



Watertown City Council  
Regular Meeting

Mayor Michael Walters  
Adam Pawelk  
Fred McGuire  
Dan Schuette  
Kay Thul

9/12/2023 - Minutes

1. Call To Order And Roll Call

Pursuant to due call and notice thereof, the regular meeting of the Watertown City Council was called to order in the Council Chambers of City Hall at 6:30 p.m. on Tuesday, September 12, 2023, by Mayor Mike Walters.

Councilmembers present: Mike Walters, Fred McGuire, Adam Pawelk, and Kay Thul.

Councilmembers absent: Dan Schuette.

City Staff present: City Administrator Jake Foster, City Engineer Phil Schrupp, City Planner Mark Kaltsas

2. Adopt Agenda

Mayor Walters asked for any changes to the Agenda. Mr. Foster stated there were no changes that were not discussed prior to beginning of the meeting. Foster stated however, he did want to make note that the preliminary platform for the Cove at River Ridge was moved to the meeting. Just to get some more information. Foster stated there was an additional item added to the consent agenda for the council's approval. This was published but was added a little bit after the initial publication. Walters restated, if there is any one present for the preliminary platform for the Cove at River Ridge, this has been will on the docket for the next council meeting in two weeks.

**COUNCILMEMBER MCGUIRE MOVED TO APPROVE THE AGENDA AS PRESENTED.  
COUNCILMEMBER THUL SECONDED. MOTION CARRIED 4-0.**

3. Consent Agenda Discussion And Approval

**COUNCILMEMBER PAWELK MOVED TO ADOPT THE CONSENT AGENDA AS PRESENTED. MCGUIRE  
SECONDED. MOTION CARRIED 4-0.**

3.A. 3A - August 22, 2023 - City Council Minutes

3.B. 3B - August 22, 2023 - City Council Work Session Minutes

3.C. WWTF Pay Application #16

3.D. Highland Park Pay Application #1

3.E. 3E - 2023 Mill And Overlay Pay App 3

3.F. 3F - Appoint Administrative Services Director

3.G. 3G - Homecoming Parade Road Closures

#### 4. Open Forum

Mayor Walter asked if there was anyone interested or if anyone signed up for the open forum. Mr. Foster stated he did not have anybody sign up. There is someone that expressed interest in speaking but was no longer interested not that the Cove Preliminary has been taken off of the tonight's agenda. Mayor Walters stated he will certainly let people speak on this topic. Mayor Walters stated he knows there was a public hearing at the planning commission meeting which is the procedure for this topic. He will allow its constituents the opportunity to speak for three minutes as long we're not repeating and as long it is not getting real negative.

#### 5. New/Old Business

5.A. 5A - 2023 Storm Water Projects

Mr. Foster stated City Engineer, Phil Schrupp with Bolten & Menk would be presenting the bulk of this topic. Foster stated there some complicated financing factors that will need to be walked through. After Mr. Schrupp's presentation Mr. Foster will walk the council through the financing piece of the project. Schrupp stated he would be presenting on the award for the pond improvements project. Schrupp stated at the May 9th, Council meeting, the city, staff received authorization, a pair of final plans, and specifications, and authorizations to quote the pond improvement projects. The project includes the removal and installation of the outlet pipe and the Weir structure on the correct side. As well as fixing and cleaning out the PVC drain tile of the pond. The project also includes the installation of berm forbays, and installation of the filter bench in the King Highland Pond, installation of drain tile. In the Forest Hills development was also originally included. What was later directed by Council to be removed.

Since then the city has received a number of concerns about the pond in the Wildflower development, about the water being too high and not functioning properly. Staff reviewed the pond and the outlet and it was determined that the outlet pipe was being plugged. So it is recommended to be removed and replaced. So the larger diameter pipe stack. Staff recommended, adding this project to the pond improvement and completing this work on these three ponds to repair the functionality of the ponds as well as fixed maintenance issues on all ponds. Schedule for maintenance through 2024.

Quotes for the project were open on August 30, 2023, three quotes were received with Whidmer Construction from Minnetrista being the low bid. The three quotes were Windmill \$137,770, Schneider \$167,000. The engineer's estimate was \$169,000. Valley Paving was \$190,000.

A breakdown of the Total Construction Cost per pond are summarized below: Pond: Bid Amount: Engineering, Legal, Total Project Cost: and Administrative Amount: Riverpoint Pond \$66,000 \$7,000 \$73,000 Kings Highland Pond \$43,000 \$4,000 \$47,000 Wildflower Pond \$29,000 \$3,000 \$32,000 Total \$152,000

Staff has reviewed all quotes and based on the low quote from Widmer Construction, the construction costs of the project is more than 18% below the engineer's estimate. The quotes received indicate that

the bidding process was competitive. Widmer Construction has successfully completed projects of this type in the past and thereby have shown themselves to be a responsible contractor.

Mr. Foster presented the budget portion of this project. In the 2023 Capital Improvement Plan, there were budgeted items for General Pond Sewer maintenance filtration basin at River Point. The Forest Hills drainage but at Mr. Shrupp had mentioned this has since been removed from consideration but those projects are in the funds. This funds has a total of \$130,000 which remained in the fund balance.

Mr. Foster stated after talking to Abdo, we are running into some licensing issues, upgrade, and licensing issues with the planet software, we use to run the CIP. The old draft was one of the pages that got cut off during the upload process. However, we did talk to Abdo and I wasn't able to update those just because I can't get into the software. But nonetheless, after speaking with Abdo about the percentage of operating funds versus what can be used for Capital. We actually have a higher starting balance than what was presented when we talked about the CIP. We will be able to add an additional \$50,000 to the starting fund balance. The starting balance is going to be \$300,000. We removed from the starting fund balance, what hasn't already been funded in 2023, this will be taken off of the starting fund balance for 2024. Considering the additional \$50,000 from what Abdo says we have in there currently, there is probably more like \$380,000 but to be conservative we'll use \$300,000. We do still have plans to transfer from the operating in our budget \$50,000, which is something we've just done annually although it's been into the capital fund. We'll have a starting fund balance of \$350,000. Overall with what was presented, we had a ending balance that year of just under \$90,000 in the storm water fund. We have \$41,000 budgeted for that stormwater fund. We have \$41,000 budgeted for that storm water maintenance that we will have been in there. We can use the funds from that. We have a \$100,000 and just to kind of a placeholder from stormwater repairs and then just in general. This has not been earmarked or allocated for any CIP plans. Roughly right there, there's \$141,000 that we can use for these projects that can come off the starting fund balance of the 24 CIP for stormwater. Also, talking with Doug, there is a half ton pickup that was split between water sewer and stormwater. Doug said quite frankly that the pickup is really more of a sewer vehicle with a little bit of water, so we will remove that allocation. In reallocating it to the sewer and water funds, then we should be be another piece of equipment included in there, we should have about \$211,000 worth of funds that can be removed from that starting fund balance. While still giving us the end fund balance in 2024, of like \$88,000. Foster stated we don't need to spend that entire \$211,000. There is a project on Kiefer Street with unimproved right away, which Foster sent over today and would be a good candidate for a portion of those funds in 2024. However, with that all being said, there is about \$211,000 available for these projects along with the Keifer project. Foster understand it is a little bit complicated and without the software, it is hard to visualize, but there is funds available. As staff spoke, Phil, Andrew, and Doug these are probably the three highest priority, storm water, pond maintenance, and mechanical issues. Along with the drainage issue on Keifer, there are some of those other items that we have allocated for storm water maintenance. General storm, water, repairs that can potentially be pushed out in further years of the CIP as well. These three projects are a priority along with the Keifer Street, we have the money to do it. Other items could be move further out, if it does look like that fund needs help in our 2025 budget and beyond.

Councilmember Pawlek would like staff to continue to monitor the situation and keep council up to date as staff works throught those numbers and works with Albo, all the different components of the situation including software issues, staff transitioning in and transitioning out with some new folks coming aboard. We will continue to monitor this just to ensure there wasn't a glitch in the understanding of all of this information. As far as the project at hand, Councilmember Pawlek & Thul had no further questions. Councilmember McGuire asked if this project would still be done in 2023. Mr. Schrupp stated it would be done after there was alittle more frost in the ground. Allowing for the ground to be harder with the moving of equipment in the areas.

Mayor Walters wanted to clarify that there is \$211,000 unallocated available for this project. Mr. Foster stated the funds are being reallocated, it is basically a placeholder for stormwater, repairs of \$100,000 that we don't have allocated anywhere. That's on allocated the pond/storms who are maintenance is unallocated. There is a half ton pickup that will just be removed, since it is more of a sewer water vehicle and then an additional \$50,000 in funds that we did not account for previously. Essentially to answer the question in a complicated way, for all intents and purposes, there is just over \$200,000 in that funds that could be reallocated.

Mayor Walters stated he has been saying it for years, there needs to be funds in the budget for pond repairs an restoration, and maintenance. Mayor Walters stated he has pond in his backyard and has been told the life of the ponds is between 20-22 years and it is currently 28 years. The ponds are overgrown with cattail and duckweed and have turned more into a swamp. We need to continue putting money into the budget annually for these expenses. Possibly looking into if there are some grants to help offset some of these expenses. Moving forward we will probably see more of these types of expenses and repairs needing to be made on our ponds. The city needs to start planning for annually maintaining, restoring, and repairing the ponds.

The City had budgeted a total of \$50,000 (UC057) to the Filtration Basin Riverpoint, \$40,000 (UC063) to the Pond/Storm Sewer Maintenance, and \$40,000 (UC064) for the Forest Hills Drainage for a total of \$130,000. Those funds have now been moved to the General Stormwater Capital Fund Balance.

**MAYOR WALTERS MOVED TO ADOPT RESOLUTION #2023-55 APPROVING THE LOW BID AND AWARD OF PROJECT CONTRACT TO WIDMER CONSTRUCTION FOR STORMWATER PROJECTS. THUL SECONDED. MOTION CARRIED 4-0.**

5.B. 5C -MUBRLI Subzone Amendment

Mark Kaltsas had two items that he brought in front of the council, after the items had been under consideration at the planning commission meeting. Having the the public hearing notices associated with both of the items. The first is a request to change the sub zone for a property that is in the mixed-used brii zoning district. The city had adopted that zoning district that applies along Highway 25.

When the city had contemplated there would be an associated, what we call a subzone map, that would provide the city with guidance on various portions of that district without having to have a hard zoning designation. It allows some flexibility in how we could zone particular pieces of property. Using the mixed brii is the kind of Master zoning and then be able to use this subzone categories as a more flexible way to kind of respond to the market. Look at properties, more specifically for how think they could be used. Then give the city the ability to adjust the sub zones if necessary. There was an applicant that came forward to the city seeking a change to the property, that identified on the handouts as 595 industrial Boulevard. The applicant is asking that the city would consider changing the sub zone from the subzone C to subzone B. This property is about .72 acres. It is in what we call our referred to as the industrial park. The applicant owns the property that is directly adjacent to the west of the subject property. So they own this property as well. They ha come to the city a while ago about the possibility of building an office in a shop on the property. They are still considering something of that nature. But when they dug into it a little bit more, they understood that their property was guided, subzone C, and the subject property was guided subzone B. The property that is being discussed is identified pink on the handouts. The dark blue is what is being consider to be subzone B and in the staff report that was present it gave a little bit of a snapshot of the ordinance. The main focus of this ordinance is just the kinds of uses that we have permitted in subzone B, which is more oriented towards kinds of smaller lot uses, that would be visible from the highway or have frontage on the highway. Those things would be offices, businesses, retail businesses with some light manufacturing, processing, and assembly, fabricating, cleaning, those types of uses. So small shops, small retail, and small office. The subzone C gets into a different kind of category. It is usually reserved in our planning for larger properties that have uses that accommodate larger type uses more in manufacturing and commercially uses, but also includes many storage, self storage type facilities. The applicant is interested in the possibility of this property being reguided in our plans and gave us an idea of what they'd like to do with that property. The sketch they provided comprises two properties, putting their two properties together. Do a lot combination and then the ability to build a office for their own business, as well as some storage buildings that they could rent out or lease out storage. Tonight the specific topic is jus the change in the sub zone. There is no talk about a site plane, particular use, concept plan even at all at this time, just the changing of the sub zone. The pervious was just provide the city some context as far as the completability to change the subzones. We can change them, however the question is if we want to change them. We came up with than initial plan and then we put language in the ordinance that said it 's really at the discretion on will of the city council to determine those subzones boundaries. The applicant noted that adjacent to this property on the subzone map they are are subzone C. Looking at the map the idea that we would reguide something to subzone C in the industrial park seems completely in context. They possibility of reguiding the whole cul de sac is

something the planning commission did discuss at their meeting. The planning commission did hold a public hearing and the applicant spoke about it as did the owners of the industrial park. The owner of the industrial park did state he has been trying to sell a lot for a long time. There hasn't been small retail, small office type uses that have come forward, he also thought changing the use to all more types of businesses wasn't a bad idea.

The planning commission found that the proposed requested sub-zone change would not create a material compatibility issue between subzones and recommended approval to the city council to rezone the property. It is a resolution just allowing the city to amend the map, which all we have in this kind of subzone category. The city has the completeness to either amend it or not amend it, then the zoning applies accordingly to how ever it is decided to amend the map.

Councilmember Pawelk's only question is if this change is made is it a permanent change or the applicants plans change could the old subzoning be changed back. Mr Kaltsas stated this is only a color change in our zoning map is completely changeable in the future if need be. Councilmember Thul had not further question, as she had attended the planning commission meeting. Councilmember McGuire had not further questions. Mayor Walters had no further questions as he was also at the planning commission meeting.

**COUNCILMEMBER THUL MOVED TO ADOPT RESOLUTION #2023-52 REZONING THIS LOT FROM SUBZONE B TO SUBZONE C. PAWELK SECONDED. MOTION CARRIED 4-0.**

5.C. 5D - 2910 Highway 25 Site Plan And Variance

Mark Kaltsas present the second application. The applicant approached the City about the possibility of adding two new accessory buildings to the existing site. The applicant currently operates a portion of their business in the existing building on the subject property. The company primarily uses the existing building for storage of tools and some equipment and office space for their environmental group. The majority of the company's equipment is staged around the country. The applicant is asking for permission to add two (2) accessory structures to the property for the purpose of indoor storage of company and personal equipment, vehicles, trailers, etc. The subject property was initially approved for boat storage and marine services as outdoor storage only.

A second approval allowed for a 7,750 SF structure to be constructed to the west of the Neal Slate building. The applicant is asking the City to allow the construction of two (2) new accessory buildings as follows: • 10,000 SF – heated, concrete floor, overhead doors • 6,750 SF – cold storage, concrete floor, overhead doors The subject property is located in the MU-BRLI zoning district, subzone C. Office and warehousing are permitted uses and outdoor storage is a conditional use within the zoning district. The City granted approval of a CUP for outdoor storage that runs with the land and is not proposed to be expanded. The City has performed a detailed review of the proposed building and site development. There are several aspects of the project that may require additional information and or revised plans to be submitted. The City has completed a more in-depth review of the proposed site plan. Site Plan Review – The City requires an application for all new construction to complete a site plan review of the proposed improvements. Staff has completed a site plan review of the proposed accessory buildings and related site improvements.

The City approved the site plan review for the existing building in 2007. A condition of the approval required the applicant to plat the property and dedicate right of way for a future road on the west side of the property if any additional expansion occurred on the property. The current request to expand the use on the property would initiate the 2007 condition of approval (see attached resolutions and site plan). The applicant is agreeable to dedicating the future right of way either via a plat or easement. The City will work with the applicant to secure the necessary conveyance documents to fulfill this requirement. The proposed plans indicate that the buildings will be accessed via the existing drive aisle and parking area that is accessed off Highway 25. The current outdoor storage area is comprised of a gravel surfaced area. The City has historically required outdoor storage and similar staging areas to be paved with a hard surface. The City has been supportive of leaving curb and gutter off of those non-public serving portions of the site that will be used solely for outdoor storage and building access. The applicant is agreeable to paving the subject area and would need to revise the plans to show the area

with a hard surface.

The City will require an additional grading and drainage plan. As a result of the larger setbacks and overall property size, the City believes that grading and drainage can adequately be accommodated on site. The City's engineer, Bolton & Menk, Inc., will provide a more formal review of the additional plans requested relating to the utilities, storm water and grading plans.

The Fire Department has provided general comments to the applicant relating to the proposed buildings that will need to be addressed by the applicant. This includes a question relating to building sprinkling and fire apparatus access. The City will work with the applicant to ensure compliance with all Fire Department requirements.

A landscape plan has not been submitted for review and will be required. The City has noted that the previously approved landscape plan (see attached) provided for landscaping around the outdoor storage area. The City would recommend that the west side of the proposed buildings maintain a level of landscaping that is consistent with that which was previously planted.

The landscape plan will need to indicate the type of ground cover for all areas that are being disturbed including storm basins.

A lighting plan has not been submitted for review. A lighting plan and along with the corresponding photometric plan will need to be submitted for any proposed lighting. The lighting plan should also provide details on the prescribed light fixture types.

The lighting plans should also indicate standard IES lighting calculations. Please provide the average fc, uniformity ratio, average to minimum and maximum to minimum fc calculations for further review.

All signage will need to be reviewed and approved by the City prior to installation. You will be required to submit a sign permit application for formal City review and consideration. The signage plan should address each of the individual units and how (location on building, monument sign that has common signage, etc.) they will be proposed to be signed.

The MU-BRLI (adopted design standards) establishes building/architectural standards for new development within the district. The standards essentially provide for the requisite exterior building materials and roof design. The applicant has provided several black and white building elevations without materials labeled. At the last Planning Commission Meeting, the City discussed the potential to change the design standards to allow certain types of "finished" metal panels. The applicant is proposing to side the public facing sides of the proposed buildings with a textured (Structurok -stucco like) metal panel. Based on the Planning Commission discussion, this material would not count as metal paneling and would allow for the proposed buildings to meet the 50% maximum metal panel provision. The applicant applied for a variance from the materials requirement prior to the recent Planning Commission findings relating to finished metal panels.

The proposed development of this property is generally in keeping with the allowable use based on the MU-BRLI, Subzone C zoning district. The applicant is proposing to use the two (2) proposed accessory buildings for indoor storage of tools, equipment, vehicles, etc. The City has provided several comments which will require a revised and final submittal. There does not appear to be any adverse effects on the surrounding or subject properties in the after condition as a result of the proposed development. Should City Council approve the requested actions, it is recommended that the following conditions, findings be incorporated into the recommendation.

Planning Commissioners reviewed the requested actions and asked questions of staff and the applicant. Commissioners asked whether the buildings would be heated, and it was noted that just the north building would be heated. Commissioners asked if the pond on site would accommodate the additional stormwater. Commissioners noted that the building would be visible from the public road that could be constructed to the west in the future. Commissioners recommended that the applicant utilize the decorative paneling as a wainscot around the entire building perimeter rather than on east facing

walls. The City is confirming whether or not this can be accommodated by the applicant.

Recommendation:

The Planning Commission recommended approval for the requested site plan review and variance with the following findings:

1. The proposed site plan review and variance meets all applicable criteria and conditions stated in Chapters 28, 52 and 62 (Landscaping, Subdivisions, Zoning) of the City of Watertown Zoning Ordinance.
2. Prior to the City Council's approval of the site plan review and variance, the applicant shall complete the following items: A. The Applicant shall provide the City with a revised set of plans addressing all remaining review comments made by the staff review and Planning Commission. B. The Applicant shall provide a grading, stormwater and utilities plan and address all comments contained within the City Engineer's review letter. C. The Applicant shall address all comments provided by the Fire Chief pertaining to the Fire Department review of the proposed buildings.
3. The criteria for granting a variance were found to be met for the following reasons: • The City has found that the proposed decorative finish metal panel made by Structurok meets the intent of the building materials standards. The proposed decorative panels will comprise 50% of the total exterior of the building. • The subject property is located in an area of the City and distance from adjacent properties that provides adequate mitigation from surrounding properties. The proposed detached accessory structures shall not be used for commercial storage rental.
4. The variance will allow the proposed detached accessory building to be constructed using metal siding for more than 50% of the exterior.
5. Any expansion of the proposed use, buildings or site improvements will require the review and approval of the City through a site plan review amendment.
6. The area used for outdoor storage and access to the proposed buildings shall be comprised of bituminous pavement installed in accordance with the revised site plan.
7. The proposed building and site plan improvements shall be in accordance with the approved set of site plans that will be further revised and approved. The approved set of plans is attached hereto as Exhibit B.
8. The Applicant shall dedicate the requisite future road right of way to the City, as described on the previously approved site plan, attached hereto as Exhibit C. The City will prepare the requisite conveyance documents.
9. The Applicant shall pay for all costs associated with the review and approval of the subject applications.

Councilmember Pawelk had a question if an easement needs to be part of this document to allow for access to maintain the pond and wants to make sure a road goes in the future that this is all covered.

Mr. Kaltsas stated the resolution is written giving the City an easement for a future right of way in the event a road would be constructed here. That leaves the property private until which time the city comes in and makes any improvement.

The owner of QT Environmental and the property owner/applicant stated he did not have an issue with the 50% rule. Originally we were thinking of doing 4-5 feet of needed requested siding but is fine at relooking at the siding to accommodate the 50% rule requirement.

**COUNCILMEMBER PAWELK MOVED TO ADOPT RESOLUTION #2023-54 GRANTING APPROVAL OF A VARIANCE TO ALLOW AN ACCESSORY STRUCTURE TO BE CONSTRUCTED WITH MORE**

**THAN 50% OF THE BUILDING BEING COMPRISED OF METAL SIDING AND SITE PLAN REVIEW FOR TWO NEW ACCESSORY STRUCTURES ON THE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 2910 HWY 25. GRANTING THE FLEXIBILITY TO CITY STAFF TO WORK WITH THE APPLICANT ON THE FINAL LAYOUT OF THE 50% SIDING REQUIREMENT. MAYOR WALTERS SECONDED. MOTION CARRIED 4-0.**

5.D. 5E -Deputy City Clerk Resignation

Mr. Foster stated this is a little bit out of the norm on how we handle resignation and recruitments.

However, given our current situation and staffing levels, we thought it'd be important to discuss a plan with council and get some buy-in from Council and sort of agreed on a approach for how we get through the next few weeks until Michael comes onboard as the Administrative Service Director. Deputy City Clerk, Christine Dammann, has submitted her notice of voluntary resignation effective September 21, 2023. The resignation is considered to be in good standing. Christine's a great employee, works very hard, and will certainly be missed in the office. With that being said, Kim Block had expressed some interest in potentially moving into that role. Kim is also a great employee, hard work, quick learner and is certainly willing to put in any extra time and effort to learn the skills necessary. We were hoping there might be a potential for a two week overlap here with Christine's last two weeks. But now Kim is now out on a medical leave, she now not able to fulfill that two-week training/overlap. I am looking for direction from council on we should approach this situation. I think there is more importance or more impact for Christine's deputy clerk position as she handles utility billing claims plackets, not saying it's more important just more time sensitive. I don't know how possible it would be to get a temporary person in the deputy clerk position, however, if that were a possibility we could certainly explore that later. We have a couple people who might be interested in filling the front desk role temporary Councilmember McGuire said his wife my be one of them and also Doug Karmerer's wife is another option. So we do have a couple option for at least someone to answer the phone, route calls, that sort of thing. However don't have a real good sense for how we can move forward until Michael gets here and we should ultimately fill Christine's role again. Kim is fantastic and would love to give her the opportunity but also to make sure we are setting her up for success and opportunity to learn. The only motion I need tonight would be to move to adopt Christine's resignation, just to make it official and then I am happy to take direction from council on moving forward with recruitment of one of the positions, direct to fill them, temporarily. We have reached out to MNSpect and they have said they can support in some capacity at least on the permitting side of things. Mayor Walters asked if we know, how long Kimberly how long we anticipate her being out of the office. Mr. Foster stated it could possible quite lengthy as she goes for surgery tomorrow and we are possibly looking at 8-12 weeks and she will need a additional surgery also. Mayor Walters asked if there was a minimum amount of time the job needed to be posted. Mr. Foster stated there is not minimum amount of time that the job needs to be posted depending on the applicants you receive. Mayor Walters stated he would like to give consideration to Kimberly, to promote from within and if she that option to train and fill that position. He also stated there is a lot to be said about someone who wants to be there and is will do what it takes to do that. Unfortunately, with her being out for 8-12 weeks that might hinder that transition. Mayor Walter also stated regardless of what happens when Kimberly returns she should be cross trained on some of this stuff and if that results in her staying in her current position, she should be recognized by being paid more. With a small office like this, we have to have a lot of cross training, especially on the main functions. Mr. Foster stated Kim had started to learn certain pieces of the utility billing process, so she does have that experience and has taken on that responsibility. Kim has been here for one year and has learned her job and started cross training in other areas. She has absolutely shown her willingness and aptitude to learn some those other roles. There is a definite need for getting someone in these positions temporary to answer the phones. Councilmember Pawelk stated he would like to be able to promote an individual from within and would hate to take that opportunity away from Kim for circumstances out of her control. Councilmember Thul stated Kim has been here a year, and looking at Christine's job description it is very heavy on the finances, human resource, and assisting the city clerk. Councilmember Thul stated she is not aware of Kim past experience and with Michael only having a year experience and being new to the city that this would be a lot of new people in new positions. Councilmember Pawelk agreed that Kim would need to come with the credentials and education needed for the position. Mayor Walters stated he agreed and stated moving forward getting Kim training and cross training so she hopefully become that valuable person that can step into that role or step into more responsibility as we move forward.



Mr. Foster stated, Mike also had a employee who severely broke his leg and will potentially be out until the Middle of November. Mr. Foster also stated there is money in the budget to hire a seasonal person. We had budgeted for 3 seasonal positions and only hired 2 so there is money for an additional seasonal position.

**MAYOR WALTERS MOVED TO ACCEPT CHRISTINE DAMMANN'S RESIGNATION AND TO SEND OUT FOR APPLICATIONS FOR THE DEPUTY CLERK FOR 5-7 DAYS, SEASONAL PUBLIC WORKS, AND TEMPORARY ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT. COUNCILMEMBER THUL SECONDED. MOTION CARRIED 4-0.**

6. Other Reports

Mr. Foster reported he has been busy at the front desk and has some great conversation with residents about a variety of things. The residents of Watertown have been great and very understanding with everything going on.

Councilmember Pawelk - Had no report. The park meeting will be cancelled due to the current short staffing in the officer at this time. He would like to wish Christine good luck in her new endeavors and wish Kim the best with here recovery from her accident.

Councilmember Thul - Had a Commission on Aging meeting, they discussed the senior dance and are moving forward with the dance.

Mayor Walters - Reported on his EDA meeting, they approved the EDA Levy and it will be staying the same as last year. The EDA decided to put the Developer Day on hold until next year.

Councilmember McGuire had no report.

7. Claims

**COUNCILMEMBER MCGUIRE MOVED TO APPROVE THE SEPTEMBER 12, 2023, CLAIMS PACKET. COUNCILMEMBER PAWELK SECONDED. MOTION PASSED 4-0.**

7.A. Claims Packet 9/12/23

8. Adjournment

**COUNCILMEMBER PAWELK MOVED TO ADJOURN THE MEETING. COUNCILMEMBER MCGUIRE SECONDED. MOTION PASSED 4-0.**

**309 Lewis Avenue South; P.O. Box 279, Watertown, MN 55388**

---

Michael Walters, Mayor

ATTEST: \_\_\_\_\_

Jake Foster, City Administrator