

**MINUTES OF MEETING**  
**SOUTH ST. PAUL PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**August 2, 2023**

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER BY CHAIR FELTON AT 7:00 P.M.

Present: Tim Felton, Chair  
Geoff Fournier  
Jason Frankot  
James Hart  
Ruth Krueger  
Brienne Miller  
Michael Healy, Planning Manager

Absent: Chad Schlemmer

- 1) APPROVAL OF AGENDA – Motion to approve as presented –Hart/Miller (5-0)
- 2) APPROVAL OF MINUTES – July 5, 2023 –Motion to approve the minutes as presented- Krueger/Miller (7-0).
- 3) NEW BUSINESS

None

- 4) PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. Rezoning 444 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue North to C-1 Retail Business District

Mr. Healy presented the staff report. The Applicant is Gaylene Camacho. She is requesting to have the two parcels that make up her property at 444 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue North rezoned from R-2 and R-3 to C-1. The property is made up of two parcels, one containing a commercial building and the other containing the parking lot for the commercial building. The Applicant would like the properties to be rezoned to expand the list of uses that can go into the commercial building. Today, the building can be used as a church, a day care or one of the 7 office uses that were approved through a Special Use Permit in the 1970s. The comprehensive plan guides the subject property for “mixed use.” Staff recommend approval of the rezoning.

Chair Felton commented that this request is unique because the property is located in the middle of a residential area with no other commercial buildings. Mr. Healy commented that Thompson Avenue is the closest commercial node which was a few blocks away.

Chair Felton asked Mr. Healy if he was concerned about any of the uses that are allowed in the C-1 district that might propose to use the space. Mr. Healy shared that he was not, in part because of the orientation of the building towards 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue and the neighboring property has a privacy fence along the property line that is shared with the subject property. Mr. Healy commented that there were similarly placed buildings near Thompson Avenue and Vet’s Field.

Commissioner Hart asked if rezoning the property would open the door for a business that would create additional glare or noise and would negatively impact the neighboring residential properties. Mr. Healy commented that that businesses are inherently louder than residential properties, but there are some protections

in place such as requiring a photometric plan to change any lighting which would help prevent some of these disturbances. Mr. Healy added that the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency also regulates noise pollution.

Chair Felton asked if a notice of public hearing was sent out for the application. Mr. Healy confirmed that a notice of public hearing was sent out to all properties within 350 feet of the site. Chair Felton asked if staff had received any correspondence. Mr. Healy stated that he had not received any written correspondence.

Commissioner Miller asked if the lots could be combined if both parcels are rezoned. Mr. Healy explained that the lots could be combined if the properties were rezoned. Lot combinations are a County process that simply requires the submittal of a lot combination request form. These combinations typically take place at the end of the year after the second half taxes are paid on the property. The City does not have the ability to require the properties to be combined.

Gaylene Camacho, the owner of 444 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue North was present to speak to the application. Ms. Camacho spoke about the struggles of trying to find a tenant for the site. Ms. Camacho explained she has had to turn away hair salons, small contractors' operations, a pastry shop, and a coffee shop due to the zoning of the property. Ms. Camacho explained that many of her previous tenants had outgrown the space and she has struggled to lease the site since.

Chair Felton asked Ms. Camacho if any of the neighbors had voiced concerns to her about the businesses that had previously been in the space. Ms. Camacho stated that no one had voiced concerns to her directly and that she does her best to maintain the property.

Chair Felton opened the public hearing.

Allen Weeks, 1115 Dwane Street, shared that he and his wife lived next door and had a nice conversation with Ms. Camacho. Mr. Weeks shared that Ms. Camacho had agreed to put up some additional privacy fencing between her building and their property. Mr. Weeks shared that he was not concerned about the types of businesses that he anticipates going into the building. Mr. Weeks shared that he had more concerns about the property being torn down and rebuilt with a gas station or a convenience store. Mr. Weeks shared that there was a very large, very bright light on the utility pole on Ms. Camacho's property and inquired if anything could be done about the light. Mr. Weeks reiterated that they were generally in support of the application.

Chair Felton encouraged Mr. Weeks to reach out to the City about the light.

Chair Felton closed the public hearing.

Motion to recommend approval of the rezoning of 444 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue North to C-1 Retail Business- Hart/Fournier (6-0).

Chair Felton asked about the dates that the Application would be reviewed by the City Council. Mr. Healy stated that the first reading would take place on August 21<sup>st</sup> and the second reading would take place on September 5<sup>th</sup>.

#### B. Conditional Use Permit for Quality Truck and Trailer at 497 Farwell

Mr. Healy shared the staff report. The Applicant is Quality Truck and Trailer Repairs. They are seeking a site plan for a 12,000 square foot industrial building and a Conditional Use Permit to operate a truck and trailer repair operation out of the new building. The subject property has recently had two "false starts" in using the site and went as far as to receive zoning approvals to redevelop the site but both redevelopment attempts failed for different reasons. The business owner has hired a new contractor and team to redevelop the site. The proposed development meets the code except for the asphalt parking surfaces which are "grandfathered" to not meet setback requirements. Some of the asphalt surfaces are laid out the way they are because this property and the properties to the north and south are connected with a series of ingress-easement easements that allow vehicles

to drive between the properties. The Applicant is proposing to use a type of insulated metal panel that looks like stucco that is not officially allowed so the Planning Commission will need to weigh in on whether they believe this is an acceptable material that is comparable or superior to the materials that are officially allowed.

Chair Felton asked Mr. Healy to clarify what the Applicant was looking for from the Planning Commission regarding the building material. Mr. Healy explained that the Applicant would like the Planning Commission to review the material and decide if they are ok with allowing the material to be used as the primary material for the building.

Chair Felton asked if the material they would like to use is a metal panel that looks like stucco or if the metal panel had a stucco-type finish. Mr. Healy shared that the panel was metal with a textured material that looks like stucco.

Mr. Healy explained that due to the lot size and shape, there is limited potential for redevelopment at the site. The proposed use is the highest and best use of the site. The only open question is if the Planning Commission is ok with the building material. Mr. Healy addressed some of the ongoing exterior storage code enforcement issues at the site and explained that these issues would largely stop if the development moves forward since there will not be room on the site for exterior storage. Staff recommends approval of the application with conditions.

Chair Felton asked staff to clarify that if a “grandfathered” structure is demolished and it is not rebuilt within a year that the business loses its “grandfather” rights. Mr. Healy explained that according to the State’s regulations, if a grandfathered use is discontinued for a year, you lose your rights to that use forever. If a grandfathered structure is destroyed by a fire or a storm, you have 180 days to apply for a building permit to reconstruct the “grandfathered” structure. After 180 days, all “grandfather” rights are lost.

Commissioner Hart asked Mr. Healy to elaborate on the “grandfathered” asphalt that was at the site. Mr. Healy explained that the site is vacant except for the asphalt parking lot which goes all the way up to the property lines that are shared with Stockman’s and the bird seed company. Typically, parking lots are required to be setback from a shared property line so the existing asphalt parking area is “grandfathered” to not be setback.

Commissioner Hart asked if the proposal requested any changes to the easements. Mr. Healy explained that the Applicant does not control the easements and does not have the ability to change the easements. The Applicant is proposing to respect the easements and allow the easement owners to use the property.

Commissioner Miller asked if easements expire. Mr. Healy explained that the easements at the site are permanent easements. Mr. Healy added that easements are legal documents with terms and that sometimes easements can end when both parties agree to discontinue the easement.

Aaron Sundeen, Derek Building Solutions, explained that the building material they were proposing is incredibly common for industrial buildings and provide flexibility that is not possible with precast buildings. Mr. Sundeen listed a few other projects they had worked on using the proposed building material. Mr. Sundeen explained that they designed the site to be respectful to the easement holders while meeting the landscaping requirements.

Chair Felton asked about the pit easement at the site. Mr. Sundeen explained that the easement holder of the pit easements and one of the ingress/egress easements is the bird seed company. Mr. Sundeen explained that easement is used for loading/unloading grain or birdseed.

Mr. Sundeen passed around a sample of the material they were proposing to use for the exterior of the building. Chair Felton asked about the durability of the product. Mr. Sundeen explained that the exterior material was very durable and looks nice. Mr. Sundeen explained that this product is a direct competitor to concrete precast.

Commissioner Krueger asked if the width of the sample panel was comparable to the width of the actual panel. Mr. Sundeen explained that the width of the actual panel was much wider than the sample panel. Commissioner Krueger noted that the panel seemed like it would be a good temperature and sound insulator.

Chair Felton asked if the Applicant was aware of the 20 conditions that staff had on the approval of the project and if they had an issue with the conditions. Mr. Sundeen stated they had no concerns with meeting the conditions. Mr. Sundeen explained that he and his team were confident and prepared to take on the project.

Commissioner Frankot asked about how quickly a building using the metal/stucco panels could be constructed. Mr. Sundeen shared that the building could be constructed in about 3 weeks. Mr. Sundeen explained that the plan was to excavate the site and put in footings this fall and start construct the building in early January/February with the hope to have the business operating out of the site by April of 2024.

Chair Felton opened the public hearing.

No one was present to speak on the Application and no correspondence has been received prior to the meeting.

Chair Felton closed the public hearing.

Chair Felton asked if the Conditional Use Permit was written to allow the building material the Applicant is proposing to use. Mr. Healy explained that the approval had been structured to have the Planning Commission acknowledge the material type and state that they are ok with its use for the building.

Motion to recommend approval of the conditional use permit- Frankot/Fournier (6-0)

#### C. Ordinance Amendment Restructuring Regulations for Body Art Establishments

Mr. Healy provided staff background. The Applicant is Tony Lodge. One of his tenants at the 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue Plaza operates a beauty parlor and would like to start offering cosmetic tattooing and micropigmentation where features such as eyebrows, freckles, and lipstick are tattooed onto a client's body. The City currently prohibits any form of tattooing or body art in the C-1 district with no exceptions. The Applicant has requested an ordinance amendment to allow his tenant to operate this business and repeal the citywide cap on the number of body art licenses. Mr. Healy explained that the state changed its rules around body art establishments in 2011. The State rules allow for cities to require a local license in addition to being licensed with the state as long as the city adopts standards that are stricter than what is in State Statute. The City Council viewed body art establishments as being an undesirable land use in 2011. They passed a strict local ordinance for body art establishments which created a local license requirement in addition to the required state licenses, created a cap on the number of body art establishments allowed within the city, and limited the location of these businesses to the General Business district. In the last few years, the City has approved some zoning changes for body art establishments including allowing them as permitted in the CGMU district and the MMM district. The City only has one body art establishment at this time. The City Council discussed changes to the existing body art establishment regulations at their July 24<sup>th</sup> work session meeting and provided staff with feedback that they are ok just having body art establishments be regulated by the state as long as some commonsense regulations are added to the zoning code. The City Council stated that they were ok with allowing micropigmentation and cosmetic tattooing citywide but that they would like the Planning Commission to evaluate whether other types of body art establishments belong "up the hill" in the C-1 district. Staff drafted an ordinance that they would like the Planning Commission to review.

Chair Felton asked what the staff recommendation was. Mr. Healy explained that the way the ordinance was drafted would allow body art establishments "down the hill" as long as they are licensed with the state and follow the new rules that would be enacted in the zoning code. Cosmetic tattooing and micropigmentation would be permitted uses "Up the Hill" for beauty parlors but any other body art establishments in this area

would need a conditional use permit. Mr. Healy explained that one of the criteria for when to approve a conditional use permit is the proximity of the use to a residential area, so in theory if someone wanted to put a body art establishment in the middle of a residential area with C-1 zoning and the proposal seemed like it could have negative impacts to the residential area, the conditional use permit could be denied due to its proximity to residential uses.

Chair Felton asked staff to clarify that they could do more than just restrict the hours of operation with a conditional use permit and that the City could flat out deny the use if they felt the location of the use was inappropriate due to being located in a residential area. Mr. Healy cautioned that applications should not be prejudged but that conditional use permits can be denied if they do not meet the conditional use permit criteria. The City cannot deny the application because they do not like the use. Chair Felton asked if an application for a conditional use permit for a body art establishment in the C-1 district could be denied due to the proximity of the establishment to a residential use. Mr. Healy confirmed that this could be an appropriate reason to deny a conditional use permit request for this type of use but cautioned that the City could be subject to a lawsuit if the conditional use permit was denied. Mr. Healy went on to explain that he did consider adding a distance requirement between residential buildings and body art establishments but decided not to include this language because it would effectively ban body art establishments in the C-1 district.

Chair Felton asked staff to clarify that as proposed, the ordinance lists cosmetic tattooing and micropigmentation as permitted while requiring a conditional use permit for body art establishments that do body work other than cosmetic tattooing and micropigmentation in the C-1 district. Mr. Healy clarified that the ordinance was drafted with this language but that the draft language is not a formal recommendation.

Chair Felton asked if there was a concern about businesses in the C-1 district offering body art procedures other than cosmetic tattooing and micropigmentation without a conditional use permit while operating under the guise that they only offer cosmetic tattooing and micropigmentation. Mr. Healy explained that there is always an “honors system” component to land use if a City does not strictly license the type of business. Mr. Healy explained that he had chased out illegal uses out of buildings that were not zoned for the use but that this was uncommon because most businesses do not want to invest in a site only to be kicked out.

Commissioner Hart asked Mr. Healy if the draft ordinance is what the group would be approving, either as-is or with amendments. Mr. Healy confirmed that was correct. Mr. Healy explained that when an individual submits a petition to the City, the City has 60 days to schedule a vote on the application or to extend the deadline for a vote to 120 days. If the City does not respond to the request in 60 days, the request gets added to the code automatically. Mr. Healy explained that he drafted an ordinance in response to Mr. Lodge’s zoning petition because it is easier to review the request with a model ordinance to work off of. Commissioner Hart asked Mr. Healy to clarify that a body art establishment was the same as a tattoo parlor. Mr. Healy explained that a body art establishment is defined as “any structure or venue, whether permanent, temporary, or mobile, where body art is performed.” Body art is defined as “physical body adornment including, but not limited to, tattooing and body piercing.” Mr. Healy explained that body piercing includes branding, scarification, suspension, subdermal implantation, microdermal, pocketing and tongue bifurcation. Back in 2011, many of these types of body piercing were prohibited and the City has the ability to prohibit these uses but it does not prevent residents from seeking out establishments that offer these services outside of City limits.

Commissioner Hart asked staff to clarify that the proposed ordinance would remove the conditional use permit requirement for body art establishments in the GB district but would add a conditional use permit requirement for body art establishments in the C-1 district. Mr. Healy clarified that this was correct and pulled up the zoning map to show which districts the use is allowed in today, which district the use was conditional in today and which districts are proposed to have changes to their rules.

Commissioner Hart asked if any of the surrounding communities had a cap on the number of body art establishments that are allowed in town. Mr. Healy explained that the other cities that have the same licensing requirements limit the number of licenses to two. Both of these other Cities had the same City Attorney as South St. Paul in 2011 and she brought the same ordinance to all three communities. Mr. Healy went on to explain that capping the number of businesses of a certain type is something that cities (and the state) does for uses that can have a negative impact such as liquor stores. Commissioner Hart asked if it was common to cap the number of body art establishments that are allowed. Mr. Healy explained that typically capping the number of businesses of a certain type is done through licensing, not through zoning. Mr. Healy reiterated that there are only two other cities he was aware of in Dakota County that cap the number of body art establishments.

Commissioner Krueger commented that the presentation had been very informative. Commissioner Krueger asked staff to clarify that the proposal was to allow cosmetic tattooing and micropigmentation in any of the commercial districts. Mr. Healy confirmed this was correct. Commissioner Krueger commented that South St. Paul was catching up to Saint Paul as they allowed cosmetic tattooing 20 years ago. Commissioner Krueger asked staff to clarify that the ordinance as it was written would allow cosmetic tattooing and micropigmentation “up the hill” and “down the hill” without a conditional use permit or city oversight. Mr. Healy explained that the State would still license these establishments and any body art technicians but the City would view the business as a beauty parlor.

Commissioner Frankot asked staff if the proposed definitions related to body art establishments were the same definitions the state uses. Mr. Healy explained that the definitions in the model ordinance are the same as the state’s definitions with some minor modifications to address local issues.

Chair Felton commented that he agreed that cosmetic tattooing and micropigmentation should be allowed within a beauty salon but shared that he did not feel comfortable allowing other types of body art “up the hill,” even with a conditional use permit. Commissioner Frankot echoed that he felt similar.

Chair Felton asked staff to clarify that the Applicant was only interested in allowing cosmetic tattooing and micropigmentation in the C-1 zoning district. Mr. Healy explained the narrative requested cosmetic tattooing and micropigmentation but that the Applicant owned a shopping center and was always looking for new tenants. Chair Felton commented that there seemed to be plenty of space down the hill for body art establishments that offer services other than cosmetic tattooing and micropigmentation and that he did not see a need to add this use “up the hill.”

Commissioner Frankot asked if they could make the regulations in the draft ordinance stricter. Mr. Healy stated that they could and reiterated that the draft ordinance was not staff’s recommendation but rather a model to base discussion on.

Commissioner Fournier asked Mr. Healy to clarify that if the City denied a conditional use permit for a body art establishment offering services other than cosmetic tattooing and micropigmentation that this could open the City up for a potential lawsuit. Mr. Healy stated that when a Conditional Use Permit is approved or denied, the City adopts findings that the application either does or does not meet the criteria for when to grant a conditional use permit. Mr. Healy provided the example that if the City were to deny a conditional use permit for a body art establishments on the grounds that they do not like the use, the City could be sued for making an arbitrary and capricious decision. But the City could conceivably deny a conditional use permit for a body art establishment at 444 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue North due to its proximity to residential properties.

Commissioner Hart asked if there was an option to update the rules for just cosmetic tattooing and micropigmentation and leave the current regulations that are in the code for body art establishments as-is. Mr. Healy explained that the Planning Commission could strike the language in the draft ordinance that would allow body art establishments that offer more than cosmetic tattooing and micropigmentation as a conditional use in the C-1 district. Commissioner Hart asked if the draft ordinance would change the cap related to the number of body art establishments that are allowed in South St. Paul if cosmetic tattooing and micropigmentation is allowed in the C-1 district but the rest of the regulations were left in place. Mr. Healy explained that the cap on the number of body art establishments is currently regulated through licensing, which is not an area that the Planning Commission has a say about. Commissioner Hart asked if removing the cap on the number of licenses was imminent. Mr. Healy explained that if the City Council votes to repeal the local license requirement, the cap on the number of body art establishments would go away because the cap is based in licensing. Chair Felton clarified that the Planning Commission was there to look at the zoning regulations for body art establishments, not the licensing of them. Mr. Healy confirmed that was the case.

Commissioner Fournier asked if the City would be able to regulate the types of body piercing that are allowed through a conditional use permit if the rules were amended to allowed body art establishments in the C-1 district. Mr. Healy explained that the Planning Commission could add regulations to the code that would allow a conditional use permit for body art establishments in the C-1 district but only if the body art establishments met certain zoning conditions such as a spacing requirement or only allowing certain types of body piercing.

Chair Felton commented that he was comfortable with prohibiting body art establishment that offer more than cosmetic tattooing and micropigmentation “up the hill” because there is plenty of space for the use “down the hill.”

Tony Lodge, owner of the 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue Plaza, came forward to speak on the application. Mr. Lodge explained that the request came from a current tenant who operates a salon and would like to offer micropigmentation and cosmetic tattooing in addition to their other services. Mr. Lodge explained that his request was specific to allowing micropigmentation and cosmetic tattooing in the C-1 district but he is always looking for tenants and would not be opposed to other body art establishments also being allowed in the C-1 district.

Commissioner Hart asked if the ordinance amendments related to allowing tattooing “up the hill” was something that he requested or something that staff proposed. Mr. Lodge explained that he was open to all potential uses at the 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue shopping center. Chair Felton commented that Mr. Lodge’s application was to allow micropigmentation and cosmetic tattooing, not other types of body art. Mr. Lodge commented that the state views cosmetic tattooing and other tattooing to be the same. Mr. Healy explained that the way the City’s ordinance is written today, all tattooing is considered to be the same. Under the proposed regulations, micropigmentation and cosmetic tattooing would be viewed differently than other types of body art. Chair Felton shared his concerns about cosmetic tattoo artists offering non-cosmetic tattoos.

Chair Felton opened the public hearing.

No one was present to comment on the application and no correspondence had been received prior to the public hearing. Mr. Healy noted that for an ordinance amendment, a notice of the ordinance is included in the newspaper and is listed on the City's website but is not mailed out.

Chair Felton shared that he and Commissioner Hart were inclined to allow just micropigmentation and cosmetic tattooing in the C-1 district as a permitted use while continuing to limit other types of body art establishments to being located "down the hill." Commissioner Hart asked about the hesitation the other commissioners had with allowing body art establishments that offer services other than micropigmentation and cosmetic tattooing "up the hill" in the C-1 district with a conditional use permit. Chair Felton shared that he felt there was no need to allow these other body art establishments "up the hill", even with a conditional use permit, because they are already allowed in other areas of the City. Commissioner Frankot commented that he was not comfortable with allowing branding and tongue bifurcation in salons in the C-1 district. Commissioner Miller shared that she was comfortable allowing everything up the hill because these types of body art procedures are regulated by the State which means the state considers the procedures to be safe. Commissioner Fournier stated that he would be comfortable with allowing body art establishments that offer services other than micropigmentation and cosmetic tattooing "up the hill" with a conditional use permit as long as certain types of body art can be prohibited through that process. Chair Felton reiterated his position and added that he did not feel comfortable with this use near a residential area. Chair Felton added that there are a lot of things that are regulated by the State that are not allowed in residential areas.

Commissioner Hart shared his hesitation with flat out prohibiting body art establishments "up the hill." Chair Felton commented that they would still be allowed to do micropigmentation and cosmetic tattooing which is what the Applicant requested be allowed. Commissioner Hart questioned if only allowing micropigmentation and cosmetic tattooing in the C-1 district would negatively impact small body art establishments. Commissioner Hart stated this was why he asked Mr. Lodge if there were any plans for body art establishments at the building. Commissioner Frankot brought up that allowing other body art establishments in the C-1 district could lead to a request to allow the use at 444 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue North which may be rezoned C-1.

Mr. Healy noted that the Planning Commission could add a space or lot size requirement for body art establishments that need a conditional use permit to operate in the C-1 district if they wanted to prevent body art establishments in commercial buildings in residential areas.

Chair Felton asked if the ordinance would need to come back to the Planning Commission if additional conditions were added for body art establishments in the C-1 district. Commissioner Frankot commented that the group was advisory to the City Council.

Commissioner Krueger commented that she trusted the future planning commission and City Council to make the right decisions, but only if a conditional use permit is required for the use. Commissioner Krueger stated she was in favor of the ordinance as presented.

Mr. Healy stated that if there was a consensus that a conditional use permit was the correct tool to regulate body art establishments and the Planning Commission wanted staff to create conditions for body art establishments prior to the first reading, Mr. Healy stated that he was willing to do so.

Motion to approve the proposed ordinance as presented- Krueger/Fournier (4-2) (Frankot, Felton)



5) OTHER BUSINESS

None.

6) STAFF UPDATES

A. Park Master Plan Update

Mr. Healy shared that the Parks and Recreation Department is in the process of updating the City's Master Parks Plan. Mr. Healy invited the planning commissioners and other residents to take the kickoff survey for the master plan.

Commissioner Felton asked if Mr. Healy could provide an update on the status of Northview Pool. Mr. Healy prefaced that while he typically would not know this type of information, he had recently spoken with the Parks and Recreation Director who had shared the status of the pool with him. There had recently been a substantial leak several weeks ago which resulted in the pool being shut down for several days for repairs. The pool had aged and is realistically at the end of its useful life. In order for the pool's use to be continued, substantial investments would need to be made so the pool can be used by future generations. The 2005 Parks Master Plan called for phasing out Northview pool and trying to create a new pool facility. Mr. Healy iterated that a large part of the Master Plan and the survey is to understand what residents would like to see from the pool.

Commissioner Frankot shared that the pool is currently losing about 10,000 gallons of water a day and that the pool has been in need of repairs for many decades. Chair Felton shared that he hopes the pool is rebuilt in the same location. Chair Felton shared that he would take the survey. Mr. Healy stated that the city is hoping the community will recognize that Northview pool will not be around for another 50 years without substantial investment.

Chair Felton asked where the survey was available. Mr. Healy shared that the survey is on the City's website and on the City's Facebook page. Mr. Healy read off the survey link for anyone watching.

Commissioner Hart asked if there were plans for engagement around the survey for individuals that do not use social media. Mr. Healy explained that the Parks Department is leading the project update and has hired the consulting firm HKGI to assist with the project. Mr. Healy explained that the engagement kicked off at the Splish Splash Bash where HKGI and Staff promoted the survey. Mr. Healy explained that the survey would close in two or three weeks, but additional engagement would take place after the survey window closes. Commissioner Hart commented that there are likely a number of residents that will want to take the survey that are not currently aware it exists.

Commissioner Krueger commented that the messaging around the survey has an impact and shared that she was more interested in the survey knowing that it will provide feedback about Northview pool instead of just being a general survey.

7) ADJOURNMENT

Motion to adjourn- Hart/Miller (6-0).