



**City of Jordan  
Park and Recreation Commission  
September 16, 2010  
Special Meeting**

**Members Present:** Chair Jerry Langsweirdt, Vice Chair Donna Breeggemann, Thom Boncher, John Glynn, Margaret Knutson, Pete Ewals.

**Staff Present:** Senior Planner, Joe Janish

**Others Present:** None.

**1.0 Call to Order.**

*Chair Langsweirdt called the Park and Recreation Commission to order at 6:35pm.*

**2.0 Tax Forfeit Property (East Street Lot).**

Senior Planner Janish indicated that after the last discussion by the Park and Recreation Commission it was indicated by Scott County that the tax forfeited lot would not be able to be publicly conveyed for the purpose of natural preservation.

Janish indicated staff spoke with Scott County and the State of Minnesota about the tax forfeiture process. The following options are available to the City of Jordan in regards to this property:

- The City of Jordan could request the property to be publicly conveyed to the City if the requirements of state law are met. This would mean the proposed use by the city would have to meet the definition of “public use.” Council members questioned what was defined as public use, and the law governing tax forfeited property has recently been amended to provide a definition which is:
  - (1) a road, or right-of-way for a road;
  - (2) a park that is both available to, and accessible by, the public that contains amenities such as campgrounds, playgrounds, athletic fields, trails, or shelters;
  - (3) trails for walking, bicycling, snowmobiling, or other recreational purposes, along with a reasonable amount of surrounding land maintained in its natural state;
  - (4) transit facilities for buses, light rail transit, commuter rail or passenger rail, including transit ways, park-and-ride lots, transit stations, maintenance and garage facilities, and other facilities related to a public transit system;
  - (5) public beaches or boat launches;

(6) public parking;

(7) civic recreation or conference facilities; and

(8) public service facilities such as fire halls, police stations, lift stations, water towers, sanitation facilities, water treatment facilities, and administrative offices.

*(H.F. No. 3729, 4th Engrossment - 86th Legislative Session (2009-2010)  
[H3729-4] Lines 136.18 – 136.35)*

- The City could purchase the property for \$5,000 (plus addition fees) (Scott County has determined this as the value of the property and would include both lots). Please note that staff's intentions are to ask the City Council to consider placing a \$5,602 assessment on the property. This assessment is related to the East Street reconstruction project that occurred a few years ago. Bond debt had been issued for the construction and the assessment would go to pay the bond payments.
- The City could ask that the property is sold to the public. According to Scott County, if the property is put up for sale everyone would be available to purchase the property and the neighboring property is **not** giving a first right to purchase. Scott County staff did indicate that the abutting property owners would receive notification of the sale.
- The City could ask that the property not be sold at this time, this could potentially allow for the City of Jordan to determine a use of the property. It is my understanding of staff that the City would be responsible for the cost of maintenance during the six month period.

Janish further explained Scott County has set a date of November 23, at 9:30 a.m. to potentially sell the property if the City of Jordan is not interested in acquiring the property.

Janish also noted it was his understanding staff would ask the City Council to place a \$5,602 assessment on the property which is the assessment that was placed on the lots when the East Street Reconstruction project was completed.

A question that was also raised by the Council is who determines if the proposed use meets the intent of the law. I have been informed by a representative from the State Department Taxation Department that the Scott County Board has the responsibility to determine if the City of Jordan's proposal meets the intent of the law. The decision made by the county is also reviewed by the State Taxation Department to be certain that the proposal is appropriate.

Janish noted a neighboring property owner was not able to attend tonight's meeting but provided a letter indicating that if the property was placed for sale they would be interested in submitting a bid for the property.

Members of the Park and Recreation Commission discussed the options of potentially placing a trail on the property which could ultimately tie into the right-of-way of Maple Lane. The Commission also noted it would be appropriate to invite neighboring property owners to potentially discuss park possibilities on the lot.

*Motion Breeggemann seconded by Boncher to recommend to the City Council to ask Scott County to wait six months prior to the sale of the property in order to attempt to develop a plan for the property as it may relate to the city park system. Motion approved unanimously.*

Direction was also provided to have the City Engineer take a look at potentially having some type of trail on the property and connecting it to the Maple Lane right-of-way.

### **3.0 Adjournment.**

*Motion Knutson, seconded by Breeggemann, to adjourn the Park and Recreation Commission meeting at 7:15 p.m. Motion unanimously approved.*

Respectfully Submitted,

Joe Janish  
Senior Planner