

**MINUTES OF STUDY SESSION OF THE PRINCETON CITY COUNCIL
HELD ON MARCH 6, 2008, AT 4:30 P.M. IN THE CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBERS**

Mayor Jeremy Riddle called the meeting to order. Council members present were Dick Dobson, Paul Whitcomb, Lee Steinbrecher, and Victoria Hallin. Staff present was Mark Karnowski, Steve Jackson, Jay Blake, and Ann Bien. Also present were City Engineers Mike Nielson and Todd Hubmer (WSB).

WATER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN DISCUSSION

Hubmer started with a powerpoint presentation. He began by explaining a Water Resource Management Plan (WRMP) provides storm water management guidelines, goals, and policies; identifies problem areas and solutions; provides an implementation road map; and provides a funding source for the implementation. He reviewed the contents of the plan and described each section.

Regarding Section 5, Establishment of Goals and Policies, Regulation No. 4, he explained the City's existing policy is the design of the local storm sewer and drainage system must be based on a 5-year storm event for residential development or redevelopment and a 10-year storm event for commercial/industrial development or redevelopment. He stated another option which is being used as a standard in surrounding communities is the design of the local storm sewer and drainage system must be based on a 10-year storm event. The design of the trunk storm sewer and drainage system must be based on the critical 100 year event. He stated that although this may result in a 15% increase of the project, it could save/delay immensely if/when reconstruction is necessary. Karnowski asked and Nielson answered county and state aid roads are on a 10 year storm event and it is the standard being used in surrounding communities.

IT WAS THE CONSENSUS OF THE COUNCIL TO USE THE 10 YEAR STORM EVENT DESIGN.

Regarding Regulation 8, Hubmer stated the City's current ordinance requires the basement floor elevation must be 1 foot above the 100 year high water level. He stated another option would be the requirement that the basement floor elevation will be 2 feet above the elevation of any known historic high groundwater elevations for the area and 2 feet above the critical 100 year high surface water elevation in the area. This policy would not apply to walkouts as the walkout is considered the low building. He suggested specific language for underground ductwork and plumbing.

IT WAS THE CONSENSUS OF THE COUNCIL TO REQUIRE THE BASEMENT FLOOR ELEVATION BE 2 FEET ABOVE THE ELEVATION OF ANY KNOWN HISTORIC HIGH GROUNDWATER ELEVATIONS FOR THE AREA AND 2 FEET ABOVE THE CRITICAL 100 YEAR HIGH SURFACE WATER ELEVATION IN THE AREA.

Regulations 18 and 19 require for new development projects an average 25 foot upland buffer from the delineated wetland boundary or Ordinary High Water (OHW) level for wetlands, lakes, and streams and a 15 foot buffer around created storm ponds to provide additional water quality protection, wildlife habitat, and erosion prevention. A 30 foot principle structure setback from all buffers will also be required. Nielson stated this is also a phosphorus reduction measure which costs very little.

Karnowski suggested surveys be required for new homes, indicating easements, setbacks, etc. Hubmer added builders do not always place homes at the elevations the developer proposed. A survey would also show elevations. Nielson stated most communities now require a survey with

March 6, 2008

Page 2

a grading plan and topos. Hubmer suggested conservation easements also be obtained, as well as utility and drainage.

Regulation No. 24 addresses erosion and sediment control. Hubmer asked if the requirements should stay the same as now or should smaller disturbances should trigger attention. Blake suggested it be kept the same since we have scenic and wetland ordinances. Hubmer will look at the City's current ordinances.

Hubmer stated Section VI addresses the Implementation plan. This includes capital projects, programs, and studies.

Section VII addresses financial considerations. Hubmer stated a storm water utility and trunk fee is developed with the water resource management plan. The utility pays for maintaining the existing systems (current landowners pay quarterly) and the trunk fees pays for providing storm sewer to a new development (developers pay with development). The storm water utility cannot be used to help a developer. Hubmer recommend fees be reviewed annually or bi-annually to see that they are meeting the costs.

Hubmer stated the City needs \$164,000 annual for the storm water utility. To meet this need, the base rate for the R-1 zoning district is proposed to be \$5.67/qtr. The commercial rate per acre is being proposed at \$40.80. The residential equivalency factor is used as the multiplier to base rate based on impervious surface. He stated an appeal process is included in the plan. Adjustments can be approved administratively and fees can be adjusted when improvements are made.

The Council compared utility rates for various cities. Steinbrecher stated he does not think the commercial rate should be pushed so high it is unreasonable; and thinks the R-1 rate is reasonable compared to metro cities. Hallin agreed.

Hubmer then went on to explain methods and assumptions to determining storm water trunk and ponding fees. He recommended the City review these fees more often

Steinbrecher asked what happens if a developer does not want to place a pond where it is designated, is map a legal document? Hubmer explained this is a guidance to justifying the level of fees the City is charging and determining a logical location for ponds. As development occurs, the City does not have control over the number of lots or location of ponds; some developers may need fill and will want to dig larger ponds. He stated easements will be needed to get water from upstream developments

Hubmer stated the next steps are storm water model final QA/QC; complete trunk fee; and Council adopts WRMP, utility fee, and trunk fee. Nielson suggested going to the Chamber of Commerce and visionary meetings to get out this information and suggested the fees be in place within 60-90 days.

LIONS CLUB GAMBLING LICENSE

STEINBRECHER MOVED TO APPROVE THE APPLICATION FOR EXEMPT PERMIT FOR THE PRINCETON LIONS CLUB TO HOLD BINGO AND A RAFFLE AT THE PARTY HOUSE ON MARCH 29, 2008. DOBSON SECONDED THE MOTION. ON THE VOTE: AYES - 5; NAYS - 0. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

March 6, 2008
Page 3

There being no further business, STEINBRECHER MOVED TO ADJOURN AT 6:05 P.M. DOBSON SECONDED THE MOTION. ON THE VOTE: AYES - 5; NAYS - 0. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully Submitted,

Ann Bien, Deputy City Clerk

ATTEST:

Jeremy Riddle, Mayor