle.

Commissioner Severin stated that Finance Director Green was talking about the two every two years. She stated it was probably more efficient to just do it every two years.

Chair Secara stated that it was two and half percent annual rate of the rate increase.

Commissioner Weakly stated she also looked at the salaries in terms of percentages and comparisons and as she said at the last meeting, didn't want to be the highest payer for those

things and didn't want to be the lowest. She stated if they looked at doing a 3% increase for the mayor, it would still be paying more than Plymouth and Lakeville, which was being paid right now more than Plymouth and Lakeville. She stated they were being paid less than Bloomington, about \$3,000 less. If they did a 5% for the mayor and based on the city manager Stroebel's memo, it sounded like he was definitely deserving of that. She stated it would still be between Bloomington and Plymouth and thought 5% would be fair.

She stated that as far as the current Council, the Mayor was more than Plymouth and Lakeville, but the current Council was more than Lakeville and Bloomington, but less than Plymouth. She stated doing 3% for the Council would bring them right in the middle of Lakeville and Bloomington. She stated doing 5% would bring them within \$200 of Plymouth.

She stated they also talked about the city personnel getting an average of 3% this year. She suggested 3% for the current Council and 5% for the mayor. She asked if the city employees got increases every year or every two years.

City Manager Strobel that in terms of city compensation, that was adjusted typically every year, typically there was a cost-of-living component, referred to as COLA. He stated sometimes some of the employees were on an employee schedule where they had certain steps and depending on where they were on that step, might also get a merit increase as well. He stated employees that were salaried also had a salary range and were eligible for an increase, if they were not at the top of that range.

He stated last year; the city did a very comprehensive market study on all of the positions within the city and there was additional adjustments that went into effect over the course of the last year. He stated for non-represented employees, those were approved by city Council. For the represented employees, in labor groups, were adjusted based on their contracts.

He stated if the Council chose to adjust the mayor/Council salaries, those did not go in effect until the following election and would be following the 2026 November election, on January 1, 2027.

He stated that on the \$50 compensation issue, historically, that \$50 was not typically used by most Council Members up until four and half years ago when some Council Members used that going to instate or out of state conferences. He stated there were two or three Council Members elected to do that. He stated those had not been used for instances of a local meeting, gathering or speaking engagement but more so, statewide or national conferences. He stated the one challenge was that often, if those early eligible pending Council approval, when the Council met only twice a month, there were a lot of meetings that came up in between Council meetings that might never become before a Council for approval. As an example, the mayor was asked to testify, and the legislature usually was given a day or two notice and not time to come before the Council to get that approved.

He stated that working with Mayor Lunde, Mayor Jacobson and Mayor Winston, that the amount of time the mayors spent in the city, at least over the last ten years during his tenure, had been significant. With the number of invitations that were received for speaking engagements, ribbons cuttings, constituent conversations, emails, running Council meetings, and participating in other events, where they were representing the city, had only grown over the course of those ten years.

He stated one of the other conversations the Council had in 2022 when they made the

adjustments in October was the fact that it was not just Brooklyn Park, but all suburban cities. He stated they now created a position of mayor of a suburban community that was only limited to those who might have the financial wherewithal to be able to have a salary such as the city and its peer cities and had the ability to do that. He stated in some cases, being able to have a forty hour a week job during the day and being a mayor of a large group of a community was almost impossible to coexist. He stated he was not suggesting a change in the government structure but suggested the amount of time that was being called on the mayor in the city was very significant.

Commissioner Alabi thought the Commissioners agreed when they started the conversation to use Bloomington or Plymouth and now brought in Lakeville and their population was less. He stated if they looked at the population, the amount of work and effort the Council had to do, required more than what they expected from the agreement based on the number of constraints.

Commissioner Hanson stated the city manager talked about not having enough time for approval in those instances when the Mayor/Council was called to the state legislature and asked how many times it happened in a month. She thought about changing some language, that the mayor or Council could receive a stipend up to a certain amount if it was approved post the instances like that.

City Manager Stroebel stated that during the legislative session, as an example, there had been three days during the session where they had spent at least a half day if not a full day at the legislative meeting. He stated there was one day where they met with nine or ten different legislators, the mayor, himself and Chief Bruley, in trying to secure additional public safety data and also tried to get support around, addressing a group home, private care issue. He stated there had been instances of all day three times and asked to testify before a committee at least five or six times. He stated he had spoken about TIF, spoken about primary care to two different committees and did not speak about workforce. He stated Council Member Klonowski spoke on workforce last year. He stated that on the legislative sessions, it was probably six to ten times.

He stated that he did not count every week on Tuesday mornings of the legislative conversations with a lobbyist that was an hour long, every Tuesday morning. He stated that was at least four months in a row they did that. He stated there was additional conversations taking place with the legislative delegation and just had a press conference last week about trying to get bonding dollars for the Community Activity Center.

Commissioner Hanson stated it was good for the Commissioners to understand, what those meetings were like and how quickly they came up when they happened.

Commissioner Bor stated they had many discussions outside tonight's meeting, strong mayor versus a part time mayor and the same with Council Members. She stated it was clear that the demands on all their time regardless of what they volunteered to, what they were elected to, had increased. She stated the discussion for the Commissioners today was within the context of the government they had at the city and the city manager said they were not there tonight to change the government structure. She thought what they had to do within the context of the work, was what was being compensated to the mayor and the Council and she wanted to bring it back to that.

Commissioner Hanson asked if it was within their purview if they made a motion around the increases and address the \$50 per meeting compensation. She stated she would like to see

something that said during the legislative session, particularly because it was a quick turnaround on meeting times and dates, that the Council and mayor could come after the fact that they attended those meetings.

Staff Liaison Montero stated that Council compensation was done by resolution and maybe language could be added to the resolution. He stated that resolution was adopted by the Council.

Commissioner Weakly stated the Council determined the circumstances and the amount for that compensation. She stated it was established at \$50 in February 2025. She stated it was up to the mayor and Council how they wanted to get paid or if they wanted to get paid for that and didn't think it was up to the Commission.

BAC Chair Blake asked if that \$50 payment was reimbursable. He stated they incurred the expense and income because that could be one of the reasons someone was not accessing it. He stated they could have bought gas to go to many appointments for a meeting and didn't get a receipt or something because those were the substantiated pack of documentation they should bring back to the city to claim any reimbursement.

Staff Liaison Montero stated that after each conference that a Council Member attended, provided receipts and submitted an expense report for reimbursement. He stated he was not sure if there was a line in the expense report for that \$50 compensation.

Commissioner Williams stated he needed clarity on the discussion tonight about the stronger mayor form of government and asked what that meant.

Chair Secara stated a strong mayor would be a mayor where the city did not have a city manager. He stated the mayor took care of not only their mayoral functions but also functioned as a city manager. He stated Brooklyn Park was a city manager form of government. The city manager was in charge of all city staff and ran the day-to-day operations of the city. He stated the mayor was the face of the city, presided over Council meetings, attended conferences, ribbon cuttings, public events, and various other meetings. He stated the mayor was more of a part time position as opposed to a management administrative position. He stated there had been discussions about merging the two positions in the past, deferred on that and liked the way things were for now. He stated some communities were small and only had a mayor, like Lakeville, and wouldn't need a city manager. He stated that a city the size of Brooklyn Park, Minneapolis, and Saint Paul would need a city manager. He stated in some case the city managers could act as a go between, between the Council and staff to protect staff from undue influence. He stated there was a checks and balance component to that.

Commissioner Williams stated he knew they were looking at Bloomington but discussing Plymouth too and now that they knew they didn't fall under the category of strong mayor for those three cities, asked if the functions were commensurate with each other. He stated that with the salaries being adjusted, those things should be looked at too and revenue generating capacity. He stated they also needed to find money from somewhere if they had to pay them. He stated that in the attachment they had, Plymouth's budget was \$99,000,000 but still paid more than Bloomington and Brooklyn Park, the Council Members for Plymouth got more but not the mayor. He stated the Council Members got more than Bloomington but their mayor got more than Brooklyn Park's mayor and the same thing with Plymouth, their Council Members got paid more than Bloomington and Brooklyn Park. He stated the mayor was not too different from Brooklyn Park and was about \$800. He stated those were the things they had to be clear on the

parameters and show some degree of transparency across the board.

Commissioner Alabi stated if they looked at the three forms of government, used as a baseline, all had the same set up.

Commissioner Hanson stated she would like to make a motion:

That we recommend a Council increase to their salaries of 3% for both the mayor and the Council.

Commissioner Alabi suggested an amendment to the motion. He stated he agreed with the motion made but suggested adding, **“it would take effect January 1, 2027.”**

Commissioner Weakly asked if they could make the motion separately for Council versus the mayor. She asked why they didn't want to do the 5% for the mayor.

Commissioner Hanson stated before they continued to discuss it, the motion needed a second.

Commissioner Alabi asked Commissioner Hanson if she understood his friendly amendment, he would second the motion.

Commissioner Hanson accepted the friendly amendment to the motion.

That we recommend a Council increase to their salaries of 3% for both the mayor and the Council and it would take effect January 1, 2027.

Chair Secara stated a motion had been made by Commissioner Hanson to give the mayor and Council Members a 3% increase. He stated it was over a two-year cycle, two and a half percent a year and it was seconded by Commissioner Alabi.

Commissioner Weakly asked why only three versus five for the mayor.

Commissioner Hanson stated she went through a budget cyclor at her work and 3% was common in corporate America right now. She stated they were looking at a potential recession coming up that the financial world was warning them about. She stated she would rather be conservative than give a larger number and then say, “I wish we wouldn't have done that.”

Commissioner Weakly stated they were not talking about a lot of dollars when they looked at the difference between 3% and 5%. She gave an example, for the mayor, \$1,500 over the year for 5% versus 3%.

Commissioner Hanson stated the mayor got 20% two years ago to bring him up.

Commissioner Weakly stated she understood the 3% at the last meeting and she was the one that talked about the 3% for the employees and how she didn't feel it was necessarily fair to give more. She stated that looking at the city manager's memo and hearing how much the mayor did above and beyond the Council Members, felt it would be equitable, she could explain that and justify that.

Commissioner Severin stated if it was not effective until January 1, 2027, she leaned toward the 5% for both Mayor and Council Members because it was going to be negligible by the time they

fast forward to January 1, 2027. She stated it wouldn't damage the city budget and would still approve the 3% if that was how it stood.

BAC Member Walker stated when they were preparing the budget review and seeing 3% asked if that was over a two-year term. She stated that it would be allocated for over two years and looking at one and half percent for one year and one and half percent for the other.

Commissioner Weekly stated they would get 3% right away but stayed at 3%. She stated the way they did it the last time, they did a 3% for each year and didn't say, one and half percent for the first year and then add another one and half percent, they got the 3%.

BAC Member Walker clarified if it was 3% upfront and then created a hold for two years.

BAC Chair Blake stated it was actually 6%.

BAC Member Walker stated they were talking about their expenses and 3% and was also looking at the fact that the cost of everything was increasing. She stated inflation was not going down, it was going up and felt they should not shortchange the city leaders in that manner and felt they should do more.

Commissioner Bor stated that Commissioner Weekly also asked to segregate out the mayor from the motion and do a separate motion, so it was clear from the Council what they were proposing in the discussion.

Chair Secara stated they could have a separate motion or amend the present motion.

Commissioner Hanson and Commissioner Alabi accepted the friendly amendment to separate the motion.

Chair Secara stated the proposed increase was 5% for the mayor and 3% for the Council Members, after the election of 2026, effective, January 2027 through 2029.

The vote on the friendly amendment passed unanimously.

Chair Secara stated the motions now were for the mayor, 5% and Council Members 3%, effective January 2027.

The vote on the motion to increase the mayor's compensation salary by 5% effective January 2027 passed unanimously.

The vote on the motion to increase the Council Member's compensation salary by 3% effective January 2027 passed. Commissioner Hanson voted no.

Finance Director Green clarified that the Charter Commission was making a recommendation to the Council to increase the Council Members' salary by 3% and increase the mayor's salary by 5%, effective January 2027.

Chair Secara thanked City Manager Stroebel, Finance Director Green and the Advisory Budget Commissioners for attending.

City Manager Stroebel stated that during the conversations tonight, Commissioner Hanson had considered the idea for the Council to retro approve \$50 in instances where a Council Member

or mayor might request it. He stated he knew that was not the decision of the Charter Commission but didn't know if the Charter Commission wanted to consider a recommendation along those lines.

Commissioner Hanson asked if it required a motion from the Charter Commission to send the recommendation.

Commissioner Bor stated the way the policy read, it was clear. She thought part of it was the awareness of the Council Members knowing it was available and how they were going to utilize it. She stated it was approved by the Council and was not sure they should dip into that at this point.

Council Liaison Xiong asked if the supplemental compensation language in the resolution was for travel specifically or for events, for meetings like going to the legislature.

Staff Liaison Montero stated they were trying to clarify what the resolution actually meant.

Commissioner Bor stated how that was determined and discussed in terms of how it applied to the city, rested within the Council and the mayor.

Staff Liaison Montero stated that discussion was held at the beginning of each year when they passed resolutions for the rest of the year.

Commissioner Hanson stated she would like to entertain a recommendation to the city manager about it because knowing the tempo of the legislature and the legislative session, would like to have a recommendation to the Council, if they were called, for a hearing or an event within two or three days, and the Council met every week and times when they couldn't get that preapproved. She stated she would be happy if it was capped twice per month as an example and \$250 could be retroactive.

Commissioner Weakly stated it was not up the Commissioners to make the cap or to tell the Council what to do.

Commissioner Hanson stated the city manager asked if the Commissioners would like to make a recommendation to the Council for that.

Commissioner Weakly stated they just did that in January and if they didn't know what they were approving or discussed it they could tell the Council it might be more advantageous, especially for the mayor.

Chair Secara stated they could at least make a recommendation, or a strong suggestion and the Council didn't have to accept it.

Staff Liaison Montero stated he would put in his notes to send a recommendation via the city manager to the Council when they were approving the supplemental compensation resolution to suggest adding language to that.

Chair Secara thanked the BAC Members for their input.

4. Approval of Minutes

4.1 APRIL 9, 2025, MEETING

Chair Secara asked the Commissioners if there were any substantial changes to the minutes.

Motion Chair Secara, Second Commissioner Bor to approve April 9, 2025, meeting minutes as presented. The motion passed. Chair Secara abstained.

6. Reports of Officers, Boards, and Standing Committees – None.

7. New Business

7.1 Summer Meeting Schedule

Chair Secara stated the amendments to Sections 2.06 and 4.03 were going to be presented to the Council on May 27. He stated he prepared his speech and would read it out loud for comments and suggestions from the Commissioners. He stated the First Reading was May 27, the Second Reading was June 9 and the Charter Commission's meeting was June 11 and still had not received the City Manager's Population Report.

Staff Liaison Montero stated the 2025 population estimates had not been released by the Met Council and would check with GIS Manager Nerge.

Chair Secara suggested that it could be deferred to the September meeting. He stated May 27 was the First Reading and didn't have to be a unanimous vote to move forward, however, on June 9, all Council Members had to agree on the amendment. He asked the Commissioners if they wanted to take June, July and August off or take July and August off.

Motion Commissioner Bor, Seconded by Commissioner Hanson to take July and August off. The motion carried unanimously.

Chair Secara stated June 9 meeting was on a Monday and the Charter Commission meeting was on Wednesday. He stated if the motion failed or if it passed, they probably didn't need to meet and would send a notice to cancel the meeting.

He stated if it failed, they could meet in June and decide on further action if they wanted to.

8. Correspondence/Communications

8.1 Council Liaison Update

Council Liaison Xiong stated that the larger projects, Council Member Klonowski, covered a lot of it according to the minutes and not much to update since then. She briefed on:

- The Fire Station project was going out for bid.
- Work Session discussion of the level three sex offenders living in the city. Looking at restrictions on keeping the offender where they were living from schools, parks, places of worship. There were concerns about if the ordinance would be legal and whether legally the city had to have an area where they were able to move to. There were 23 level three offenders in the city.

Chair Secara asked if the 23 mentioned was larger or smaller than the other communities.

Council Liaison Xiong stated the city had a higher amount and a lot of the cities had an

ordinance and ranged from 0, 4, 7, or 8 while Brooklyn Park was at 23. She stated no formal decision had been made and looking at further maps that would work out with those numbers and would not affect any other concerns.

Commissioner Severin asked what the map looked like when adding certain layers on the footage away from those facilities. She asked if it was only 10% of the land left for apartments or houses where they could live.

Council Liaison Xiong stated that was still open for discussion. She gave an example, if they did a thousand feet away from parks and 300 or 500 feet away from schools, that left the city around 22% residential area, they could still move into and have access. She stated on the map it looked like all red within the city where they couldn't move into but could still argue that the city still allowed up to 22% of residential areas for them to move into. She stated they were also looking into where they couldn't live a within a certain foot from each other.

Commissioner Weakly asked if they talked about where they lived and did it overlap with the group home.

Council Member Xiong stated the Council talked about the congregated facilities, apartment complexes and the group homes and unfortunately the Council could not do anything legally to kick them out. She stated if it came down to those facilities and homes where they were together, they would have further discussions if they wanted to add to the ordinance about how many feet apart they lived from one another.

Commissioner Bor stated at one of the work sessions, the consultant for Metropolitan Transportation, presented the Highway 252 project. She stated in the chats, or the forums didn't show the slides what were presented to the city and was not on the website either. She asked if it was possible to have those slides presented of what the four scenarios were up and over intersections of 8.7 miles. She stated Brooklyn Park and Brooklyn Center attended one event at Caribou, they could hardly hear and some people got agitated. She stated the city engineer was there. She stated the focus had been on safety and there was no argument from anyone who attended appreciated that and how long it had been to make that change. She stated when talking about other aspects of how the project would impact community noise, it had not been seen in any of the materials that were on the site nor had it been considered in terms of a sound barrier.

She asked what the sound would be if they were going to raise it over 85th Avenue as example and brought the freeway over that for the people that lived there. She thought that was a critical piece as the Council had their discussions of considering and approving the projects and what got done. She stated that pollution also had to be considered and there was not a lot they were going to do with it.

She stated it was clear in the assessment of how much more traffic there would be, and the big trucks would take it as a shortcut to St. Cloud. She stated the noise level, brought it up and the volume of that change would impact all the communities.

Staff Liaison Montero stated he could check with the city engineer regarding the slides.

Commissioner Bor stated she didn't think the decisions had been made but it was being discussed and people ought to see how it had evolved to four lanes versus six lanes and sounded it was going to be an overpass.

Council Liaison Xiong stated that based on the last meeting they had with the 252 staff, she had those questions as well. In terms of safety, they were also considering pollution and considering health. She stated they knew on average, highway 252 had one of the highest rates of car accidents and fatalities as of right now but then what the average was going to be if it turned into a freeway.

She stated that in terms of pollution, they were still within the environmental impact phase and still conducting further studies of the air quality. She stated they were still trying to get an estimate of how much traffic would increase on residential roads and how much traffic would increase on the freeway. She stated she requested they look further into displacement not just for residents but the displacement of residents if it pertained to noise, and if it came to businesses. She stated that was a reason why Brooklyn Center did not support it and even if Brooklyn Center did not agree on highway 252 turning into I94, and what Brooklyn Park agreed, would do the first part of the project.

Commissioner Bor stated pollution was critical and important for their quality of life but the sound would be an impact, especially the residential and businesses. She stated it tied into how much more traffic and what kind of traffic. She stated they knew the trucks were going to go that way too.

8.3 Aquatics Center – Bonding Dollars.

Chair Secara stated that on the aquatics center, that was something he brought up and others had questions about it. He stated information was provided and hopefully it answered the questions.

Commissioner Hanson stated she wanted to make a comment on natural resource management. She stated in her farm life and growing up with master gardener parents, understood the importance of natural resource management. She stated she brought it to the past recreation and parks director that she was always shocked when she had seen areas being burned or mowed when it was monarch migrating season. She stated that seeing some of the funding and hoping to get funded through the ongoing CIP projects, hoped that it was not getting pushed aside.

8.2 Public Hearing and First Reading Amendments to Sections 2.06 and 4.03

Chair Secara read his comments he would be giving to the Council at the May 27 Council meeting for the Commissioners.

Staff Liaison Montero asked if Chair Secara wanted to have some slides to present to the public.

Comments from the Commissioners:

- Suggested not having a reference to putting the amendment on the ballot
- Editing slides to present to the public
- The focus of the amendments was shortening the time and saving the city money
- The Council had seen the presentation at several work sessions
- The presentation should include the amendments to Section 2.06 and 4.03 separately

9 Adjournment

Motion Chair Secara, second by Commissioner Hanson to adjourn the meeting. The motion carried unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 8:27 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Devin Montero
Staff Liaison