

**MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING OF THE PRINCETON CITY COUNCIL HELD ON  
MAY 22, 2014 7:00 P.M. IN THE CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBERS**

\*\*\*\*\*

Mayor Paul Whitcomb called the meeting to order and led the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag. Council members present were, Thom Walker, Dick Dobson, and Victoria Hallin. Staff present, Administrator Mark Karnowski, Finance Director Steve Jackson, Police Sergeant Joe Backlund, Community Development Director Carie Fuhrman, Clerk Shawna Jenkins and Attorney Dick Schieffer. Absent was Jules Zimmer

**AGENDA ADDITIONS/DELETIONS**

None

**CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES**

- A. Regular Meeting Minutes of May 8, 2014

HALLIN MOVED TO APPROVE THE REGULAR MEETING MINUTES OF MAY 8, 2014. WALKER SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

**CONSENT AGENDA**

**A. Permits and Licenses**

- 1. Fireworks permit for TNT Fireworks – Walmart parking lot
- 2. Fireworks permit for Coborn's
- 3. Transient Merchant License for Gerald B Johnson
- 4. Food Vendor permit for Uncle Gerry's cotton candy
- 5. Fireworks permit for Shopko

**B. Personnel**

**1. Liquor Store**

- a. Approval to hire Marjorie Chase

**2. Public Works part time employees**

- a. Clarence Reiman increase from \$9.75 hour to \$10.00 hour
- b. Robert Goodell increase from \$9.50 hour to \$9.75 hour
- c. Jake Green increase from \$9.00 hour to \$10.00 hour
- d. Chase Lindenfelser from \$9.00 hour to \$10.00 hour

**3. Splash Park part time employees**

- a. Ashley Schramel increase from \$7.25 hour to \$7.75 hour
- b. Austin Gerth increase from \$7.75 hour to \$8.00 hour
- c. Linda Alexander increase from \$7.75 hour to \$8.00 hour
- d. Approval to hire Tom Jensen at \$7.25 hour
- e. Approval to hire Bailey Bartz at \$7.25 hour

**C. Donations / Designations**

- a. Resolution 14-21, approve donation for Fireworks

WALKER MOVED TO APPROVE THE CONSENT AGENDA. HALLIN SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

**OPEN FORUM**

**PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**PRESENTATION** – Lori Lestina with Faith in Action, "Act on Alzheimer's"

Lestina stated that the Act On Alzheimer's started in MN in 2011 when a pilot project was created to help prepare communities for the aging population. In addition to alzheimer's, there are many additional types of dementia and memory loss. The state came up with a plan to address this, and there are some grant opportunities available. The convening phase

is the first and has begun. There is another meeting next week at Sterling Point, who have been wonderful hosts and a partner in this process. The next phase is pulling the leaders together and working on an assessment for the area.

Fuhrman said she is very busy, but has agreed to assist however she can. However, Lestina is also looking for a letter of support from the council. The final phase is presenting the plan to the community and starting to take action.

Lestina said they are expecting the number of people affected by Dementia and Memory Loss in this community to double in the years to come as the population ages.

Hallin spoke about the previous meeting she attended and said it was very informative. She recommended others attend the meeting on Tuesday the 27<sup>th</sup>.

Whitcomb said he is glad they are doing this, and suggested holding some of these meetings later in the afternoon, so more people can attend. Lestina said there are some coming up this summer and fall that will likely be later in the afternoon and evening.

DOBSON MOVED TO APPROVE STAFF DRAFT A LETTER OF SUPPORT FOR ACT ON ALZHEIMER'S. HALLIN SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

#### **REPORTS OF OFFICERS, BOARDS, AND COMMITTEES**

- A. EDA Board meeting of April 17, 2014
- B. 4R Board meeting of April 23, 2014
- C. PAVC Board meeting of April 28, 2014
- D. Fire Board meeting of May 6, 2014

#### **PETITIONS, REQUESTS, AND COMMUNICATIONS**

- A. Wine and Spirits Grant request from the American Legion Post 216

Karnowski reported there is a grant request from the American Legion Post 216 for Fourth of July Fireworks.

DOBSON MOVED TO APPROVE THE WINE AND SPIRITS GRANT REQUEST FROM THE AMERICAN LEGION POST 216 FOR \$1,000. HALLIN SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

- B. Wine and Spirits Grant request from Ruff Start Rescue

Karnowski reported that Ruff Start Rescue is having an online auction to raise funds for their animal rescue.

Hallin said the rescue located in the City. Karnowski said they do have a store front here in the City, but they do not advertise as such as it is not staffed regularly. Walker said they do have a large presence in the City.

WALKER MOVED TO APPROVE THE WINE AND SPIRITS GRANT REQUEST FROM RUFF START RESCUE GIFT CARDS IN THE AMOUNT OF \$250.00. DOBSON SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

## **ORDINANCES AND RESOLUTIONS**

### A. Resolution 14-22, purchase of tax forfeited parcel (former gas station)

Fuhrman reported that the building located at 903 9<sup>th</sup> Ave North (PID #24-040-1930) is dilapidated, unfit for habitation, unsafe, as well as full of debris on the inside and graffiti on the exterior. At one point, the property was gutted and slated for remodeling, which never occurred. It contains 0.45 acres. The property was formerly used as a gas station, but has not been occupied since the early or mid-1980s and has not been maintained in years (see map and photos attached to the resolution).

The EDA utilized NSP funding to investigate the environmental issues on the property. The Phase II revealed asbestos and lead paint, a well, and a potential onsite sewage disposal system, as well as several Volatile Organic Compounds in the soil gas samples. However, the levels of VOCs were not high enough to be reportable. Recommendations for moving forward include: sealing the well, abandoning the septic system, additional investigation underneath the concrete slab, a Construction Contingency Plan, as well as a technician to monitor the soils during demolition and redevelopment. NSP funding will be utilized for this work. There are other funds available through the State for redevelopment of these types of properties as well.

The Princeton Economic Development Authority (EDA) utilized NSP funding to purchase the vacated and dilapidated house directly to the south of this site (former Bergstrom house). The plan is to utilize NSP funding to demolish that house and this building at the same time, clean up this site, and prepare both sites for redevelopment. There are two potential options for redevelopment of this site, along with the site to the south: A) Donate to Habitat for Humanity for a single family home and yard; or B) Redevelop into a townhome or multi-family residential home site. Further investigation into buildable area still needs to occur.

The feeling of the EDA and staff is that the market has had years to clean up this property, or redevelop it, but it has not happened. The EDA is very interested in cleaning up this property and removing the current blighted condition for the public good of the neighborhood and entire community. The property is tax-forfeited. The County Board has agreed to sell the property to the City for \$1. In order to acquire it, a Resolution in support of the City's acquisition is in order.

HALLIN MOVED TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 14-22 APPROVING THE ACQUISITION OF TAX FORFEITED PROPERTY (PID # 24-040-1930). WALKER SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

## **UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

### A. Sealcoating bids

Karnowski reported that the City only received one bid for Sealcoating this year. Gerold stated he did call the company that the City used last year and the quote we received from Caldwell Asphalt was a good price.

HALLIN MOVED TO AWARD THE 2014 SEALCOATING TO CALDWELL ASPHALT FOR SEALCOATING AT A PRICE OF \$1.10 PER SQUARE YARD. WALKER SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

## B. Sign Violation Update

Karnowski reported that the zoning violation involving a sign being erected without a valid building permit has been settled in court. Attorney Damien Toven has prepared this memo outlining the events leading up to the citation and a synopsis of the results of the court case:

RE: State of Minnesota vs. Timothy Jay Siercks  
Court File: 48-CR-14-391  
My File: 11625-14-1371

To all interested parties:

I am aware that the above-referenced matter has garnered a significant amount of attention in the public. During the pendency of the criminal proceedings, I refrained from commenting on the matter so as to not affect the criminal proceedings. As the criminal proceedings have now been resolved, it is now acceptable to provide those who wish to know (1) the factual background of this case; (2) the specific terms of the plea agreement reached in this case; and (3) the reasoning for both initiating the criminal charges against Mr. Siercks, as well as the reasoning for entering into the ultimate plea agreement.

### **BACKGROUND**

In or around August of 2013, Mr. Siercks, owner of Minuteman Press, entered into an agreement with Christine Stuck, owner of Paws up 4 you, to install certain signage on her business. Shortly thereafter, Mr. Siercks met with Carie Fuhrman, Community Development Coordinator for the City of Princeton, with a sketch of the signage he wished to install on the Paws up 4 You business. Ms. Fuhrman informed Mr. Siercks that the signage he wished to install would not be permitted as it was not allowed under the City's signage ordinance.

Paragraph 5 of the "Intent and Purpose" portion of the City's zoning ordinance clearly states:

**"This zoning ordinance is intended to be exclusive in nature. In other words, the uses, provisions and standards that are listed herein are deemed as being the complete delineation of the allowed uses, provisions and standards. Any use, provision or standard not specifically listed or noted as permitted herein is deemed unacceptable and is not allowed unless reviewed and approved by the Planning Commission."** (emphasis added).

As the proposed signage was not specifically identified as allowed under the ordinance, it was specifically not allowed.

It is important to note that during the time period in question, Mr. Siercks was a member of the City of Princeton's Planning Commission. The Planning Commission is the governmental entity that is charged with oversight of land use and zoning issues for the City of Princeton. Also, during the time period in question, there were ongoing discussions within the Planning Commission to make changes to the City's signage ordinance; one component of this discussion revolved around changing the existing ordinance to allow the type of signage Mr. Siercks was seeking to install on Paws up 4 you.

This means that Mr. Siercks has actual knowledge that the signage he intended to install on Paws up 4 you was NOT permitted at that time. It also means that Mr. Siercks was

well versed in the requirements for seeking and obtaining the requisite permits to construct signage.

On October 14, 2013, Mr. Siercks submitted an application for a permit to construct the signage in question on the Paws up 4 You business.

On October 28, 2013, City staff sent Mr. Siercks a letter denying his request for a permit to construct the signage, again reiterating the fact that the proposed signage was not allowed under the City's existing signage ordinance.

On or about December 27, 2013, Mr. Siercks constructed the signage on the Paws up 4 You business. The signage he constructed was of the type not permitted by the City's signage ordinance and he constructed the signage without the required permit.

On January 7, 2014, City staff sent Mr. Siercks a letter informing him he had constructed the signage in violation of the city's ordinance and directed he remove the signage within 7 days. Christine Stuck was copied on this letter. Apparently, this was the first time Ms. Stuck had been made aware that the signage installed by Mr. Siercks was not permitted and done in violation of the City's ordinance.

On January 9, 2014, Mr. Siercks submitted another application for a permit governing the signage he had already constructed on the Paws up 4 You business.

On January 21, 2014 City staff sent Mr. Siercks another denial letter again stating the signage constructed was not permitted under the existing ordinance.

On January 23, 2014, Ms. Stuck appeared at the City Council meeting (with Mr. Siercks in the audience) and requested the City staff decision to deny the permit be reversed, and that the signage be allowed to remain. The Princeton City Council denied this request and explicitly directed the signage be removed until such time as the ordinance was amended to allow such signage and a permit allowing the signage was obtained.

On January 28, 2014, at approximate 4:01 p.m. Ms. Stuck sent an email to Mr. Siercks instructing him to remove the signs from the Paws up 4 You business by February 3, 2014. Mr. Siercks responded to Ms. Stuck at approximately 4:15 p.m. that same day, stating "I am requesting Princeton City Council Action against the decision of the permit denial. When we have a decision from that meeting we will then take the appropriate action." This response, despite having the issued dealt with by the City council the week prior.

Section 11 (Enforcement) of the City's ordinance states:

"It shall be unlawful for any person, firm or corporation to erect, alter repair, move equip, or maintain any sign or sign structure or cause to permit the same to be done in violation of any of the provisions of this chapter. **Any person who violates any provision of this chapter shall be guilty of a misdemeanor**, except those violations specifically subject to administrative fines under this ordinance. Each day that a violation is permitted to exist constitutes a separate offense." (emphasis added).

Consequently, the matter was referred to the Princeton Police Department for investigation on January 29, 2014. Princeton Police Chief Brian Payne conducted the investigation. The investigative material was referred to my office for review. On or about March 5, 2014, a criminal complaint was filed with Mille Lacs County District Court charging Mr.

Siercks with two misdemeanor counts for violating the City's ordinance. Count one related to constructing signage not allowed under the City's ordinance; count two related to constructing signage without the required permit. The maximum penalty for each offense, if convicted, is up to 90 days in jail and/or a fine of up to \$1,000.00. A Mille Lacs County District Court Judge reviewed the allegations in the complaint as to the two counts and determined that probable cause did exist to support the criminal charges.

Mr. Siercks retained counsel for representation in this matter. The criminal matter proceeded in the normal course with the first actual hearing having occurred at 11:00 a.m. on Monday, May 12, 2014 before the Honorable Steven A. Anderson at the Mille Lacs County Justice Center located at 225 6<sup>th</sup> Ave. SE, Milaca, MN 56353. At that time, a plea agreement was reached and the terms of which were placed on the record and adopted and approved by the Court. The terms of the agreement serve the dual purpose of correcting past behavior of the defendant while also discouraging similar conduct in the future.

#### **THE PLEA AGREEMENT**

Mr. Siercks was afforded the benefit of a Continuance for Dismissal for a period of 1 year, pursuant to Minnesota Statue Section 609.132. Assuming Mr. Siercks successfully complies with all of the terms outlined on the record, my office will administratively dismiss the matter on May 12, 2015. The most significant benefit to Mr. Siercks in proceeding in this manner is that if he is ultimately successful in complying with all of the terms the Court set forth, the matter will be dismissed without any criminal conviction having ever being entered, thus allowing Mr. Siercks the ability to maintain a "clean record" without this matter having a negative effect on him in the future.

The terms of the agreement placed on the record are as follows:

Mr. Siercks can have no same or similar violations of the City's ordinances for the next 12 months.

Mr. Siercks must pay \$250.00 in costs.

Mr. Siercks must (1) remove the signs he constructed on Paws up 4 You no later than 5:00 p.m. on May 26, 2014 or (2) have possession of a permit granted by the City of Princeton authorizing and permitting the signage in question to remain.

In addition to the above, there are two other aspects of the agreement that were placed on the record at this hearing.

First, Mr. Siercks admitted to the allegations contained in the probable cause portion of the complaint that, if proven at trial, would result in a conviction for constructing the signage in question and doing so without he required permit.

Second, Mr. Siercks explicitly waived any rights to raise certain "affirmative defenses" should this matter return to Court for further proceedings if Mr. Siercks should violate the terms of the continuance for dismissal; these include the following:

1. Selective prosecution. Mr. Siercks alleged that he was being singled out for prosecution and that many others have engaged in the same behavior without facing prosecution.

This defense has no merit. The totality of Mr. Siercks' conduct is unique to himself, and no information has been provided to identify others who have engaged in similar con-

duct. He has been advised that if he is truly of the belief that there are others who have engaged in similar behavior, he should report these infractions to City staff for further action.

2. Inappropriate party. Mr. Siercks alleged that he could not be prosecuted for his conduct because once he installed the signage on the Paws up 4 You business, they became the property of Ms. Stuck, the owner thereof. Furthermore, the assertion was made that because the City of Princeton sold the property in question to Ms. Stuck when she opened her business, that the City was somehow responsible for allowing the continued signage. This was never fully articulated by defense counsel, but nevertheless, the issue was raised.

This defense has no merit. The facts clearly show that Ms. Stuck did no wrong. She hired a contractor to do a job, and relied on that person's experience and representations that the work was being done in a lawful manner. When Ms. Stuck went so far as to instruct Mr. Siercks to remove the signage, he did not do so. Under these circumstances it would not be appropriate to hold Ms. Stuck responsible for the actions of Mr. Siercks.

3. Reliance on counsel. Apparently, Mr. Siercks had an attorney providing him legal advice during the timeframe wherein we was applying for permits, constructing the signage and weeks thereafter. Mr. Siercks may have attempted to argue that he cannot be prosecuted for his actions because he engaged in the conduct because his attorney said it was OK. Those communications are protected by the attorney/client privilege and I have no specific information regarding these alleged communications.

Under these facts, this defense has no merit. Regardless, the possibility that Mr. Siercks can make this argument in the future has been eliminated.

4. Subjectivity of the ordinance. Mr. Siercks may have attempted to argue that the signs he constructed were either (1) not excluded by the ordinance as it existed, or (2) that no permit was required under the ordinance as it existed, as defenses.

Under these facts, this defense has no merit. Regardless, the possibility that Mr. Siercks can make this argument in the future has been eliminated.

Neither Mr. Siercks nor his attorney should or can be faulted for raising these issues during the criminal proceedings. Mr. Siercks had the presumption of innocence and had every right to avail himself of every defense and tactic available. The State had the burden of proving guilt; Mr. Siercks had no obligation to prove his innocence.

#### **COMMENCEMENT AND RESOLUTION OF THE CRIMINAL PROCEEDINGS**

One may question why criminal proceedings were initiated in the first place, and why was this particular plea agreement reached. To answer these questions I must articulate the unique nature of my role as City Attorney, and specifically as my role as a criminal prosecutor on behalf of the State of Minnesota. In my role as a criminal prosecutor, I am held to a higher standard than most other attorneys and it is a responsibility I take very seriously and have done so for over a decade.

As stated by our Supreme Court, "[J]ustice is a process, not simply a result." State v. Lefthand, 488 N.W.2d 799, 802 (Minn.1992). This process requires the entire "criminal justice system, including judges, prosecutors, and defense lawyers" to be "responsible

for the fair administration of justice.” State v. Windish, 590 N.W.2d 311, 319 (Minn. 1999). The prosecutor’s obligation as “a minister of justice . . . is to guard the rights of the accused as well as to enforce the rights of the public.” State v. Ramey, 721 N.W.2d 294, 300 (Minn. 2006) (quoting State v. Penkaty, 708 N.W.2d 185, 196 (Minn. 2006)). As the Supreme Court has explained, a government lawyer “is the representative not of an ordinary party to a controversy, but of a sovereignty whose obligation to govern impartially is as compelling as its obligation to govern at all; and whose interest, therefore, in a criminal prosecution is not that it shall win a case, but that justice shall be done.” Berger v. United States, 295 U.S. 78, 88, 55 S.Ct. 629, 79 L.Ed. 1314 (1935). In other words, “[t]he duty of a prosecutor is to seek justice, not merely to convict.” Ramey, 721 N.W.2d at 300.

The reason criminal proceedings were initiated is fairly straight forward; Mr. Siercks left no other alternative.

Mr. Siercks was aware in the summer and fall of 2013 what was and was not permitted by the City’s ordinance at that time.

Mr. Siercks approached City staff with information regarding the signage he wanted to construct, and he was informed the signage would not be permitted because it was not approved under the ordinance at that time.

On October 14, 2013, Mr. Siercks applied for a permit to construct the signage and his application was denied with a letter on October 28, 2013 stating the signage was not approved under the ordinance at that time.

On December 27, 2013, Mr. Siercks constructed the signage in question even though he had been denied the permit.

On January 7, 2014, City staff sent Mr. Siercks a letter instructing him to remove the signage. He did not do so.

On January 9, 2014, Mr. Siercks applied for yet another permit for the signage and this application was yet again denied. He did not remove the signage.

On January 23, 2014 the issue was heard by the Princeton City Council and yet again the signage was ordered removed. He did not do so.

On January 28, 2014, Ms. Stuck, the owner of Paws up 4 you instructed Mr. Siercks to remove the signage. He did not do so.

In the end, the question was simple. Do we enforce the law or do we not enforce the law. The answer both simple and mandated; we enforce the law. It may be true that discussions were taking place within the Planning Commission regarding changing the City’s ordinance to allow the type of signage Mr. Siercks constructed, but that was not the law at the time. We must all conform our actions to laws as they exist at the time, not how we believe the law may exist in the future.

As to why the plea agreement was reached, the answer to that is likewise simple; it is what is “just”.

While it is true that, if convicted, Mr. Siercks could have faced up to 90 days in jail and a fine up to \$1,000.00, it does not mean that is what he should have been sentenced to.

The purpose of the criminal proceeding was to bring Mr. Siercks' behavior into compliance with the law, and ensure similar conduct does not occur in the future. But, a criminal conviction can carry a lifetime of consequences. Based upon the facts of this case, I felt it appropriate to give Mr. Siercks an opportunity to avoid these consequences.

Mr. Siercks has taken responsibility for his actions. He has suffered a consequence for his actions; he is bringing his actions into compliance with the law and he will be required to continue to act in accordance with the law.

He has every hope and expectation that Mr. Siercks will be successful and that this matter will be dismissed at the end of 1 year, and that he will be able to put this matter behind him.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

### A. Sign Retro-reflectivity maintenance policy

Karnowski reported the City is required to have a sign retro-reflective policy in place. The following is the policy that staff recommends the Council adopt.

#### **1. INTRODUCTION**

The Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) published by the US Department of Transportation (FHWA), set standards for basic principles of traffic signs to promote safety on public roads and establishes uniform standards.

Recently adopted language requires all agencies that maintain roadways open to public travel to adopt a sign maintenance program to maintain traffic sign retroreflectivity at or above specific levels. "Retroreflectivity" describes how light is reflected from a surface and returned to its original source.

Improvements to nighttime visibility of traffic signs will help drivers better navigate roads at night and thus promote safety and mobility. Improvements in sign visibility will also help older drivers whose visual capabilities may be declining.

The MN MUTCD requires a city to establish an assessment or management method that is designed to meet federal standards. The assessment or management method must be established by January, 2015.

Retroreflective properties of all sign sheeting materials degrade over time making signs progressively less visible at night. Environmental conditions can cause a loss of Retroreflective performance as well as damage due to vandalism, thus, losing their effectiveness in communicating regulatory, warning and guidance messages, especially at night. To maintain nighttime effectiveness, signs must be replaced before they reach the end of their useful life.

As traffic signage covered by this policy becomes difficult to read during twilight or nighttime hours, said signage will be replaced with new signs that meet the new regulatory retroreflectivity requirements. Said requirements shall apply to all regulatory signs (STOP and speed limit signs), yellow "warning" signs, green/white "guide" signs and all street name signs.

**2. PURPOSE**

The purpose of this policy is to establish how the city will implement a management and assessment method to meet the MN MUTCD sign retroreflectivity requirements. The goal is to improve safety on the city's streets and road.

**3. APPLICABLE SIGNS**

This policy applies to all traffic signs in the city with the exception of:

- a. Stop signs at MnDOT or County controlled intersections.
- b. Specific signs installed by others (MnDOT, transit agencies, Mille Lacs and/or Sherburne County).
- c. Signs along county highways, within MnDOT right-of-way.
- d. Bike path and other pedestrian-control signs not pertaining to vehicle traffic installed by government agencies other than the city.
- e. Authorized signage on approaches to city streets installed by private business and/or property owners.

**4. APPROVED MANAGEMENT METHOD**

After reviewing management methods proposed for sign maintenance, the City of Princeton has approved a combination of two methods:

- a. BLANKET REPLACEMENT. After taking a complete inventory of all signs in the city, sign replacement will begin with all regulatory, warning and guide signs to begin January 2015.
- b. EXPECTED SIGN LIFE. When the above signs have been replaced according to the blanket replacement method, an expected sign life process/practice will be established utilizing a combination of expected sheeting warranty life estimations of manufacturers/suppliers and "on the ground" experience in the field. The inventory of signs will contain information regarding placement, expected years of life and inspection records indicating degradation to monitor changes to ensure nighttime visibility. The eventual goal will be that the majority of retroreflectivity related sign replacement will be handled through the expected life cycle/sign life process.

**5. INSPECTION AND REPLACEMENT**

The Maintenance Supervisor shall establish procedures for regular inspection of signs. Those procedures will include an inspection survey, regular inspections and criteria for determining whether a particular sign condition is in need of replacement.

**6. MISCELLANEOUS SIGN PRACTICES:**

- a. Staff is not directly on-call after normal working hours. Contact city hall office for repairs needed or in case of emergency replacement.
- b. Training is provided to ensure staff can perform maintenance duties in an efficient and responsive manner. Training shall consist of, at a minimum, appropriate signing and traffic control seminars (when available and funding available through budget), training videos or website trainings and as appropriate and available.

- c. Unauthorized signs will be removed by City from city right of way.

**7. REVIEW AND MODIFICATION OF POLICY:**

The Council may modify or clarify this policy at any time. Where the Council has delegated responsibility or authority to any city employee or official for development or implementation of any portion of this policy, that employee or official shall have full authority to modify that portion of the policy at any time.

**8. REVIEW OF POLICY:**

The City Clerk will keep on file comments and complaints received regarding this policy. The policy will be reviewed periodically. Any review will consider comments and complaints since the last review and any other factors affecting the policy or its implementation.

**9. EFFECTIVE DATE OF POLICY:**

This policy shall be effective upon approval by City Council on May 22, 2014. Modifications of the policy shall be effective on the date said modifications are approved by City Council or the date the city employee or official (with authority granted by the City Council) has approved the policy modification or change.

HALLIN MOVED TO APPROVE THE SIGN RETRO-REFLECTIVITY MAINTENANCE POLICY. DOBSON SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

B. City Website Posting Policy

Karnowski reported it has been suggested that the city adopt a policy relating to which businesses, organizations or other entities are eligible to be listed on the city's "Community Information" section.

The following is the proposed language for that policy.

**City of Princeton's Web Page policy**

As a service to the residents of the City of Princeton, the city has a "Community Information" section on the city's web page. That information includes, but is not necessarily limited to Community Services (churches, youth activities, senior services, library, etc.), DMV information, Dog & Cat licensing information, Recycling information, Utilities information (electric, water, telephone, television, etc.) and yard waste. It also includes **area** maps, community services, a local business directory, area history, voter information, links to other web sites of local interest as well as city services.

The amount of space available on the city's web site is limited and the city does not want to overwhelm visitors to the city web site with superfluous information. Accordingly and pursuant to Subdivision 6 of Minnesota Statue 10.60, the city's policy for listing a business, organization or other entity on the city of Princeton's website includes the following criteria:

The business, organization or entity shall:

1. Have a physical presence within the City of Princeton or the immediate area, and/or
2. Already provide a service to a significant portion of the Princeton area, and/or
3. Be licensed or franchised by the city of Princeton, and/or

4. Be a service organization with a significant number of Princeton area residents as members, and/or
5. Be a governmental or quasi-governmental entity that serves Princeton or the greater Princeton area.

The city reserves the right to make exceptions to the five criteria noted above and also reserves the right to remove a listing from the city's web site for any or no reason.

WALKER MOVED TO APPROVE CITY'S WEBSITE POSTING POLICY. SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

#### C. June 12 Council Meeting Rescheduling

Karnowski reported that the Council's June 12<sup>th</sup> meeting night falls on the same night as the Rum River Festival Parade.

In the past the Council has moved that meeting to the previous Tuesday (which, this year, would be Tuesday, June 10<sup>th</sup>). He asked if the Council would like to move the meeting to that date or would some other day work better? The following Tuesday, June 17<sup>th</sup> would also be a realistic option.

HALLIN MOVED TO RESCHEDULE THE JUNE 12<sup>TH</sup> COUNCIL MEETING TO JUNE 17 AT 7PM. DOBSON SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

### **MISCELLANEOUS**

#### **BILL LIST**

HALLIN MOVED TO APPROVE THE BILL LIST WHICH INCLUDES THE MANUAL CHECKS AS LISTED ON THE MANUAL BILL LIST FOR A TOTAL OF \$144,707.60 AND THE ITEMS LISTED ON THE LIQUOR BILL LIST AND GENERAL CITY BILL LIST WHICH WILL BE CHECKS 69988 TO 70062 FOR A TOTAL OF \$140,461.57. DOBSON SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

#### ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business:

HALLIN MOVED TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 7:34pm. SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Respectfully Submitted,

---

Shawna Jenkins  
City Clerk  
ATTEST:

---

Paul Whitcomb, Mayor