

Minutes of the Proceedings of the City Council of the City of Champlin in the County of Hennepin and the State of Minnesota
Pursuant to Due Call and Notice Thereof

Regular Session
July 14, 2025
Municipal Center

Call to Order	The Champlin City Council met in Regular Session and was called to order by Mayor Ryan Sabas at 6:00 p.m.
Pledge of Allegiance	The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.
Roll Call	Present: Mayor Ryan Sabas and Councilmembers Jessica Tesdall (Ward 1), Tom Moe (Ward 2), and Tim LaCroix (Ward 4). Absent: Councilmember Nate Truesdell (Ward 3).
	Also present were City Administrator Jenny Max, Community Development Director Scott Schulte, City Planner Lexi Smith, City Attorney Dave Schaps, and City Engineer Heather Nelson.
Approval of Agenda (July 14, 2025) Motion	Motion by Councilmember Tesdall and seconded by Councilmember Moe to approve the agenda for the July 14, 2025, Regular Meeting as presented. Voting in favor were Mayor Sabas, Councilmembers Tesdall, Moe, and LaCroix. Voting against: none. Motion carried.
Approval of Minutes Motion	Motion by Councilmember LaCroix and seconded by Councilmember Tesdall to approve the minutes of the June 23, 2025, Worksession and June 23, 2025, Regular Session Meeting as presented. Voting in favor were Mayor Sabas, Councilmembers Tesdall, Moe, and LaCroix. Voting against: none. Motion carried.
Ratification of Payments (July 14, 2025) Motion	Motion by Councilmember Moe and seconded by Councilmember LaCroix to approve ratification of payments as submitted on July 14, 2025. Voting in favor were Mayor Sabas, Councilmembers Tesdall, Moe, and LaCroix. Voting against: none. Motion carried.
Announcements	Mayor Sabas made the following announcements: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Council Worksession – Monday, July 28th at 5:00 p.m. in the Council Conference Room• City Council Meeting – Monday, July 28th at 6:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers• July is National Parks and Recreation Month. We celebrate park and recreation professionals and how they improve the lives of tens of millions of people, making a lasting impact on communities across the country. With that said, I'd like to extend a heartfelt thank you to our City of Champlin Park and Recreation team!• The 2025 Farmers Market is open every Tuesday from 2 to 6 p.m. at the Ice Forum through September 30, featuring fresh, local goods each week. Stop by to shop local.• Night to Unite returns on Tuesday, August 5th. Plan a block party and register to get a visit from the Police and Fire Departments between 6 and 9 p.m. The first 50 hosts who register by July 18th will receive a special gift.• This Wednesday, July 16th from 5:30 to 7:30 p.m., join us at Mississippi Crossings for Llamas Nearby! It's a free community event with live llamas, art projects, musical performances, and the Yang Yumm food truck.• Don't forget we offer free live music and food trucks every Thursday at 6 p.m. at Mississippi Crossings. Come enjoy an evening on the river.• The Northwest Food Truck Fest is back at Mississippi Crossings on Sunday, July 27th, from 11 a.m. to 5 p.m. Come hungry and enjoy a wide variety of food truck offerings.• Bring the family to explore vehicles and equipment from Public Works, Police, and Fire at Big Trucks & Cool Stuff on July 31st from 4 to 7 p.m. at the Public Works Yard, with parking available at the Ice Forum. Mini O's Donuts and Brain Freezze Ice Cream will be on site.• Residents now have access to curbside collection of organics as part of Hennepin County's zero waste initiative. Organics are collected weekly on the same day as your regular garbage, and containers can be requested through the website's online form.

- Parks and Recreation has summer programming available for all ages. Be sure to visit the online catalog to browse programs and reserve your kid a spot.

Special Presentations

Presentation of
Proclamation Recognizing
Champlin Women of
Today

Mayor Sabas presented the proclamation recognizing the Champlin Women of Today, which is now celebrating its 36th year of commitment to leadership, training, and personal enrichment through community service.

Overview of Worksession
Discussion

The City Administrator provided a brief overview of the discussion that occurred earlier in the evening at the Council Worksession regarding:

- The Council continued discussions related to the 2026 budget process. Initial scoring and ranking of budget initiatives were discussed, and they will continue to work towards a preliminary levy number over the next six weeks.

Consent Agenda

Councilmember Moe requested to pull Item 9.8, Resolution Approving Plans and Specifications and Order Advertisement for Bids for the Cartway Culvert Replacement Project, Improvement Project No. 22403, from the Consent Agenda for further discussion.

Resolution to Amend Joint
Powers Agreement with
North Metro Mayors
Association
Resolution 2025-35

Councilmember Tesdall introduced the following resolution and moved its adoption:

A Resolution to Amend Joint Powers Agreement with North Metro Mayors Association

The motion for the adoption of the resolution was duly seconded by Councilmember Moe, and upon vote being taken thereon, the following voted in favor thereof: Mayor Sabas, Councilmembers Tesdall, Moe, and LaCroix, and the following voted against the same: none, whereupon said resolution was passed this 14th day of July 2025.

Motion by Councilmember Tesdall and seconded by Councilmember Moe to approve the Second Amended Joint Powers Agreement for a Coalition of Metropolitan Communities. Voting in favor were Mayor Sabas, Councilmembers Tesdall, Moe, and LaCroix. Voting against: none. Motion carried.

Second Amended Joint
Powers Agreement for a
Coalition of Metropolitan
Communities
Motion

Approve Temporary On-Sale Liquor License for Elm Creek Brewing Co. to Sell Alcohol at Rescheduled Mississippi Crossings Summer Series Concert Motion

Motion by Councilmember Tesdall and seconded by Councilmember Moe to approve the temporary on-sale intoxicating liquor license for Elm Creek Brewing Co. to sell alcohol at the August 29th concert at the Mississippi Crossings Event Center. Voting in favor were Mayor Sabas, Councilmembers Tesdall, Moe, and LaCroix. Voting against: none. Motion carried.

Resolution Adopting the
City of Champlin Data
Practices Procedures
Policy
Resolution 2025-36

Councilmember Tesdall introduced the following resolution and moved its adoption:

A Resolution Adopting the City of Champlin Data Practices Procedures Policy

The motion for the adoption of the resolution was duly seconded by Councilmember Moe, and upon vote being taken thereon, the following voted in favor thereof: Mayor Sabas, Councilmembers Tesdall, Moe, and LaCroix, and the following voted against the same: none, whereupon said resolution was passed this 14th day of July 2025.

2nd Quarter Financial
Reports
Motion

Motion by Councilmember Tesdall and seconded by Councilmember Moe to accept the 2nd Quarter 2025 financial reports. Voting in favor were Mayor Sabas, Councilmembers Tesdall, Moe, and LaCroix. Voting against: none. Motion carried.

Approve Cooperative
Agreement with Hennepin
County Regarding 109th

Motion by Councilmember Tesdall and seconded by Councilmember Moe to approve the Cooperative Agreement with Hennepin County for Intersection Improvements at Winnetka Avenue and 109th Avenue related to the 109th Avenue Reconstruction Project 1, Improvement Project No. 21606. Voting

Avenue Intersection
Improvements,
Improvement Project No.
21606
Motion

Approve Cooperative
Joint Powers Agreement
Between Champlin and
Brooklyn Park for
Maintenance of 109th
Avenue
Motion

Resolution Approving
Plans and Specifications
and Order Advertisement
for Bids for the Cartway
Culvert Replacement
Project, Improvement
Project No. 22403
Resolution 2025-37

Resolution Approving
Comprehensive Plan
Amendment for
Development Guidelines
in the Northwest Area of
Champlin

in favor were Mayor Sabas, Councilmembers Tesdall, Moe, and LaCroix. Voting against: none.
Motion carried.

Motion by Councilmember Tesdall and seconded by Councilmember Moe to approve the Joint Powers Agreement for maintenance of 109th Avenue with the City of Brooklyn Park, subject to City Attorney review. Voting in favor were Mayor Sabas, Councilmembers Tesdall, Moe, and LaCroix. Voting against: none. Motion carried.

Councilmember Moe asked if this project would impede navigation ahead of the culvert once the two-culvert system is added, recognizing the work that has been done on Elm Creek.

The City Engineer provided details on the design of the two-culvert system, noting that it would match the existing flow of the culvert. She stated that the new culverts would have the same floodplain elevation. She commented that kayaks could still continue to go through the culverts as they do today.

Councilmember Moe introduced the following resolution and moved its adoption:

A Resolution Approving Plans and Specifications and Order Advertisement for Bids for the Cartway Culvert Replacement Project, Improvement Project No. 22403

The motion for the adoption of the resolution was duly seconded by Councilmember LaCroix, and upon vote being taken thereon, the following voted in favor thereof: Mayor Sabas, Councilmembers Tesdall, Moe, and LaCroix, and the following voted against the same: none, whereupon said resolution was passed this 14th day of July 2025.

Open Forum
No comments.

New Business

The City Planner stated that in January 2025, the City Council adopted a moratorium on five parcels totaling approximately 19 acres, located south of French Lake Road and north of The Reserve at Elm Creek neighborhood. The objective of the moratorium was to evaluate the redevelopment potential of the study area by identifying barriers and feasibility factors that help guide future land use decisions and development provisions. The final outcome is an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan. During this process, the City completed traffic, grading, and utility studies and held two Council Worksessions to review findings and develop a shared vision. The Council's consensus from the worksession was used as the guidelines for the Comprehensive Plan Amendment. Since the Council last discussed the moratorium, the City hosted a public informational meeting on June 18th, and a formal public hearing was held by the Planning Commission on June 30th. Following the public hearing, the Planning Commission recommended approval of the Comprehensive Plan Amendment with a revision to the land use section.

Councilmember Tesdall commented that she had the opportunity to have a great conversation with staff to discuss the two interests at hand, the five parcel owners and the existing neighborhood. She appreciated the review and discussion of the Planning Commission and the input of residents. She proposed that staff take the next two weeks to craft language that would potentially bridge some of the gaps between what is feasible and good for the five property owners and what is reasonable and good for the existing neighborhood. She recognized the comments that two units per acre would not be feasible, and on the other side, there are concerns with traffic and shared amenities.

The Community Development Director stated that the issue at hand is the input from a developer who has done a fair amount of investigation on what would be feasible for this area, and it would not be feasible to provide the desired outcome of the Council because of the constraints of the topography and the involvement of five property owners. He stated that if the Council were to support that argument,

there is a question of alternative housing styles, which could include a slab on grade or villa-type product, which would require less fill. He stated that, as they have gone through this process, it is clear that the Council would like an extension of the Reserve, but if there are questions of the feasibility of that scenario, perhaps the Council would like to have additional discussion related to alternative housing choices.

Councilmember Tesdall commented that she would like to discuss not only alternative housing styles but also density. She believed that a density range of zero to five would be too dense and would like to discuss that as well.

Mayor Sabas confirmed that the Council provided clear direction to have an extension of the Reserve, which is one of the most prominent neighborhoods in Champlin. He wanted to ensure that they maintain the quality of that neighborhood and also understood the constraints on these five properties. He referenced a concept plan that was provided today, which would have 16 single-family homes along the Reserve, which would be a good fit, but then seems to jam in several detached slab-on-grade homes. He stated that that plan seems to have a lack of character for the slab-on-grade homes compared to the Reserve. He noted that the concept would add 64 additional homes that would only have access through the Reserve, which already has concerns with traffic at the intersection into the neighborhood.

Councilmember Tesdall referenced the concept plan and noted that the density is jarring compared to what already exists in the Reserve.

The Community Development Director stated that staff has not vetted the concept plan layout, which appears to be a hybrid version combining two housing products. He stated that if the Council desires, they could take a half step back to further review the concept layout, the villa product that the Council may support, along with a potential layout the Council may support.

Councilmember LaCroix commented that his two main concerns with this area are related to traffic flow and character. He stated that he had made earlier concessions based on the density that the Council supported, which also maintained the overall character of this neighborhood. He stated that he would prefer to keep his original position, as he does not see this concept as an improvement. He stated that he would like to see more information to see how this could be considered an improvement that would not impact residents in this area.

Councilmember Moe thanked the Planning Commission for the work it did in reviewing the case and asked for more information on the thought of the Commission to support any type of single-family home on the properties.

Planning Commissioner Uglem stated that they listened to the discussion from the current Reserve homeowners as well as the five property owners, noting that he lives in the Reserve. He stated that the Commission was leaning towards the villa style home for the other housing style, as that would address the concerns related to the impact on property values of the five property owners. He stated that he lives on Three Oaks Lane and realized that this would be a large increase in traffic on a road that is used to access community amenities. He stated that safety is the largest concern for the existing neighborhood. He commented that Nathan Fair held a neighborhood meeting at the Reserve, which was commendable.

Councilmember Moe asked if the Planning Commission envisioned the increase in density as shown on the concept plan.

Commissioner Uglem replied that the concept came forward fast, and the Commission did not anticipate that increase in density.

Mayor Sabas asked if the City could mandate more than one builder for the villas to provide variety.

The Community Development Director stated that if a villa product is introduced, he would prefer to be more detailed in the architectural and elevation requirements rather than dictating multiple builders.

Mayor Sabas referenced the dog park villas and stated that if those were added to this area, it would not be compatible with the Reserve, and therefore, his expectation would be much higher.

The Community Development Director stated that if the Council were interested in opening the door to a villa product, that type of feedback would be helpful for staff to look into the market and to craft some potential regulations.

Councilmember Tesdall stated that, in looking at this concept plan as an example, this would be too dense. She stated that she is interested in finding a middle ground for the five property owners and the existing Reserve neighborhood. She noted that there is only one entrance, and that intersection has been discussed for years. She did not support the increase in density as shown in the concept and would support a lesser density. She noted that the concept also lacks the stub to Dayton, acknowledging that it could be years before the neighboring development in Dayton occurs. She stated that they would still want to plan for that connection to Dayton. She believed there would be an advantage to having some separate amenities within the new development area to alleviate the pressure that would be put on the existing Reserve amenities.

Mayor Sabas commented that there is a park component proposed to be included in the concept, although it is not shown.

Councilmember Tesdall commented that her comment was more for staff as something she would want to see incorporated. She appreciated the additional amenities that would be added to the Reserve amenity area but would still want to see some play equipment in the new addition.

Nathan Fair, Jonathan Homes, asked if the Council would go back to a worksession-type discussion as the next step in the process. He believed that a lot of the details could be worked out in that type of setting.

Mayor Sabas commented that the Council is deciding that direction tonight.

Mr. Fair recognized the statement that there are no villas in Champlin or the surrounding areas and that would be desired for this area. He commented that there are only so many villa builders in the Twin Cities market, and there is only so much that you can do to a villa on a 45 to 50-foot-wide lot. He stated that to have a healthy association for villas, you need to have a certain number of villas to make it run effectively. He explained that if there are not enough units, the HOA fees are too high, and the product is not successful. He stated that if there were no issues with fill and floodplain, he would have already moved forward with two-story single-family homes. He stated that they have spent a lot of time and energy working with their land planners and City staff to find something that could work for the existing landowners and could create a successful HOA. He stated that he had a good conversation with his attorney today, and it would be very challenging for them to join the existing Reserve HOA, as 67 percent of the Reserve residents would need to approve adding these new homes into the HOA. He stated that the villa buyer tends to be 55-plus, and they would prefer a walking path that ties into the Three Rivers Park District as well as pickleball. He stated that one week ago, he shared a plan that included a central park, but that was not feasible as the pond needed to be larger and deeper. He stated that he is working with the City Engineer, and they discovered the sewer in Cedar Ridge Lane is not as deep as they hoped it would be; therefore, additional fill would be needed to provide the necessary depth. He stated that this concept would create a balance of fill within 1,000 yards. He stated that the primary concern he has heard from the Reserve is related to safety. He did not believe the villas would detract from the value of the Reserve. He stated that a center island would be proposed at the end of Three Oaks to slow the speed of traffic. He commented that the parallel parking near the pool also helps to slow the speed of traffic. He stated that he would prefer to have this development separate from Dayton but would include the connection if that is desired by the Council. He stated that he wants to be part of the team and believed there would be value in holding a worksession to further discuss the issues and hopefully find something that would work for all parties. He did not see any financially feasible way to create a full single-family home neighborhood. He stated that it is very difficult to have multiple builders for villas because of the HOA requirements. He noted that two recent villa properties sold in the \$600,000s. He believed they could work together to find a way forward.

Councilmember Tesdall asked Mr. Fair for input on the desired density range.

Mr. Fair commented that he did not look at the density range but tried to find a land plan that would make the villas successful. He recognized some of the things that made the Reserve what it was able to become, including the Trout Pond and contributions from the City for amenities. He stated that this land is not nearly as nice as the southern half of the Reserve land. He stated that the amenity of the Trout Pond can still be utilized through trails.

The Community Development Director noted that the concept would have a density of 3.37 units per acre.

Mr. Fair stated that while the density could be capped at a range of zero to four, the Council should also respect the landowner's rights, as the R-1 zoning district has a range of zero to five.

Mayor Sabas recognized that the overall density includes the larger single-family home lots and noted that he would be interested in the density of just the villas.

Mr. Fair stated that he would like to keep the single-family homes, if possible, to be a transition from the Reserve. He stated that if the single-family homes were removed, the villas in that area would include basements because the ground is already raised in that area.

Gary Baker, 1104 Brookside Trail, stated that he is very concerned with the density of this area. He commented that he and his wife chose Champlin as the location for their retirement and love their neighborhood. He applauded the City staff and Council for the thorough work that has gone into the creation of the development guidelines and wants to see something compatible with the existing neighborhood. He asked the Council to approve the guidelines as originally proposed. He stated that he supports the lower density and housing type, as that would be the best scenario to protect the character and safety of the existing neighborhood. He recognized that the main consideration is the cost of fill but believed that would only be about two percent of the home value if the cost were split equally between the homes to be built.

Lindsey Eaton, 10934 Brookside Trail, stated that her primary concern is related to the safety of the children in the Reserve. She stated that the more homes that are added, the more traffic that will be generated, which will drive along the street where the Reserve amenities exist. She appreciated that there is a deal to be made but asked that safety remain a concern as this moves forward.

Carrie Guthrey, 12751 Cedar Ridge Lane, appreciated that this is a complex issue and appreciated that Mr. Fair visited the Reserve to discuss this further. She commented that density remains the largest concern, along with traffic concerns, as there are already safety concerns with the one entrance, and this would add more vehicles. She commented that the Reserve is unique in Champlin, and to take away from that to make this deal is very concerning. She stated that it will also be concerning as to how the amenities will be policed between the neighborhoods. She believed that introducing a new demographic, without their own amenities, is concerning. She did not believe that the current residents of the Reserve would vote to include, even the single-family homes, into the existing HOA.

Mark Gustafson, 10951 French Lake Road, stated that he would like to protect the property rights, as there is an aroma of discrimination. He commented on the two years of construction noise they endured when the Reserve was built. He commented that everything is developable and to say that this plan would not fit in is hypocritical. He commented that traffic will never go away as quiet communities develop like Champlin has. He wanted to ensure that he and his neighbors have the same opportunity that the Reserve property owner and current residents benefited from. He stated that they have property rights the same as everyone else. He stated that there are only two spots left to develop in Champlin, and they will be developed. He did not believe that what is ultimately built on the property would detract from the Reserve property values.

Ryan Holland, 11085 French Lake Road, commented that he is a Champlin business owner and heavily invests in the community. He appreciated all of the desires to have safety for kids, which is also important to him. He stated that there is a lot of discussion about awesome ideas for development that are not possible to achieve. He stated that these plans are contingent on all of the five properties developing at the same time, with all five properties being willing sellers at that time. He noted that one of the five property owners may not be interested in selling. He stated that he purchased the

property in 2022 with the intention of building a single-family home for his family and City staff told him that he would incur all of the City water and sewer connection charges destined for the 10 to 12 homes that were planned for the property, explaining that would be over \$60,000 in sewer and water charges for one home. He stated that ultimately, he backed away from building a home on the property and in 2023 he had a purchase agreement for the property, which was contingent upon the City approving a legal and conforming plat for the property. He stated that this is a very recent thing for the City to dictate two-story walkout homes to be built on property. He stated that in October of 2023, Councilmember Tesdall reached out to him about the potential use of his property as a nonconforming commercial wedding venue. He stated that over the next year, the City engaged with Dayton to determine if there would be a connection between the communities, how water would be managed, and potential annexation of the property he owns in Dayton into Champlin. He noted that all of this kicked the can of development of his property down the road until the time the City enacted the moratorium, which targets his property, as his property was the only one that had mentioned development plans. He stated that the moratorium was passed without even alerting the five property owners, and thankfully, the City stepped back the following month to involve landowners, although the moratorium was still approved. He stated that after the moratorium was passed, Mayor Sabas called him to offer two-thirds of the value of his property in trade for his commercial property on TH 169. He found it odd that, less than two weeks after the moratorium was enacted, the Mayor would offer him two-thirds of the value of his property, which had already been established through an agreement with a developer. He believed that conflict of interest is up to the public as to whether someone can sign on a moratorium and then make a lowball offer on his property.

Mayor Sabas commented that he did not make an offer on the property but discussed a trade of properties, as he was aware Mr. Holland was looking for commercial property. He noted that financials were never discussed.

The City Attorney redirected the conversation to the topic at hand.

Mr. Holland stated that ultimately, this is a new vision of the Council, and he respects that, along with the Reserve residents wanting to have the best project developed on the lake. He stated that his concern is that all of the proposals have involved all of the five property owners selling at the same time, which is not necessarily going to happen. He stated that if the requirement is for two story walk out single-family homes to be built with an HOA, that will prohibit him from doing anything on his property unless all five property owners agree at the same time as it would not be feasible to develop his property without the fill from a giant pond that would be located on someone else's property. He stated that to bring in enough fill to develop his property in that manner would have a cost of \$2,000,000 just in dirt and would make his property worth zero dollars and would have a significant impact on him as a property owner.

Councilmember Moe asked if Mr. Holland would like to develop his property outside of the concept plan.

Mr. Holland stated that if all property owners were on board, he would agree with the larger plan, but if that cannot happen, he would still like to develop. He stated that his original intention was to develop his property on its own, and he had previously proposed conforming plans to the R-1 district.

Councilmember Tesdall stated that she got Mr. Holland's phone number from a neighbor and asked permission to walk the property as she potentially wanted to create a space that could be used for special events. She stated that she has family members who are autistic, and her family has the desire to create small businesses where people with special needs could work. She commented that ultimately, she walked the property with her dad, and it was priced out of their range, so they did not pursue that option.

Mayor Sabas reiterated that he has never had financial conversations with Mr. Holland about his property but has been available for Mr. Holland to discuss his concerns. He stated that when they originally moved forward with the moratorium, they did not notice the residents, and the City recognized that mistake and then provided notice to the homeowners to hear their concerns. He stated that they are trying to do this right for the citizens of Champlin and the residents of the Reserve. He stated that it is clear that a less dense, single-family neighborhood would be the desire, but recognized

that may not be possible. He asked if the Council would like to proceed with its previous vision or take a step back to further discuss this in a worksession.

Councilmember Tesdall believed that the Council should take a step back and take a second look in an attempt to find a middle ground between the concerns of the Reserve residents and the ability of the five property owners to be able to sell at market value. She asked if staff would like additional direction.

The Community Development Director stated that the question being asked is whether the Council supports an alternative housing choice. He stated that staff would desire additional input on the desired type of housing so that there can be recommendations provided. He stated that there have been comments related to traffic calming, transitioning, and amenities, noting that those things will be helpful in staff determining what a development scenario could look like.

Councilmember LaCroix stated that his decision has not changed in the sense that he understands the economic feasibility, but he also cannot support the concept that was shown. He stated that he would be open to a worksession discussion but recognized the work that may be necessary to do that.

The Community Development Director stated that he did not want to consider this plan in particular. He asked if the Council would support an alternative housing style based on the constraints of the site.

Councilmember LaCroix stated that he is unsure. He stated that he knows what has been discussed and was comfortable moving forward in that direction. He stated that he would need to be convinced that they could still achieve the same level of safety and aesthetics.

Councilmember Tesdall stated that if she got to choose, she would pick a continuation of the Reserve, but they also have to consider the residents who own and live on properties they want to make choices about. She acknowledged that approving the plan as it stands would preclude those property owners from having that choice.

Councilmember LaCroix stated that it appears there is one property owner who may not sell, which means this plan would ultimately not be built. He stated that if the Council desires, he would support participating in additional discussion that could potentially address the concerns and make things economically feasible. He stated that he would not support an open-ended option for the development of this property.

Mayor Sabas stated that there are five parcels with four landowners who also have rights. He stated that if the landowners are getting paid the tax assessed value for their property, that would be fair market value. He stated that he has not seen all of the properties listed for sale. He believed that the properties could be sold as is for market value, but recognized that is different than developable value. He stated that the value may not be there for development because it is a lesser quality land, and that is not the problem of the City or the rest of the community. He stated that every property owner has the right to list their property for sale at fair market value.

Ryan Karasek stated that he had the opportunity to meet the landowners when he knocked on their doors when the Reserve was being built. He stated that he spoke with the residents because he wanted them to be informed about the project and the potential impacts on them. He recognized that their concerns at that time were similar to the residents of the Reserve now, as people do not want to see change, and it takes time to adjust and accommodate to that change. He stated that he was a Councilmember when the Reserve was being voted on, and he was the sole vote of opposition for that development because of concerns he had related to safety. He stated that there have been concerns and issues in the neighborhood that are not new. He stated that he did have the permission of the landowners to send the written correspondence he provided to the City prior to this meeting, as he wants to see the landowners have the opportunity to sell their properties at a fair value. He recognized the issues with the floodplain and the dirt that would be required. He commented on the amount of fill that would be required, as shown on an earlier plan, which would equate to 7,000 truckloads of dirt. He stated that while it would be great to have an extension of the Reserve, it is clear that is not viable. He explained that the Reserve benefited from the 300,000 yards of dirt that were excavated from the Trout Pond. He stated that it would not be feasible to haul that amount of dirt into this site because the cost is too high, and the only way to make up for that expense is to increase the density to share the

expense. He stated that having a villa product would be a nice complement to the Reserve as it would provide variety to the area. He stated that the density did not seem as much because many of the homeowners would perhaps be seniors with only one vehicle and would not be making as many daily trips as a young family. He stated that the Reserve has the amenity of the Park Reserve, which is an incredible amenity, along with the other community amenities. He stated that the Berry Farm did not have the Park Reserve, but had the clubhouse and pool to help sell those homes. He commented that in this neighborhood, if there were only single-family homes not a part of the existing HOA, it would be difficult to sell the homes because of the lack of amenities. He stated that it would not be cost-effective to put in a pool-type amenity for 40 homes, noting that both the Reserve and Berry Farm developments have over 100 homes. He believed that the Council seems to be heading in the right direction to take a step back and further discuss this. He stated that this is a big decision that impacts residents he has known for over a decade, and he wants what is best for them to be able to move on with their lives and get the most value for their properties. He stated that the reality is that selling the properties to a developer is likely their best choice to move forward.

Mayor Sabas recognized the real estate experience of Mr. Karasek. He referenced the assessed values of the properties and asked if Mr. Karasek believes that the property owners could get those prices on the open market.

Mr. Karasek replied that they probably could, but the reality is that other extenuating circumstances could impact property values. He stated that Mr. Gustafson is on the flip side in that he has a large piece of land, and the best potential for him would be through development. He stated that one property owner is stuck in the middle, and she has still been incredible to deal with through this process. He explained that Ms. Myer could most likely list her property for sale tomorrow and receive more money that way, but she also cares about the community and is potentially willing to take less, knowing that she is part of the bigger picture.

Councilmember Moe asked if Mr. Karasek is currently representing any of the property owners in the sale to the developer.

Mr. Karasek commented that he is not currently representing any of the landowners but is simply representing them as a friend. He stated that he has been working with Mr. Fair in the process, but they do not have a legal partnership. He noted that he intends to provide a bridge between the parties involved. He stated that he is unsure how things will move forward beyond that.

Mr. Baker stated that he does not understand why all the villas could not be decreased in density with a much higher-end quality product. He commented that there are high-quality villa homes with more square footage than the villas being proposed. He believed that this plan could be much better developed with a lower density. He stated that he could support villas but would want to see high quality and low density.

Mayor Sabas recognized that they would not be looking at a standard slab-on-grade villa and would be looking for something of a higher quality that fits with the neighborhood.

Mr. Karasek provided an example of villa sales he was involved in during the last month, noting a recent villa sale in Dayton for \$799,000. He stated that the other villa currently under construction was \$650,000. He stated that the home values in the Reserve were considered to be incredible, and the price of these villas would be similar to the original home values in the Reserve. He stated that some opportunities and flexibilities could be discussed as they move forward.

Mayor Sabas recognized the concerns related to safety, density, and quality.

Councilmember LaCroix commented that he would be fine stepping back and having additional discussion.

Mayor Sabas stated that he would be interested in taking a step back and continuing this at the August 11th meeting, as Councilmembers Truesdell and LaCroix would not be at the next Council meeting.

Councilmember Moe commented that there are two recommendations from staff, as well as additional information provided by the members of the public. He stated that the original recommendation was

for two-story single-family homes to tie into the existing neighborhood, and the Planning Commission made the recommendation to consider any style of home. He also noted the 11th hour proposal submitted that perhaps the City Council step back and reconsider. He stated that the concept is simply an idea that was received prior to the worksession tonight and is not an official proposal. He stated that they can either stay the course, accept the recommendation of the Planning Commission to stay the course but remain open to any style of single-family home, or they could continue to vet the new information from the public. He stated that based on all the information, it appears the consensus is to pause and step back to reconsider the information.

Councilmember Tesdall stated that she would not want to return to a worksession as this has been heavily discussed and they are aware of the different concerns. She stated that they need to consider the end result and how they can get there.

Mayor Sabas stated that this is a major decision for everyone, and there is not a full Council present. He stated that up until this point, the Council has not been amenable to anything other than two-story single-family homes, but the Planning Commission recommended any style of single-family home. He stated that there is also more to the story, according to the information provided by Mr. Fair related to the sewer and fill. He stated that there is new information, and that is why he supports taking a step back. He recognized that Councilmember Moe will not be in attendance at the August 11th meeting and asked for a viable timeline to bring this back, or whether a special worksession should be set to discuss this item.

The City Administrator asked for the specific components that the Council would like staff to provide information on.

Mayor Sabas stated that up until Friday, he was not considering a mixed use of housing products but realizes that is a very likely possibility. He stated that additional information has been provided and received, and staff could be directed to work with the developer to see the best possible plan that could be considered.

The City Administrator stated that they should not be laser-focused on one plan and instead focus on components they would like to see, such as a variety of single-family homes, rather than a specific plan. She believed that staff has the information necessary to create language that could create more flexibility.

The Community Development Director commented that they are learning about availability of the Council, and it will be their challenge to determine a reasonable amount of time to have everyone back. He estimated a minimum of three weeks to make necessary revisions for discussion.

Mayor Sabas commented that they would then meet by the middle of August to discuss this in more detail.

Councilmember LaCroix stated that the City is being asked by the developer to develop guidelines that are economically feasible to make the project work. He stated that, to some extent, it would be upon the developer to create some proposals. He hoped that he had made his concerns clear and would like to see more work from the developer that incorporates everything that has been discussed. He stated that he would prefer for staff to work with the developer to find something that works for everyone.

Councilmember Moe stated that while he agrees, they have to consider what they need to take action on tonight. He asked the direction the Council would like to provide to staff.

Councilmember LaCroix commented that he would not support allowing any style home but could support a continuance. He recognized that he is not available for the next meeting but would be willing to schedule a special meeting.

Councilmember Tesdall commented that they can give all the direction they want, but it could still not be the right thing. She stated that perhaps the developer shows them what is financially viable, and they can continue to discuss that.

Mayor Sabas commented that the only action tonight is the continuance, and staff and the developer have heard all the comments tonight.

Motion by Mayor Sabas and seconded by Councilmember Tesdall to continue consideration of this item to be discussed on or before August 15, 2025, in a regular or worksession meeting. Voting in favor were Mayor Sabas, Councilmembers Tesdall, Moe, and LaCroix. Voting against: none. Motion carried.

First Reading of
Ordinance Amending
Chapter 38 – Offenses and
Miscellaneous Provisions,
Article IX – Fishing in
City Ponds, Sec. 38-304,
Purpose, Sec. 38-305,
Prohibited Conduct, Sec.
38-306, Enforcement and
Penalty, and Sec. 38-307,
Exceptions Regarding
Fishing at the Champlin
Trout Pond

The City Administrator stated that the management of the Trout Pond began with a City Council worksession on June 25, 2018, during which three management options were presented. The Council reached consensus to pursue a plan that involved the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) stocking the pond, with the City hosting special events. However, for the DNR to participate, the site needed at least 20 designated parking spaces and an ADA-compliant access route to the pond. In January 2019, the required parking and access improvements were included as a bid alternate in a separate construction project. Unfortunately, due to unexpectedly high bid prices, the City was unable to secure funding for these improvements. As a result, the City pivoted from the DNR-managed approach and decided to manage the fishery independently, focusing on supporting City-run special events. Funding for fish stocking has since come from revenue generated by the annual Frostbite 500 Trout Ice Fishing Contest, as well as private donations. To protect the stocked fishery, “No fishing allowed” signs have been installed along the perimeter of the pond. While signage has successfully deterred most unauthorized fishing, there have been occasional instances of noncompliance. Enforcement of the no-fishing policy is limited, as the pond is classified as a public water body since it is surrounded by public land. The proposed amendment would provide the Police Department with enforcement authority.

Councilmember Tesdall stated that residents in Ward 1 have stated that they have called the police to ask if fishing is allowed and have been told that fishing is okay at the pond; therefore, people are operating under the knowledge that they can fish there. She was not aware of many issues that have arisen from that activity. She recognized the original intent to keep the pond sacred for special events, but noted that there does not seem to be damage from people fishing from the shore.

Mayor Sabas commented that if it were to be public knowledge that fishing is allowed there, it would be overrun by people fishing regularly. He stated that the fish have to be brought into the pond, noting that people donate money to supply the pond with trout. He recognized that it had not been a large issue thus far, but if it were public knowledge, the pond would be overrun with fishing.

Councilmember Tesdall did not believe that people are catching the trout and just the native species, as the trout are deeper and cannot be accessed from the shore.

The City Engineer stated that there are native plantings around the buffer of the pond, which are intentional to provide habitat. She stated that there are not adequate docking or fishing platforms for the safety of fishermen, which are provided in other areas of the City. She stated that parking and ADA access are also not available at this location.

Mayor Sabas commented that he would hope that common sense prevails if a child were catching a sunfish.

Councilmember Tesdall asked what penalty would be imposed.

The City Attorney commented that it would be a misdemeanor if the Officer wrote a citation, similar to any other citation in the community.

Kim VanKrevelen, 504 French Lake Road, commented that she loves the amenity and that people can fish, but commented on the trash that she has noticed. She noted fishing line and hooks that she has noticed in her trees, and the damage that they can have to wildlife as well.

Mayor Sabas commented that he supports this action and encouraged law enforcement to use common sense when enforcing this.

Councilmember Moe commented that the Trout Pond is closed to public fishing currently, outside of special City events, and this amendment would provide the necessary enforcement.

Mayor Sabas commented that there are many other great fishing spots throughout the community.

Motion

Motion by Councilmember Moe and seconded by Councilmember LaCroix to approve first reading of the Ordinance amending Chapter 38 – Offenses and Miscellaneous Provisions, Article IX – Fishing in City Ponds, Sec. 38-304, Purpose, Sec. 38-305, Prohibited Conduct, Sec. 38-306, Enforcement and Penalty, and Sec. 38-307 Exceptions regarding fishing at the Champlin Trout Pond. Voting in favor were Mayor Sabas, Councilmembers Moe and LaCroix. Voting against: Councilmember Tesdall. Motion carried.

Waive First Reading,
Conduct Second Reading
and Adopt the Ordinance
Amendment and
Publication Summary of
Section 5 of Chapter 118
of the Champlin City
Code Regarding Cannabis
Signage

Ordinance No. 917

The City Planner stated that on December 9, 2024, the Champlin City Council adopted ordinances regulating adult-use cannabis businesses, codified within Chapters 30 and 126 of the City Code. These ordinances provide the framework for local regulation and zoning requirements in alignment with State law. Champlin has not yet received a registration application, but we have received multiple phone calls from prospective businesses. In preparation, staff reviewed potential impacts on signage and advertising related to cannabis and hemp-derived products. In a review of other Minnesota city ordinances, staff identified a common best practice to limit the visual promotion of cannabis through signage.

Councilmember Tesdall introduced the following ordinance, waiving the first reading, conducting the second reading, moving its adoption and approval of Publication Summary:

**An Ordinance Amendment of Section 5 of Chapter 118 of the Champlin City Code Regarding
Cannabis Signage**

The motion for the adoption of the ordinance was duly seconded by Councilmember Moe, and upon vote being taken thereon, the following voted in favor thereof: Mayor Sabas, Councilmembers Tesdall, Moe, and LaCroix, and the following voted against the same: none, whereupon said ordinance was passed this 14th day of July 2025.

Adjournment

The Champlin City Council adjourned the regular meeting at 8:26 p.m.

Attest:


Julie Tembreull, Executive Assistant/City Clerk



Ryan Sabas, Mayor

Councilmember Tesdall introduced the following resolution and moved its adoption:

**RESOLUTION NO. 2025-35
CITY OF CHAMPLIN
COUNTY OF HENNEPIN
STATE OF MINNESOTA**

**RESOLUTION TO AMEND JOINT POWERS AGREEMENT WITH NORTH METRO
MAYORS ASSOCIATION**

WHEREAS, the purpose of the Joint Powers Agreement is to establish an organization to promote transportation and economic development projects and to assist in conducting government functions effectively and efficiently in the member communities of the northern metropolitan area; and

WHEREAS, the City of Champlin is a member of the North Metro Mayors Association (NMMA); and

WHEREAS, the NMMA has determined that it is in the best interest of the public to amend the JPA to allow the City of Crystal as a member; and

WHEREAS, the City Council of the City of Champlin deems that it is in its best interest to approve such changes.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of Champlin, Minnesota to approve the second amended changes to the Joint Powers Agreement with the North Metro Mayors Association to allow membership of the City of Crystal.

The motion for the adoption of the resolution was duly seconded by Councilmember Moe, and upon vote being taken thereon, the following voted in favor thereof: Mayor Sabas, Councilmembers Tesdall, Moe, and LaCroix, and the following voted against the same: none, whereupon said resolution was passed this 14th day of July 2025.

Ryan Sabas

Ryan Sabas, Mayor

ATTEST:

Julie Tembreull

Julie Tembreull, Exec. Asst./City Clerk

Councilmember Tesdall introduced the following resolution and moved its adoption:

RESOLUTION NO. 2025-36
CITY OF CHAMPLIN
COUNTY OF HENNEPIN
STATE OF MINNESOTA

**RESOLUTION ADOPTING CITY OF CHAMPLIN DATA PRACTICES PROCEDURES
POLICY**

WHEREAS, the Minnesota Data Practices Act (Minnesota Statutes, Chapter 13) requires government entities to maintain a policy regarding dissemination of government data, and

WHEREAS, the City of Champlin Data Practices Procedures Policy is updated to meet the current requirements in Minnesota Statutes, and

WHEREAS, Minn. Stat. 13.05 subd. 5 requires the Responsible Authority (City Administrator) to establish procedures ensuring the appropriate access to not public data.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the City Council of the City of Champlin, Minnesota hereby adopts the City of Champlin Data Practices Procedures Policy.

The motion for the adoption of the resolution was duly seconded by Councilmember Moe, and upon vote being taken thereon, the following voted in favor thereof: Mayor Sabas, Councilmembers Tesdall, Moe, and LaCroix, and the following voted against the same: none, whereupon said resolution was passed this 14th day of July 2025.

Ryan Sabas

Ryan Sabas, Mayor

ATTEST:

Julie Tembreull

Julie Tembreull, Exec. Asst./City Clerk

Councilmember Moe introduced the following resolution and moved its adoption:

**RESOLUTION NO. 2025-37
CITY OF CHAMPLIN
COUNTY OF HENNEPIN
STATE OF MINNESOTA**

**RESOLUTION APPROVING PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS AND ORDER
ADVERTISEMENT FOR BIDS FOR THE CARTWAY CULVERT REPLACEMENT
PROJECT, IMPROVEMENT PROJECT NO. 22403**

WHEREAS, plans and specifications have been submitted for the Cartway Culvert Replacement Project, Improvement Project No. 22403 and

WHEREAS, the project area consists of culvert defined as a bridge where Elm Creek crossing Cartway Road.

WHEREAS, the Project will include a complete removal of the existing metal arch culvert and replacement with two box culverts in its current alignment.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Champlin City Council that:

1. The plans and specifications for the above-mentioned area are hereby approved.
2. The City Clerk shall prepare and cause to be placed on the City website and in Quest Construction Bulletin, an advertisement for bids upon the making of such improvement under such approved plans and specifications. The advertisement shall specify the work to be done and shall state the bids will be received by the Clerk until 10:00 a.m on August 18, 2025, at which time they will be opened electronically. Any bidder whose responsibility is questioned during consideration of the bid will be given an opportunity to address the Council on the issue of responsibility. No bids will be considered unless sealed and filed as set forth in the instructions to bidders in compliance unless with requirements of electronic bidding and accompanied by a cash deposit, cashier's check, bid bond, or certified check payable to the Clerk for 5% (five percent) of the amount of such bid.

The motion for the adoption of the resolution was duly seconded by Councilmember LaCroix, and upon vote being taken thereon, the following voted in favor thereof: Mayor Sabas, Councilmembers Tesdall, Moe, and LaCroix, and the following voted against the same: none, whereupon said resolution was passed this 14th day of July 2025.

Ryan Sabas

Ryan Sabas, Mayor

ATTEST:

Julie Tembreull

Julie Tembreull, Exec. Asst./City Clerk

Councilmember Tesdall introduced the following ordinance, waiving the first reading, conducting the second reading, and moving its adoption:

**ORDINANCE NO. 917
CITY OF CHAMPLIN
COUNTY OF HENNEPIN
STATE OF MINNESOTA**

**ORDINANCE AMENDMENT OF SECTION 5 OF CHAPTER 118 OF THE CHAMPLIN
CITY CODE REGARDING CANNABIS SIGNAGE**

Chapter 118 SIGNS

Sec. 118-5. General provisions applicable to all zoning districts.

- (a) A minimum of one address sign shall be required on each building in all districts. Such sign shall be of sufficient size to be legible from the nearest street.
- (b) No sign shall interfere with the ability of any driver or pedestrian to see any street or highway sign, traffic sign or signal, or crossroad or crosswalk.
- (c) All electrical signs shall be subject to the state electrical code and after approval, the electrical inspector shall affix a sticker with his signature and date of inspection.
- (d) No sign other than bench signs at public transit stops and governmental traffic safety or roadway information signs shall be erected within any public road right-of-way or upon any public easement.
- (e) No person shall park any vehicle or trailer on private property, on a public right-of-way or public property which has attached thereto or located thereon any sign for the basic purpose of directing people to a business or activity located on the same or nearby property or any other premises.
- (f) Buildings, premises or lots shall not be allowed to have pennants, pinwheels, stringers or other attention-attracting devices.
- (g) If a double-faced monument sign is constructed so that the faces are not constructed so as to be back to back, the total area of all sides added together shall not exceed the maximum allowable sign area for the district.
- (h) All signs shall be maintained in good condition and the areas around them shall be kept free from debris, rubbish, weeds and other growth.
- (I) Temporary noncommercial signs shall be allowed under the following conditions:
 - (1) If located entirely within the premises of that institution, the sign shall be set back no less than ten feet from the property line and shall not exceed 32 square feet in area. Such signs shall be allowed no more than 21 days prior to the event or function and must be removed within seven days after the event or function. Such signs may be illuminated in accordance with restrictions set forth in this section. If building-mounted, these signs shall be flat wall signs and shall not project above the roof line. If ground-mounted, the top shall be no more than six feet above ground level.

(2) If located off-premises, the sign shall be set back no less than ten feet from the property line and shall not exceed six square feet in area. Such signs shall be allowed no more than 48 hours prior to the event or function and must be removed 24 hours after the event or function. Such signs shall be not be illuminated and shall be no more than three feet above ground level. Written authorization of the property owner shall be required for all off-premises signs and no more than one such sign shall be erected on each property.

(j) Temporary signs identifying agricultural sales for products grown in the City of Champlin shall be permitted. All signs shall only be placed during the actual selling period of the advertised products and shall be located on private property.

(k) No sign shall be permitted to obstruct any window, door, fire escape, stairway or opening intended to provide ingress or egress for any building or structure.

(l) Signs shall not be attached to trees, fences, utility poles or other such permanent supports not specifically intended as sign structures.

(m) The following signs are prohibited in all zoning districts:

- (1) Billboards, except as expressly allowed in section 118-9, dynamic display off-premises signs.
- (2) Portable signs.
- (3) Motion signs, flashing signs and rotating signs.
- (4) Roof signs.
- (5) Inflatable signs.
- (6) Off-premises signs, except as expressly allowed in section 118-9, dynamic display off-premises signs.
- (7) Content classified as "obscene" as defined by Minn. Stats. § 617.241.
- (8) Signs displaying or depicting a cannabis flower, cannabis product, hemp edibles, or hemp derived consumer products, including business logos containing such depictions.

(n) State general election years. In a state general election year, all noncommercial signs of any size may be posted in any number from August 1 in a state general election year until ten days following the state general election. These signs shall be confined within private property.

(o) Electronic message signs are only permitted by conditional use permit in commercial or industrial districts or in residential districts occupied by a church or school, subject to the following standards:

- (1) No electronic message sign may be erected that, by reason of position, shape, movement or color, interferes with the proper functioning of a traffic sign, signal or which otherwise constitutes a traffic hazard;
- (2) Electronic message signs must have minimum display duration of ten seconds. Such displays shall contain static messages only, changed only through dissolve or fade transitions, or with the use of other subtle transitions that do not have the appearance of moving text or images;
- (3) All signs shall have installed ambient light monitors and shall at all times allow such monitors to automatically adjust the brightness level of the electronic sign based on ambient light conditions;

- (4) Electronic message signs shall not exceed 3,500 Nits (candelas per square meter) between the hours of civil sunrise and civil sunset and shall not exceed 500 Nits (candelas per square meter) between the hours of civil sunset and civil sunrise as measured from the sign's face;
- (5) The lamp wattage and luminance level in Nits (candelas per square meter) shall be provided at the time of permit application. Electronic message sign permit applications must also include a certification from the owner or operator of the sign stating that the sign shall at all times be operated in accordance with city codes and that the owner or operator shall provide proof of such conformance upon request of the city;
- (6) The leading edge of the electronic message sign must be a minimum distance of 100 feet from any residential district boundary. When located within 250 feet of residentially zoned property, any part of an electronic message sign must be oriented so that no portion of the sign face is visible from an existing or permitted principal structure on that property;
- (7) Electronic message signs shall not exceed 40 percent of the allowable sign area for a given wall sign or freestanding sign;
- (8) Electronic message signs on church or school sites shall only be illuminated from 7:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m.;
- (9) Electronic message signs must be placed below a minimum of 20 square feet of permanent nonelectronic message sign(s) on freestanding signs. Electronic gas price signs may be located alongside permanent nonelectronic message signs on freestanding signs; and
- (10) No more than one electronic message sign may be permitted per property, except that gas/convenience uses may be allowed one electronic gas price sign in addition to one electronic message center sign.

(p) Human signs are permitted only in commercial zoning districts or property guided for commercial land use in the comprehensive plan under the following provisions:

- (1) Not permitted in or over the public right-of-way or off-premises.
- (2) Spinning, waving, tossing, throwing or juggling of the sign is prohibited.
- (3) The sign shall be no greater than ten square feet in area.
- (4) The human sign shall be at ground level.
- (5) Human signs require a temporary sign permit. Individual businesses are limited to 30 days per calendar year to display a human sign. Not-for-profit organizations shall be exempt from temporary sign permit fees.

Additions: Add

Deletions: Delete

This ordinance shall become effective following its passage and publication as required by law.

The motion for the adoption of the ordinance was duly seconded by Councilmember Moe, and upon vote being taken thereon, the following voted in favor thereof: Mayor Sabas, Councilmembers Tesdall, Moe, and LaCroix, and the following voted against the same: none, whereupon said ordinance was passed this 14th day of July 2025.

Ryan Sabas

Ryan Sabas, Mayor

ATTEST:

Julie Tembreull

Julie Tembreull, Exec. Asst./City Clerk

PUBLICATION SUMMARY OF ORDINANCE NO. 917AMENDING SECTION 5 OF CHAPTER
118 OF THE CHAMPLIN CITY CODE REGARDING CANNABIS SIGNAGE

Section 5 of Chapter 118 - Signs of the Champlin City Code is hereby amended. The amendment prohibits signs displaying or depicting a cannabis flower, cannabis product, hemp edibles, or hemp derived consumer products, including business logos containing such depictions. The full ordinance shall be available at the Champlin City Hall during business hours or on the City's website.

First Reading: July 14, 2025
Second Reading: July 14, 2025
Adoption: July 14, 2025