

I. CALL TO ORDER.

A regular meeting of the City Council of the City of Litchfield was held in the City Council Chambers at the City Hall Monday, April 18, 2022, commencing at 5:30 p.m. Acting Mayor Dingmann called the meeting to order.

A. ROLL CALL:

Mayor	Keith Johnson	Excused
Council Member-at-Large	Ron Dingmann	Present
Council Member Ward I	Eric Mathwig	Present
Council Member Ward II	Darlene Kotelnicki	Present
Council Member Ward III	Betty Allen	Present
Council Member Ward IV	John Carlson	Present
Council Member Ward V	Sara Miller	Present
City Administrator	Dave Cziok	Present
Operations Engineer	Mike Geers	Present
Assistant City Administrator	Joyce Spreiter	Present
City Attorney	Mark Wood	Present
City Engineer	Chuck DeWolf	Present
Independent Review	Brent Schacherer	Present
KLFD	Tim Bergstrom	Present

B. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

II. CONSENT AGENDA -

Each item on the Consent Agenda was considered. No items were added or deleted.

A. COUNCIL MINUTES TO APPROVE:

- 1. City Council Meeting – April 4, 2022

B. FINANCIAL REPORTS TO APPROVE:

- 1. Electronic and Wire Transfer Report

C. CLAIMS TO AUTHORIZE FOR PAYMENT:

- 1. Computer List of Bills for \$196,752.60

D. OTHER PAYMENTS: None.

E. ORDINANCES – SECOND READINGS: None.

F. LICENSES:

- 1. Lawful Gambling Permit –
 - a. Litchfield Lions Club -

**CITY OF LITCHFIELD
 RESOLUTION NO. 22-4-57
 LAWFUL GAMBLING PERMIT FOR
 AN EXEMPT ORGANIZATION LITCHFIELD LIONS CLUB**

WHEREAS, an application for a lawful gambling license exemption was considered from the Litchfield Lions Club,

Resolution No. 22-4-57– Cont’d.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED to approve the application for an Exemption from a Lawful Gambling license for the Litchfield Lion Club on June 13, 2022 at Litchfield Eagles Club 3424, 389 South CSAH 34, Litchfield, and to direct submittal of a copy of this resolution with their application to the State Gambling Control Division.

Adopted by the City Council this 18th day of April, 2022.

Attest:

Approved:

ASSISTANT CITY ADMINISTRATOR

ACTING MAYOR

- 2. Sales on Public Property –
 - a. Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic
 - b. Meeker County Dairy Princess and Ambassadors
 - c. Litchfield Area Mentorship Program (LAMP) - Kinship

G. OTHER ROUTINE MATTERS:

- 1. Employment Offer –

**CITY OF LITCHFIELD
RESOLUTION NO. 22-4-60
EMPLOYMENT OFFER FOR
PART-TIME POSITIONS**

WHEREAS, the City needs employees for part-time positions, and

WHEREAS, the funds to fill these positions were approved in the 2022 Budget, and

WHEREAS, the supervisors will adjust the wage schedule for 2022 part-time employees to fill these positions, and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Litchfield to offer 2022 part-time employment with the City of Litchfield, to the following:

<u>Department</u>	<u>Re-Hires</u>	<u>New Hires</u>
<u>Liquor Store</u>		JoBeth Kratz Daisy Alvarez
<u>Golf Course</u>	Ava Provencher	Elliot Fluck Ela Provencher Nickolas Kuechle
<u>Parks</u>		Lia Caron Wyatt Larson
<u>Pro-Shop</u>	Shannon Bode	Gwen Stenzel
<u>Streets</u>	Mason St. Pierre	

Adopted by the City Council this 18th day of April, 2022.

Attest:

Approved:

ACTING MAYOR

ASSISTANT CITY ADMINISTRATOR

H. COMMUNICATIONS TO REVIEW: None

After review, it was moved by Council Member Mathwig, seconded by Council Member Allen, to adopt the following:

**CITY OF LITCHFIELD
RESOLUTION NO. 22-4-61
APPROVING CONSENT AGENDA**

WHEREAS, the Consent Agenda has been assembled and presented; and

WHEREAS, all requests to have items removed have been duly noted,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED to approve the Consent Agenda as presented except for items, if any, which were requested to be removed for individual consideration.

Adopted by the City Council this 18th day of April, 2022.

Approved:

Attest:

ACTING MAYOR

ASSISTANT CITY ADMINISTRATOR

Upon roll call vote, all members present voted aye, whereupon the resolution was declared adopted.

III. TIMED ITEMS –

A. 5:30 P.M. PUBLIC HEARING – BOARD OF REVIEW –

This being the time, date and place set, with all notices published and posted as required by law, Acting Mayor Dingmann opened the 2022 Local Board of Appeal and Equalization hearing regarding property valuations in the City of Litchfield, where citizens had the opportunity to present and appeal, at 5:31 p.m.

An attendance list is on file.

Meeker County Assessor Amy Rausch addressed the Local Board of Appeal and Equalization (City Council) and citizens on behalf of the City of Litchfield. She gave an overview of the information provided by the Meeker County Assessor’s office included in the Council agenda packet. She explained that the first page was the 2022 assessment changes, with this year being a little hard to explain. Rausch reported that Meeker County updated building costs which had not been updated since 2001. In the City of Litchfield alone, she shared that building cost factors ranged from 104% to 169%, adding a lot of that is just based on location. She wanted to bring that to 100% and used the City of Litchfield as the guide for her office since it has the most sales. Building costs went up from 20% to 80%. She reported that the costs came from working with the Meeker County building official, local lumber yards and other counties and their regional cost guides. Rausch explained that the ratio for the City of Litchfield started at 81.65%. She reported the State requires values to be between 90% and 105% compared to what properties are selling for and what the Assessor’s Office has them valued at, adding that was with 68 good sales. She shared updating costs alone resulted in a 98.28% ratio.

Meeker County Assessor Rausch explained that Meeker County was one of two counties in the State of Minnesota not required to do a time trend after filing an appeal to the Minnesota Department of Revenue. She explained that the Minnesota Department Revenue gives 21 months to tell you that you are not moving your values fast enough. She reported that the City of Litchfield was on track to get a 19% time trend which would have resulted in a ratio of 72% and values having to increase about 35-40%. Rausch appealed with ratios having increased by just updating costs and the Department of Revenue granted that appeal for no trend.

Overall, in Meeker County we are at a ratio of 96% for residential reported Meeker County Assessor Rausch. It has been difficult to explain, however she shared that everyone got treated the same and discussed the stratification process. She reported that the new sales are resulting in a ratio of 87% going into next year. She shared that some areas took larger hits than others based on the number of sales that took place.

Meeker County Assessor Rausch referred to the Minnesota map, included in the Council agenda packet, providing data on average 2022 residential value increase percentages for each county with Meeker County indicating an average increase of 21%. She added the increases are happening everywhere. Trends with Agricultural land sales and value impacts were pointed out by Rausch. The ratio was at 82% with 21 good ag sales for land and she shared increases that were determined.

There were 6 good apartment sales and Meeker County Assessor Rausch reported that a new income study was conducted with apartments which hadn't taken place since 2018 resulting in a 94% ratio. She shared commercial and industrial properties were not touched.

Following were property owners present to address the Council:

1. Gaylen Heacock – 1009 South Marshall Ave - Parcel No. 27-0097000 – Mr. Heacock requested the Meeker County Assessor's Office view his property for a current valuation.

Meeker County Appraiser Scoblic reported that since he had appraised the property in the past, he requested another Meeker County Appraiser conduct a complete interior and exterior review of the property which was completed on March 31, 2022, with no changes identified.

Meeker County Appraiser Scoblic recommended no changes to the 2022 EMV for Parcel No. 27-009700 based upon the results of viewing the property.

Gaylen Heacock said he supplied a certified copy of a valuation completed by a bank last year in which wasn't taken into account. He shared that it was explained to him that an evaluation by a bank is completely different than one done by the Meeker County Assessor's office in figuring the taxable value. He said last year they reduced his taxable value from \$275,000 down to \$245,000. This year, Heacock said he is being told that the actual value of the house doesn't mean anything; it's the square footage and the land that it sits on. He said you can no longer sell the land that the house sits on and doesn't understand why land value is going up. He shared that one year the value of his house went down but the value of the land went up resulting in his taxes increasing.

Gaylen Heacock doesn't understand all the information being thrown around here for evaluations. He said the county takes a chunk of his money; the city takes a chunk of his money, adding if he lived outside of the city he would only pay one tax; the county tax. He expressed concern about double taxation in the City which doesn't seem quite fair to him. Heacock compared his taxes to his daughter's taxes in Ramsey County with her having 2200 square feet more than him, but her tax is less than him. He doesn't understand how one county can have more of a load of taxes. This year his valuation is being raised from \$245,000 to \$308,000. Heacock shared he is sitting in his house he built 20 years ago with about one third of his windows needing replacement. Heacock is having a hard time believing his house would sell for \$308,000. He expressed concern that all they do is measure square footage and do not consider the actual valuation of the house. He said the city and county take and the State gives back a little bit because they

feel we are over taxed and yet he is being told that the State is who demands that the tax be at this level.

Meeker County Assessor Rausch responded that on their side they don't deal with the tax side but they can talk about the value. She said the State doesn't tell us what the tax needs to be but tells us what the typical market needs to be when a property is for sale. She explained square footage is the foundation. Rausch said we take what the replacement cost new is to build that house and then look at the age; what's the quality of construction; is it in average shape for its condition; is it in fair condition. She explained that all of those go in to the factor for determining effective age. Everything gets measured and they do take into account if you haven't done any updating and looking at the numbers, the effective age is still the year built which means he has done nothing to it.

Gaylen Heacock said he and his wife work hard to provide for themselves. He shared that he built the house in 2003 at the cost of \$179,000 and that included the land. He reported that the City refused to extend water and sewer services down the unimproved road he lives on and he had to assume that cost all on his own, adding roughly that it is 225 feet. Heacock shared that his unimproved street got plowed 3 times and most of the time he is out there with his own tractor clearing the roadway. He reported that he got a kickback on his taxes when the city came out and took measurements of the driveway and road. He added \$1,200 doesn't mean a whole lot when he paid \$6,000 for water/sewer. Gaylen Heacock expressed concern about his taxable value being raised from \$245,000 to \$308,000.

Meeker County Assessor Rausch responded that it sounds like a big jump but everybody got those big jumps in the City of Litchfield. She explained that they weren't close to what people are paying and they were based on statistical data they used to value his property. The only other thing Rausch said she could say is that when everybody's values go up and if the levies don't change he shouldn't see a big difference in his taxes.

Gaylen Heacock said he is being forced into a position that he has to sell his home and move to a different locality where the tax base isn't so crazy. He shared he is paying \$400 a month for his taxes which is more than the expense he pays for his medical insurance. He expressed concern about being a resident in Litchfield.

Acting Mayor Dingmann responded that the taxes he pays are not just the city taxes but county and school district taxes as well. Gaylen Heacock questioned what he gets for the county taxes being a resident within the city, adding they don't come and plow my street; they don't come and put gravel down. He said they don't provide anything for him; they make some nice county parks. He doesn't see the fairness of living in the city and being double taxed.

Acting Mayor Dingmann asked Meeker County Assessor Rausch if there was any adjustment for him having an unpaved street versus having a paved street. Rausch said yes they have a deduction for that and for not having curb and gutter.

Gaylen Heacock shared that he is sure that he is not the only citizen being forced out or into some type of subsidized housing. He built the house for his retirement making it handicap accessible on the first floor.

Acting Mayor Dingmann shared that by raising the value from \$245,000 to \$308,000, if the city doesn't levy any more than they did the year before his property taxes for the city won't go up. Council Member Miller added that the city's levy has been pretty stable if she recalls. Council Member Kotelnicki shared 3½ to 5%. Gaylen Heacock responded that by what they are saying his property taxes aren't going to go up that much. Acting Mayor Dingmann responded that he can't say that depending upon if his portion went up higher than the rest based on the value determined by the Meeker County Assessor's office.

Gaylen Heacock encouraged everyone to provide for taxes and increases in retirement planning.

After review, it was moved by Acting Mayor Dingmann, seconded by Council Member Miller, that the 2022 EMV remain the same for Parcel No. 27-097000. Council Member Kotelnicki inquired about utilities being frozen at a certain age. City Administrator Cziok responded that they are not frozen but the city has a senior utility rate on wastewater which was confirmed at age 70. Kotelnicki inquired about the availability of a property tax credit also for senior citizens to go through the State to help this gentleman. Meeker County Assessor Rausch responded that there are a few different options including a normal property tax refund which you can do that is based on your income, your income versus your taxes, and there is a special property tax refund that you can file when you are doing income taxes also if your taxes go up more than 12% and that does not go on your income. Rausch shared that there is also something called senior citizen deferral which basically puts a lien on your property that has to be paid after you no longer have that property. Council Member Kotelnicki asked if we could have those available for him to pick up at City Hall. Gaylen Heacock responded that he already applied for the senior wastewater utility rate. He also shared he has already contacted the state about the 12% increase in property taxes, however he makes too much money to qualify.

Upon roll call vote for the motion by Acting Mayor Dingmann and seconded by Council Member Miller, all members present voted aye, whereupon the motion carried.

2. Wesley Holmgren – 20 West 9th Street – Parcel No. 27-0299000 - Mr. Holmgren reported that his value was going up \$45,000 however he worked with Meeker County Assessor Rausch and Meeker County Appraiser Scoblic and after reviewed it got resolved. He was not appealing his value however shared that the City can't be raising property taxes based on current home sales because these are unprecedented times and you're killing us.

Acting Mayor Dingmann responded that the report provided by the Meeker County Assessor's Office indicates that everyone's values went up and if the levy doesn't increase your property tax will not increase either. He explained the property tax is based on what amount the city will levy and if that levy stays the same your property can double in valuation and it will not affect the amount of taxes you pay. Dingmann agreed that we are hitting unprecedented times. He added as long as our levy stays steady, as long as everybody's valuations go up the same percentage, your taxes will stay the same.

Wesley Holmgren expressed concern that through the years his property taxes have increased tremendously and whatever the city can do to get spending under control as far as the levy is concerned adding that people can't handle these property tax increases. Acting Mayor Dingmann responded that he hears him and they try to do their best.

Following are property owners who were not present but requested the Meeker County Assessor's Office review their properties:

1. Douglas Vincent – 511 South Donnelly Ave. – Parcel No. 27-1844000 – Mr. Vincent requested the Meeker County Assessor's Office view his property for a current valuation.

Meeker County Appraiser Scoblic reported that an interior and exterior review was conducted on April 12, 2022. Based on this review, Meeker County Appraiser Scoblic is recommending to change the condition of the property from fair to poor; to change the effective year from 1975 to 1970; and to put 33% functional obsolescence on the Residential Machine Shed as the roof leaks and the interior needs a new ceiling.

Meeker County Appraiser Scoblic recommended decreasing the 2022 EMV from \$91,900 to \$65,900 for Parcel No. 27-1844000 based upon the results of viewing the property.

After review, it was moved by Council Member Miller, seconded by Council Member Mathwig, to decrease the 2022 EMV from \$91,900 to \$65,900 for Parcel No. 27-1844000. Upon roll call vote, all members present voted aye whereupon the motion carried.

- 2. Lake Ripley Apartments – Parcel #27-1486001 – Meeker County Assessor Rausch reported that they have had initial discussions with the property owner however her office needs more information.

Meeker County Assessor Rausch requested a recommendation of no change to the 2022 EMV for Parcel 27-1486001 with the Meeker County Board of Appeal and Equalization to follow up on said appeal. She explained the property owner had sent her some income and expense information last week but she needs more information from him.

After review, it was moved by Council Member Mathwig, seconded by Council Member Allen, that no changes be made to 2022 EMV for Parcel No. 27-1486001 with the Meeker County Board of Appeal and Equalization to follow up on said appeal. Upon roll call vote, all members present voted aye whereupon the motion carried.

With no further comments, Acting Mayor Dingmann closed the public hearing at 6:09 p.m.

B. 5:30 P.M. PUBLIC HEARING –EASEMENT VACATION CONSIDERATION –

This being the time, date and place set, with all notices published and posted as required by law, Acting Mayor Dingmann opened the public hearing concerning consideration of an easement vacation at 6:09 p.m.

City Administrator Cziok explained that an easement was noted during the development planning relating to Dollar General with the current property owner being Meeker County. Research indicates that there was an alley that was previously vacated in which the utility easement was retained for infrastructure in the past however there are no known functioning utilities in the easement and City Administrator Cziok recommended vacating the easement.

Sam Daleo, the surveyor representing the applicant, was present to answer any questions. An attendance list is on file. There were no written or oral comments.

Acting Mayor Dingmann closed the public hearing at 6:10 p.m.

After review, it was moved by Council Member Mathwig, seconded by Council Member Miller, to adopt the following:

**CITY OF LITCHFIELD
RESOLUTION NO. 22-4-58
FIRST READING OF ORDINANCE NO. 811
FOR AN EASEMENT VACATION
VACATING PART OF AN EASEMENT LYING IN BLOCK 24 OF
TOWN OF LITCHFIELD BEING BOUNDED ON THE SOUTH BY THE NORTH
RIGHT-OF-WAY OF W. SEVENTH STREET AND BOUNDED ON THE NORTH
BY A LINE DISTANT 5.00 FEET, SOUTHERLY OF, AS MEASURED AT A
RIGHT ANDGLE TO AND PARALLEL WITH A LINE RUNNING EASTERLY
FROM THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF LOT 8, SAID BLOCK 24, TO THE
NORTHWEST CORNER OF LOT 21, SAID BLOCK 24, TOWN OF
LITCHFIELD**

WHEREAS, an application signed by the singular property owner abutting the entirety of an Easement lying in Block 24 of the Town of Litchfield, being bounded on the south by the north right-of-way of W. Seventh Street and bounded on the north by a line distant 5.00 feet, southerly of, as measured at a right angle to and parallel with a line running easterly from the northeast corner of Lot 8, said Block 24, to the northwest corner of Lot 21, said Block 24, Town of Litchfield, Meeker County, Minnesota has been submitted to the City of Litchfield, and

Resolution No. 22-4-58– Cont’d.

WHEREAS, said application requested that the City Council vacate a part of an Easement lying in Block 24 of the Town of Litchfield, being bounded on the south by the north right-of-way of W. Seventh Street and bounded on the north by a line distant 5.00 feet, southerly of, as measured at a right angle to and parallel with a line running easterly from the northeast corner of Lot 8, said Block 24, to the northwest corner of Lot 21, said Block 24, Town of Litchfield, Meeker County, Minnesota, and

WHEREAS, the City Council held a public hearing to consider the vacation of part of an Easement lying in Block 24 of the Town of Litchfield, being bounded on the south by the north right-of-way of W. Seventh Street and bounded on the north by a line distant 5.00 feet, southerly of, as measured at a right angle to and parallel with a line running easterly from the northeast corner of Lot 8, said Block 24, to the northwest corner of Lot 21, said Block 24, Town of Litchfield, Meeker County, Minnesota on April 18, 2022 at City Hall after due published and posted notice had been given, as well as personal mailed notice to all affected property owners by the Assistant City Administrator and all interested and affected persons were given the opportunity to voice their concerns and be heard, and

WHEREAS, there were no objections received at the hearing, and

WHEREAS, it is in the best interest of the public to grant this vacation,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the City Council of the City of Litchfield that this be the First Reading of Ordinance No. 811 to vacate a part of an Easement lying in Block 24 of the Town of Litchfield, being bounded on the south by the north right-of-way of W. Seventh Street and bounded on the north by a line distant 5.00 feet, southerly of, as measured at a right angle to and parallel with a line running easterly from the northeast corner of Lot 8, said Block 24, to the northwest corner of Lot 21, said Block 24, Town of Litchfield, Meeker County, Minnesota.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the approval of the Easement vacation is contingent upon the following:

1. Completion of final documents, easement reservations and agreements provided by the City Attorney.
2. The Applicant shall coordinate necessary removal and/or relocation of utilities lying within the easement with appropriate utility owners.

Adopted by the City Council this 18th day of April, 2022.

Attest:

Approved:

ASSISTANT CITY ADMINISTRATOR

ACTING MAYOR

Upon roll call vote, all members present voted aye, whereupon the resolution was declared adopted.

IV. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF AUDIENCE/PRESENTATIONS –

A. AUDIT PRESENTATION –

Justin McGraw, representing Conway, Deuth and Schmeising, PLLP, addressed the Council concerning the 2021 Audit. He highlighted areas of the financials including the General Fund, Special Revenue and Capital Projects Funds, Liquor Fund, Sewer Fund, Electric and Water Funds. He reported that ARPA (American Rescue Plan Act) dollars are included in the fund balance.

April 18, 2022

There are refunding bond monies that impact several business type funds by reflecting a higher balance at the end of the year with the bonds not paid off until February 2022 reported Justin McGraw. Council Member Kotelnicki inquired to availability of cash relating to the bond issuance. Both Auditor McGraw and City Administrator Cziok provided explanations that the cash reported in 2021 was for the purpose of paying off bonds in 2022.

Justin McGraw reported the City has been managed as such to prepare for a time in which they can weather some financial hardships where there may be some revenue shortages. He added the General Fund carries a healthy balance in which it can carry 9 months' worth of expenditures allowing for a buffer in the event there are revenue impacts.

Council Member Kotelnicki inquired to the status of the TH12 project. Both McGraw and Cziok responded there are items that remain unsettled yet. Justin McGraw discussed new standards taking effect in 2022 which will be included in the 2022 Financial Statements relating to leasing. He responded to Council Member Mathwig's inquiry that leasing relating to a potential Recreation Center would be included in the reporting process.

Council Member Carlson inquired if there was a certain number of months of reserves required referring to the City carrying 9 months' worth of expenditures. City Auditor McGraw responded typically it is recommended to have between 35% and 50% worth of expenditures and his recommendation would be 4-6 months of reserves in the General Fund. Council Member Carlson inquired about opportunities with the State surplus in which Justin McGraw responded that the State legislature has to determine allocation of the surplus.

Council Member Kotelnicki inquired about the requirements concerning the American Rescue Plan Act of 2021. Justin McGraw responded that single audit requirements are dependent on when the money is spent. In this case, the City has more time to spend the allocation which could be spent over a period of several years and therefore may not meet the threshold requirements of a single audit with \$750,000 being the threshold.

After review, it was moved by Council Member Kotelnicki, seconded by Council Member Mathwig, to adopt the following:

**CITY OF LITCHFIELD
RESOLUTION NO. 22-4-56
ACCEPT 2021 CITY FINANCIAL AUDIT REPORT**

WHEREAS, Conway, Death and Schmiesing, PLLP have been authorized to conduct an audit of 2021 Financial and other related matters; and

WHEREAS, a detailed report was reviewed previously with staff; and

WHEREAS, the report was reviewed by the Council on April 18, 2022,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Litchfield to accept the 2021 Financial Audit Report as on file, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED to order its submission to other governmental units and to be published as required by State Statute.

Adopted by the City Council this 18th day of April, 2022.

Attest:

Approved:

ASSISTANT CITY ADMINISTRATOR

ACTING MAYOR

Upon roll call vote, all members present voted aye, whereupon the resolution was declared adopted.

V. COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS – None

VI. COMMITTEE REPORTS – None

VII. LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS – None

VIII. BUSINESS –

A. LITCHFIELD AIRPORT PAVEMENT MAINTENANCE & CONSTRUCTION –

City Engineer Chuck DeWolf provided the results of the request for bids for the 2022 Airport Pavement and Reconstruction project and request for quotes for a snow plow truck.

After review, it was moved by Council Member Miller, seconded by Council Member Mathwig, to adopt the following:

**CITY OF LITCHFIELD
RESOLUTION NO. 22-4-59
ACCEPTING BID
FOR 2022 AIRPORT PAVEMENT MAINTENANCE
AND RECONSTRUCTION PROJECT**

WHEREAS, pursuant to an advertisement for bids for the 2022 Airport Pavement Maintenance and Reconstruction, bids were received on Thursday, April 7, 2022 at 11:00 a.m., opened and tabulated according to law and held over until Monday, April 18, 2022, and the following bids were received complying with the advertisement:

WHEREAS, the following bids were received complying with the advertisement:

	<u>Net Bid</u>
Fahrner Asphalt Sealers, LLC	\$368,534.06
American Road Maintenance	\$384,889.06
OMG Midwest Inc. Dbas Minnesota Paving & Materials	\$409,882.06
Asphalt Surface Technologies Corp.	\$412,920.60
Duininck, Inc.	\$432,846.77

AND WHEREAS, it appears that Fahrner Asphalt Sealers, LLC of Eau Claire, WI is the lowest responsive bidder,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City of Litchfield, Minnesota:

1. To give a conditional award to Fahrner Asphalt Sealers, LLC of Eau Claire, WI conditioned on final review of the bid documents by the City’s staff, for the 2022 Airport Pavement Maintenance and Reconstruction Project.
2. The Mayor and Assistant City Administrator are hereby authorized and directed to enter into a contract with Fahrner Asphalt Sealers, LLC of Eau Claire, WI in the name of the City of Litchfield for the 2022 Airport Pavement Maintenance and Reconstruction Project according to specifications on file on the office of the Assistant City Administrator.

Adopted by the City Council this 18th day of April, 2022.

Attest:

ASSISTANT CITY ADMINISTRATOR

Approved:

ACTING MAYOR

April 18, 2022

Upon roll call vote, all members present voted aye, whereupon the resolution was declared adopted.

After review, it was moved by Council Member Miller, seconded by Council Member Mathwig, to adopt the following:

**CITY OF LITCHFIELD
RESOLUTION NO. 22-4-62
AUTHORIZE PURCHASE OF SNOW PLOW TRUCK FOR AIRPORT**

WHEREAS, City staff has been evaluating equipment needs for 2022; and

WHEREAS, City staff has recommended purchasing a 2022 snowplow truck for the Airport; and

WHEREAS, there are Federal funds that can be used to accommodate the purchase; and

WHEREAS, the City received a bid in the amount of \$306,033.00 from MacQueen Equipment,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the City Council of the City of Litchfield hereby approves purchasing a snowplow truck for the Airport in the amount of \$306,033.00 from MacQueen Equipment contingent upon the availability of Federal funds.

Adopted by the City Council this 18th day of April, 2022.

Attest:

Approved:

ASSISTANT CITY ADMINISTRATOR

ACTING MAYOR

Upon roll call vote, all members present voted aye, whereupon the resolution was declared adopted.

B. PROPERTY OFFER –

City Administrator Cziok reviewed the property offer received by the owner of property located at 116 West 2nd Street.

After review, it was moved by Council Member Kotelnicki, seconded by Council Member Allen, to adopt the following:

**CITY OF LITCHFIELD
RESOLUTION NO. 22-4-63
LOT PURCHASE OFFER FOR PROPERTY LOCATED AT
116 WEST 2ND STREET**

WHEREAS, the Public Works Department continues to have needs for both cold storage and warm storage for equipment; and

WHEREAS, City staff has been reviewing options to consider for adding storage facilities; and

WHEREAS, the Council received an offer in the amount of \$70,000 from the property owner located at 116 West 2nd Street for City acquisition; and

WHEREAS, said property is adjacent to the public works storage facility on Miller Avenue referred to as the old rescue squad building; and

Resolution No. 22-4-63– Cont’d.

WHEREAS, while the long range public works facility plans have not been finalized the property could be a valuable piece in the future due to its location; and

WHEREAS, the City has designated funds for a public works facility expansion,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the City Council of the City of Litchfield hereby agrees to the purchase agreement requesting \$70,000 for property located at 116 West 2nd Street; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the City Administrator and City Attorney be authorized to facilitate said purchase,

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the property purchase be funded by the Infrastructure–Public Works Facility Fund.

Adopted by the City Council this 18th day of April, 2022.

Approved:

Attest:

ACTING MAYOR

ASSISTANT CITY ADMINISTRATOR

Upon roll call vote, all members present voted aye, whereupon the resolution was declared adopted.

IX. ADDITIONAL ITEMS – None.

X. ANNOUNCEMENTS – None.

XI. ADJOURNMENT –

The City Council meeting adjourned at 6:52 p.m. by unanimous consent.

Approved:

Attest:

ACTING MAYOR

ASSISTANT CITY ADMINISTRATOR