MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING OF THE PRINCETON CITY COUNCIL HELD ON SEPTEMBER 26, 2013 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, Dick Dobson, Thom Walker and Jules Zimmer. Staff present, Administrator Mark Karnowski, Finance Director Steve Jackson, Community Development Director Carie Fuhrman, Police Chief Brian Payne, Police Sergeant Joe Backlund, Liquor Store Manager Nancy Campbell, Clerk Shawna Jenkins, Attorney Dick Schieffer and Engineer Mike Nielson. Absent was Victoria Hallin.

AGENDA ADDITIONS/DELETIONS

None

CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES

A. Regular Meeting Minutes of September 12, 2013

DOBSON MOVED TO APPROVE THE REGULAR CITY COUNCIL MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 26, 2013. WALKER SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

CONSENT AGENDA

A. Permits and Licenses

1. Transient Merchant License for Brad Kustermann / Edward Jones Financial

B. Personnel

1. Liquor Store

a. Approval to hire Mike Gatewood for Liquor Store Clerk

b. Approval to hire Dough Hansen for Liquor Store Clerk

C. Donations / Designations

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

OPEN FORUM

PUBLIC HEARINGS

REPORTS OF OFFICERS, BOARDS, AND COMMITTEES

A. Park Board Minutes of September 23, 2013

PETITIONS, REQUESTS, AND COMMUNICATIONS

A. Baldwin Township's 8/21 letter

WALKER MOVED TO UNTABLE THE BALDWIN TOWNSHIP ANNEXATION ISSUE. DOBSON SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Karnowski reported that Staff and Council have received a letter from Baldwin Township regarding an orderly annexation agreement and requesting that representative(s) from the city

again begin meeting with representatives from the Baldwin Township Board to discuss an orderly annexation agreement.

At the July 2nd Study Session, the Council reviewed a memo commenting on some of the township proposed changes to the orderly annexation agreement I understood was previously agreed to by the city and township members who worked on the agreement. Those observations were:

1. *The new proposal would prohibit the city from annexing property designated by the MPCA or Minnesota Department of Health as needing city water or sewer service until the state determines that the township is unable to correct the circumstances. Note that there is no timetable defining how long the township would have to attempt to correct the circumstances. Normally, such a finding by the MPCA or Dept. of Health (as was the case with the Sherburne County Mobile Home Park case) includes both the annexation for services option as well as an "on site" repair option as determination by the state.*

2. *The current Township proposal does not allow any annexation that is not immediately contiguous to the city. There are circumstances where that provision could impact a requesting property owner wishing to annex.*

3. *If Baldwin Township decides to attempt incorporation as a city and the city responds by filing a contested annexation for a portion of Baldwin Township (which is generally the standard), the newly proposed version restrict the city from including in that proposed annexation area any areas that Baldwin has designated as commercial or industrial. It also prohibits the city from including "areas of interest to Baldwin's growth" in the proposed annexation area.*

4. *The Baldwin proposal removes the previously agreed to dollar per acre figure for reimbursement after annexation.*

5. *The Baldwin proposal re-defines the definition of vacant land. That new definition would potentially result in a fairly significant increase in the amount of property tax dollars to be paid to the Township.*

Former Mayor Riddle's 2012 agreement was based on the concept that an individual property owner should have the right to determine whether to annex or not and that, generally, that decision shouldn't be imposed by either the city or the township. The proposed Baldwin agreement placed restrictions on the right of some property owners to determine what they can or cannot do with their property.

That said, an excerpt from the Township's August 20th meeting reads as follows:

> Swanson said it's quite apparent to him that Baldwin has run into a stone wall with the City of Princeton. Since Baldwin has is building a comprehensive plan perhaps it's time to investigate moving Baldwin to the next step to see what the options are to incorporate. Add to the September 9th agenda "Approve/Disapprove Preliminary Conversations with Couri and Ruppe; Explore Options".

Baldwin has not updated the City on what the Township decided on September 9th. However, it is always possible that some middle ground could be reached. He asked how the Council would like to proceed.

Dobson said he believes we are close to an agreement and he feels a few more meetings with the Baldwin Board members may be enough to get something ironed out. Walker said he would be happy to continue that again. He said this letter is quite a ways off from what he remembers. He would happy to go back and negotiate some more, although he does not have the same optimism that Dobson does about being close to an agreement.

WHITCOMB MOVED TO APPROVE COUNCIL MEMBERS THOM WALKER AND DICK DOBSON TO MEET WITH BALDWIN TOWNSHIP IN REGARD TO AN ANNEXATION AGREEMENT. ZIMMER SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

B. Mayoral Proclamation for "Lights on After School"

Karnowski said Family Pathways is requesting that the City recognize the National Celebration of afterschool programs which is October 11, 2013

DOBSON MOVED TO PROCLAIM OCTOBER 11, 2013 AS "LIGHTS ON AFTERSCHOOL". WALKER SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

C. Princeton Speedway Correspondence

Karnowski reported that staff and the Council have received the following letter from the Princeton Speedway.

> We are writing on behalf of the Princeton Speedway to apologize for how late the Friday, September 20th show went. Unfortunately Mother Nature, together with the most cars we had this season resulted in a significant amount of track work and maintenance that needed to be performed throughout the event.
>
> We believe that we have had a successful initial year, bringing more people to Princeton as well as the Speedway than in recent years. Although most nights we were able to complete the show between 10:00pm and 10:30pm, this past Friday we had over 140 cars. It was only a few limited occasions that the races had to late to complete the show.
>
> We will be reviewing our procedures during the offseason in order to further minimize late disruptions to our neighbors.
>
> Timothy Siercks, CEO and D. Scott Berry President

Karnowski reported that there have been a lot of phone calls and complaints in regard to the races going until 1am on Friday September 20. There is a Conditional Use Permit for the races that include set parameters for hours of operation.

Fuhrman added that the Planning Commission's intent was to review the schedule after the season and it will be on the agenda for their October meeting. The attorney is also working on enforcement options. Karnowski said that when staff receives a complaint, we have been informing the residents that the Planning Commission will be reviewing it, and a public hearing will likely be held in November. For the Public hearing, the residents will receive notices via mail and it will be published in the paper.

Zimmer asked if the races normally go past Labor Day. Karnowski said he was not sure; he would have to look into the past years. He has also heard people say that the races used to be done by 10pm, so by 11pm most of the people were gone and the site was quiet.

ORDINANCES AND RESOLUTIONS

A.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. 21st Avenue Update

Karnowski reported that at the Council's September 12th meeting, the following motion was adopted:

WALKER MOVED TO PROCEED WITH THE ROAD AND LEAVE THE CROSSWIND RUNWAY ON THE ALP AND SEE IF IT CAN BE DONE WITH THEM COEXISTING. DOBSON SECONDED THE MOTION.

Staff is uncertain how to proceed and is requesting additional clarification. If the intent of the motion was to proceed with the road as presented by staff (see attached Exhibit A), then I believe it's clear that the FAA's position is that the "Plan B" concept (attached as EXHIBIT A) and the crosswind are not compatible.

If the intent of the adopted motion was to pursue the option presented by Rick Hoffman (i.e. a 'driveway with radio controlled gates at both ends to be used solely by emergency vehicles') then there's a chance – however slim – that the Hoffman option may be compatible. I talked at length with the MSP FAA Program Manager, Gordon Nelson, about the Hoffman concept. His comments regarding that option are noted in paragraphs 2-4:

Mr. Nelson advised that Mr. Hoffman's proposal was for the construction of an access road connecting the new public safety building with the industrial park where there were radio controlled gates at both ends of the new road. Further, those radio controlled gates could only be opened by emergency vehicles.

Nelson said he advised Mr. Hoffman that he'd never had that option presented before and that, because of the public safety component, such a configuration might be considered. Nelson went on to say that he further advised Hoffman that he was "leaning toward 'no'", and that an extensive analysis by the sponsor of all alternatives would be required if the sponsor wishes to keep the future crosswind runway on the Airport Layout Plan (ALP).

Nelson stated the decision on whether such a configuration would be compatible with a crosswind runway would not be made by him at the Minneapolis FAA Office and may not even be made at the Regional FAA office in Chicago without being sent to 'headquarters' because the FAA is getting more and more strict about incursions into existing and future Runway Protection Zones (RPZs).

It was asked how long it would take for the FAA to make a decision on the compatibility of Hoffman's configuration and the crosswind runway. He said he would not venture a

guess about how long getting a decision might take. He also pointed out that the future RPZ is now clear. Introduction of a road, even with restrictions, could eventually morph into the type of use that would be unacceptable which often is difficult to reverse.

Mr. Nelson then went into viability of Federal funding of the crosswind. Although he has not seen or reviewed the data as part of a Master Plan or ALP update submission, he was of the understanding that the new wind calculations provided to the city by the Airport Engineer indicates that the justification from the wind criteria puts the crosswind project on the cusp. The criterion for Federal funding is a forecast of 500 annual itinerate operations (take-offs and landings) by the specific aircraft or family of aircraft that would require a crosswind runway.

He also confirmed the Airport Engineer's statements to the Airport Advisory Board that the criteria for Federal funding using the current 'Entitlement Grant Funds' is tightening up (i.e. the FAA is looking more carefully at the justification documentation).

At the September 12th meeting, it was also asserted that the $2.81 million estimated cost of the crosswind runway (including the cost of the environmental assessment, securing the necessary land and/or easements and actual construction costs) was way out of line. Mayor Whitcomb requested that the airport engineer address that concern. Airport Engineer Dresel's September 17th email response:

This subject has been brought up several times at the Airport Board meetings. It is also not a question unique to Princeton. In essence, the real issue is that laymen commonly apply their own set of sensibilities when it comes to public construction. "I built a driveway for $5000, how in the world can a runway cost millions??" The real answer is that this is not a private project. It's subject to strict FAA rules and guidelines, a multitude of labor laws, and many reporting and support documents. Last but not least, this is a public improvement; it needs to be designed and constructed for the long haul, be easy to maintain, and serve all of the public as safely as possible. Which is a long way of saying it will cost a lot more than a driveway. And there are no shortcuts to be had - there is a lot of federal money involved and you are very subject to audit.

All of that being said, some laymen still will not believe the costs involved in a public airport. But they usually will believe some actual bids. Our last turf runway bid was at Mora in the spring of 2011. The average bid received was $1.2 million, which in their case worked out to $381 per foot of runway. So, in the case of PNM's 2430' of ultimate runway, that works out to about $925,000. However, that is just the 'hard' construction dollars. From experience we know that design, construction documentation, and contingencies will add another 35% to the project, bringing 'construction' costs to something like $1.25 million. Remember this is based on actual bids in 2011, and from a larger project with better economies of scale.

This is still not quite the $1.7 listed in your CIP and the remainder is, admittedly, based on our professional experience. For starters, the above was based on 2011 bids - probably the most favorable bidding climate in 10 years. That is not the case today, so add 'something' for that. The project will most likely not be built in the near term, so add some more for inflation. Too, there will (I guarantee it) be something that needs to be added to the project (i.e. FAA land release documentation) that is unforeseen today. Add something for that.....and I'm sure you start to get the idea of the art involved.

Perhaps most importantly, the ***single worst advice we can give you is to program too***

__cheaply__ at this stage of the game. If we do that, we will slowly but surely work the Council into a corner wherein you will have to dig more and more into your own pocket, and have fewer and fewer alternatives available as you do it.

In short, we're comfortable with the CIP numbers for construction. I have routinely heard the same thing you probably heard last week, namely, that the runway will only cost "a few hundred thousand." That simply is not what is going to happen. Not on a federally backed airport. I'll also add here that, even if NO federal dollars are used, you still have to design to FAA standards to maintain your public use status (and for other reasons). Again, no shortcuts allowed.

Now.....the land costs. We are NOT experts in land valuation. The numbers in your CIP related to land acquisition do, I believe, pre-date our (SEH) involvement. However, I rather suspect they aren't far off, assuming that land values in the Princeton area are starting to rebound. Perhaps one of Mark's staff could take a closer look at assessed values in the area?

In summary, we're pretty comfortable with the costs indicated in your CIP. Kaci has opined on the EA, and I hope my explanation of construction costs (above) make sense.

Please feel free to call me with any questions. Thanks for asking!

Joel A. Dresel, PE, LS
Sr. Principal
Practice Center Lead, Airport Planning and Design
Short Elliott Hendrickson, Inc.

City Staff has reported to the Council that both the new wind data collected by the city's airport engineering firm and the requisite study done by the airport engineer to address the FAA's funding eligibility requirements indicate that the proposed crosswind runway is not eligible for Federal Funding. I asked the engineer that did the study to summarize and comment on those engineering findings. The engineer's response was:

Based on FAA eligibility standards, the additional wind coverage that would be provided by the proposed crosswind runway would not provide the substantial use necessary to receive federal funding. In order to be eligible, a crosswind would have to create at least 500 additional annual itinerant (to/from another airport) operations (takeoffs or landings) during time periods when the primary runway crosswind coverage is inadequate. Based on available operations data, the proposed crosswind runway would only result in up to an additional 318 operations. This falls short of the FAA eligibility requirement; therefore, the proposed crosswind is not eligible for federal funding.

Let me know if you have any questions or would like any additional information.

Thanks

Kaci Nowicki | Planner
SEH | 3535 Vadnais Center Drive | St. Paul, MN 55110-5196
651.490.2085 direct | 651.490.2150 fax
www.sehinc.com

SEH—Building a Better World for All of Us™

1. If the Council's intention was to proceed with the "Plan B" road, then adoption of the appropriate resolution directing the Airport Engineer to revise and submit the Airport Layout Plan (ALP) such that the proposed crosswind runway is no longer on the ALP is recommended. In order to build the "Plan B" option, the city will need a land release from the FAA and, as previously stated, a land release for "Plan B" will not be approved so long as the proposed crosswind runway is on the ALP.

2. If the Council's intention is to proceed with the "Hofmann Option", then Council should direct the Airport engineer to proceed with the "extensive analysis…of all alternatives" as mandated by the FAA's Gordon Nelson in his clarification of his comments to Mr. Hofmann regarding the "Hofmann Option". Understand that the cost of that engineering analysis is unknown and that the amount of time to do the analysis is also unknown. Further even Gordon Nelson wouldn't venture a guess about how long it would take for the FAA to make a decision on the compatibility of the "Hofmann Option" with the proposed crosswind runway.

Karnowski asked how the Council wanted to proceed.

Jeff Hammer said he is a 38 year resident of the city and he cannot see getting rid of the crosswind option as it would be one more thing taken away that makes Princeton competitive to other areas. He agrees that the city should not have to fund the crosswind, so if it came down to getting it done, I'm sure those that feel it is important would find a way to raise the money. He was hoping the council could figure out a way to hang on to the option as there is a lot of tax base with the hangers and future hangers.

Whitcomb asked if the zoning can remain once the crosswind was taken off the Airport Layout Plan. Karnowski responded that he would need to double check, but added that the zoning is a separate issue and he believes the zoning could remain. The crosswind can be removed from the ALP, but if the zoning was removed that would require a Public Hearing.

Adrian Grimm from Coon Rapids said he has been coming up to Princeton for flight operations for many years and is a previous city resident. The current runway is the primary, but there are days when the weather is not cooperating with flight operations and a crosswind would be very beneficial. The crosswind is on the plan to expand and grow the Airport and he would like to see that remain for future development. The road can be done many different ways. With the elevation of the crosswind location, it would need to be built up on one side to make it level. The road could be shifted as far as over as possible, and keep it lower than the crosswind.

Zimmer said when he voted at the last meeting, he was voting on putting a road thru. Walker responded that his motion was in favor of an emergency access road. Zimmer stated he was voting for Option B and felt we could try and start the process while the crosswind was still on the ALP.

Whitcomb stated he feels that if we move forward with the Hoffman proposal, there is probably no chance that it would get approved with the crosswind on the ALP. He added that he also does not know that a crosswind could not be built at a later date down the road even if it was removed from the ALP at this time.

Dobson said the area Hoffman had suggested for a southern gate would not work. He would like to keep the zoning and then maybe a crosswind could be figured out down the road. He feels the emergency road is important for public safety. When the location of the Public Safety building was chosen, it was because the extension of 21st had been discussed for a long time. The members of the industrial park where happy with the gate and signage stating it is for emergency vehicles only and said he feels the City needs to move forward with this. If he recalls the motion was to move forward with the road, and if the crosswind could stay great, if not it would be removed. Walker added that one gate would probably suffice.

Karnowski reported that in order to proceed on Option B, a land release from FAA is needed. As long as that crosswind is on the ALP, they will not provide a land release; therefore we could not begin with the road planning. Dobson added that while it was stated at the last meeting that the crosswind could possibly coexist with the runway, but from what he is reading in the memo and emails, that likely would not be approved. Therefore, if we go ahead and pass the Resolution, the road planning could move forward.

WHITCOMB MOVED TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 13-41 DIRECTING THE PRINCETON AIRPORT ENGINEER TO REVISE THE AIRPORT LAYOUT PLAN BY REMOVING THE PROPOSED CROSSWIND RUNWAY AND ALL RELATED APPURTENANCES. DOBSON SECONDED THE MOTION. VOTE 3:1, WALKER OPPOSED, MOTION CARRIED.

B. TH95 Improvements – Mike Nielson

Nielson stated that the City of Princeton together with Mille Lacs County and MnDOT were successful in securing Federal funding for improvements to the TH 95 corridor. The project included the planning, design and construction of improvements on TH 95 from east of 13th Avenue to west of CSAH 31 from the existing two lane rural roadway to a 4 lane divided section with left and right turn lanes, a frontage road and replacement of the bridge over TH 169.

Currently the corridor Environmental Assessment (EA), corridor Staff Approved Layout and minor improvements have been completed. The project initially received $ 1.2M in Federal funding of which $ 940,000 is still available for improvements to the corridor. In addition to the Federal funding MnDOT has committed the local match of $236,000, bringing the total available to $ 1,176,000.

The increasing traffic on TH 95 along with the recent development of Wal-Mart west of TH 169 and south of TH 95, has resulted in agreement that there is a need for additional improvements to the intersection of TH 95 at 21st Avenue North to improve safety and operations at the intersection. As long as these improvements are consistent with the approved EA and Layout the remaining Federal funds can be used to help construct them.

The following Scope of Work outlines the required tasks to complete the initial phase for getting the preliminary design/approvals (Phase 1) for improvements to the TH 95 at 21st Avenue North intersection and, the tasks needed to complete the final design, bidding and construction (Phase 2 and 3) of the project. Following the Scope of Work is a summary of the Estimated Fee these tasks.

SCOPE OF WORK
Phase 1 - Project Development / Preliminary Design
Task 1 – Project Management

This task will include the day-to-day management of the project including all correspondence with City of Princeton and Mille Lacs County (as project administrator), preparation of monthly progress reports, and invoices. In addition, this task will include meeting with City/County staffs to review the progress of the project and discuss any issues associated with the project through the design and bidding phases. It is estimated that three meetings will be held throughout the project.

Task 2 - Public and Agency Involvement Plan
WSB will lead a comprehensive public and agency involvement process to make certain there is clear public understanding and timely decisions by agency staff to gain support and necessary project approvals. Our past successes are largely due to our ability to efficiently gather and share information and effectively move projects through varying agency review and approval processes for documents, plans, and permits. The following meetings are anticipated for the project: Public open house with mailings (one), City Council meetings (two), agency design meetings (two) and property owner meetings (four). WSB will provide all necessary layouts, figures, graphics, brochures, and documentation.

Task 3 – Data Collection / Survey / Base Mapping
Available data will be collected from the City, County, MnDOT and other impacted agencies for both 21st Avenue North and TH 95. WSB will work with the City/County and MnDOT in securing the GIS data for these corridors and any topographic information available.

WSB will also obtain the necessary survey data not included as part of the original TH 95 project to complete the design of the project. The field survey will include spot elevations, cross sections, centerline profiles, all existing features, and underground/overhead utilities. The survey data will be collected electronically in the field and downloaded directly to the project CAD file in the office. The result of this task will be the preparation of a topographic base mapping suitable for preparation of construction documents and right of way acquisition.

Task 4 – Intersection Control Evaluation (ICE) Report
In order to determine the appropriate intersection control, an intersection analysis will be completed evaluating the existing traffic operations and crash data at the TH 95 and 21st Avenue North intersection. This will include reviewing the warrants and needs for a roundabout, signalization, all way stop control and improved intersection geometrics. The analysis will be based on the requirements outlined by MnDOT State Aid and those found in the “Minnesota Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices”. Existing traffic volume data and crash history will be collected as part of this task to be used for this analysis. A draft report will be submitted to the City of Princeton and MnDOT State Aid for review, any comments will be addressed, and a final copy for signature will be prepared and submitted to MnDOT for final approval.

Task 5 – Preliminary Design/Staff Approved Layout (30% Plans)
Following the determination of the intersection control (Task 4) the first step in getting the concept finalized is the preparation of a MnDOT Level 1 Staff-approved Layout for agency approval. This will include the following:
Draft Level 1 Layout – Using the base mapping developed in Task 3, a draft Level 1 Layout will be prepared for submission to MnDOT and the City for review and approval. The draft layout will include:

- Roadway alignment and profile information for each roadway and intersection
- Roundabout/intersection geometrics showing lane configuration, lane width, turn-lane lengths, medians and tie-down locations.
- Location of the pedestrian facilities.

Final Level 1 Layout – After receipt of agency comments, a final Level 1 Layout will be prepared including:

- Revised information from the draft layout
- Drainage calculation, soil boring data and pavement design calculations
- Design calculations
- Truck-turning data

At the completion of the MnDOT Staff Approved Level 1 Layout process the plan will be to approximately 30% of the final design.

Task 6 – Project Environmental Documentation
An Environmental Assessment (EA) document was prepared and approved in 2008/2009. WSB will update the EA or a prepare a Project Memorandum (PM) required for the project as determined by MnDOT, in accordance with the MnDOT Highway Project Development Process Manual and current Standards and practices that will meet the requirements for Federal funding. This document will include review/update of potential environmental impacts/issues including, but not limited to; flood plain, wetland, endangered species, historical/archeological, noise, air quality, right of way, etc. A preliminary copy of the Environmental Document will be submitted to the City of Princeton and MnDOT State Aid for review, any comments will be addressed, and a final copy for signature will be prepared and submitted to MnDOT for final approval.

Phase 2 - Detail Design
Task 7 – Final Design
WSB will perform design computations, calculate quantities and prepare final design plans. The final construction plan set will be in conformance with all MnDOT State Aid and Federal Aid requirements and include at a minimum:

1. Title Sheet
2. General Layout
3. Removals
4. Statement of Estimated Quantities
5. Soils and Construction Notes
6. Utility Tabulations
7. Quantity Tabulations
8. Typical Sections
9. Details
10. Alignment Plans and Tabulations
11. Construction Plans and Profiles
12. Intersection Details
13. Grading, Erosion Control, and Turf Establishment Plans
14. Signing and Striping Plans

15. Cross Sections
16. Landscaping Plans

Final plans will be submitted to the City for review and requested changes incorporated. The revised plans will then be submitted to MnDOT State Aid for review. Once MnDOT comments have been incorporated, a final copy of the plans will be submitted for signature. A copy of the plan in electronic format will be provided to the City.

Task 8 – Construction Cost Estimate
WSB will prepare a construction cost estimate at the Preliminary Plan and Final Plan points in the project to establish and refine the estimated construction cost. Additionally, we will tabulate the construction cost splits based on Federal and local cost participation based on funding levels.

Task 9 – Permits / Approvals
WSB will coordinate and submit the project for review and/or approval from the following agencies. For any permits required WSB will prepare the permit for City signature and submit the permit on the Cities behalf. Any permit fees will be added as a reimbursable expense to the contract.

- City of Princeton
- MnDOT Federal Aid (District 3 and Central Office)
- Mille Lacs County
- MPCA – NPDES
- US Corps of Engineers
- MnDNR

Task 10 – Bidding / Contract Documents
WSB will prepare Special Provisions for certain bid items, details, designs and procedures for the project which are not covered in the project's governing specifications (MnDOT's Standard Specifications for Construction) or the current Supplemental Specifications. The provision for each item will contain a description, materials, and construction requirements, method of measurement and basis of payment.

WSB will prepare the final bid package for distribution to prospective bidders. The bid package will include all documents required for the Federal funding.
WSB will provide information necessary for the advertisement of bids and distribution of bid packages. We will be available to address any questions including issuing any addendums if required through the bidding process. WSB will be in attendance at the bid opening and will verify the bids and will make a recommendation of award to the City/County.

Phase 3 - Construction
Task 11 – Construction Administration
WSB will follow the Delegated Contract Process (DCP) outlined by MnDOT for construction contract administration. The WSB Project Manager will be responsible for construction administration activities. At the beginning of the project, a preconstruction conference will be conducted.

During the course of the project, weekly construction progress meetings will be conducted by the Project Manager. Periodic visits to the site will be made by the Project Manager. The project Manager/Engineer will be responsible for preparing all pay estimates, change orders, reviewing shop drawings, materials and suppliers, and preparing the final acceptance letter. The Project Manager/Engineer will provide coordination to all utility companies, property owners, surveyors, and all project personnel.
Prior to construction, WSB will provide staking for the construction phase. WSB will also provide day-to-day on-site observation and record keeping of the construction and activities consistent with all Mn/DOT Federal Aid requirements, the DCP, as well as providing coordination and record keeping for contractor invoice approvals, change orders, and other construction coordination.

The estimate of hours is based on assuming a 10 to 12 week construction time frame. Once the project has been bid, a contractor on board and a construction schedule provided a more detail hourly estimated can be provided.

ESTIMATED FEE
Based on the hours outlined for each task as shown in the attached table and WSB fee schedule, it is estimated that the cost for design and construction engineering services will be as outlined below:

Tasks	**Cost**
Phase 1 – Project Development / Preliminary Design	
Task 1 – Project Management	$8,056.00
Task 2 – Public and Agency Involvement	$9,918.00
Task 3 – Data Collection/Survey / Mapping	$9,012.00
Task 4 – Intersection Control Evaluation	$6,964.00
Task 5 – Preliminary Design	$26,880.00
Task 6 – Project Environmental Document	$10,424.00
Phase 1 Cost	**$71,254.00**
Phase 2 – Detail Design	
Task 7 – Final Design	$63,260.00
Task 8 – Construction Cost Estimate	$3,188.00
Task 9 – Permits / Approvals	$6,028.00
Task 10 – Bidding / Contract Documents	$8,128.00
Phase 2 Cost	**$80,604.00**
Phase 3 – Construction	
Task 11 – Construction Administration	$114,612.00
Expenses (Printing, Soils, Testing Etc.)	$21,000.00
Total Project Cost	**$287,470.00**

WSB will only bill for those hours actually worked on the project and will not proceed with any additional work without approval by the City. The costs for expenses are shown as an estimate, and will bill at the actual cost for those items.

The estimated cost is shown for each phase of the project.

The Phase 2 - Detail Design and Phase 3 - Construction Administration fees are only an estimate at this time. Once the project is developed and the scope of the design is determined, a detailed cost will be provided.

Right-of-Way needs for this project have also not been determined at this time and therefore we have not provided a cost to assist with acquisition. If it is determined that additional Right-of-Way is required for the project WSB will provide you with a cost proposal to provide those services.

Whitcomb asked if the above fees would come out of the 1.7 million in Federal Funds. Nielson responded that they did not, but some of these costs could be assessed back to the benefitting property owners.

Dobson stated that when 21st Avenue was put in, there was an access that was left open for another gas station. He said he believes that a second access was going to be removed. Nielson said he would have to research further on that. Karnowski said his recollection was that the road was put in by request by the gas station and Merlin's and if it became a traffic issue it would be removed.

DOBSON MOVED TO PROCEED AND UTILIZE THE FEDERAL FUNDS AVAILABLE. ZIMMER SECONDED THE MOTION.

Karnowski asked if Nielson's firm needs to go through a vetting process because these are Federal Funds. Nielson responded that MnDOT has suggested using the local funds for Engineering for that purpose. The funds would be funneled through Mille Lacs County since the Princeton is not a funded City.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

C. WWTP Partial Pay estimate #20 – FINAL

Walker asked if the watering and Reed issues have been resolved. Karnowski responded that he believes there are still some issues. He asked Schieffer if he would recommend payment at this time. Schieffer responded that there should be some retainage until those issues are resolved.

DOBSON MOVED TO TABLE PAY ESTIMATE #20 TO RICE LAKE CONSTRUCTION GROUP FOR $58,434.00 UNTIL THE ISSUES CAN BE RESOLVED OR A RETAINAGE AGREED UPON. WALKER SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

D. WWTP Change Order #5

WALKER MOVED TO APPROVE CHANGE ORDER #5 FOR A DECREASE OF $26,516.00. ZIMMER SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

E. Public Safety Building Partial Pay estimate

Karnowski reported that there are a few issues they are working on, but the building is coming along very nicely and they are looking at moving into the building next month.

WALKER MOVED TO APPROVE PAY ESTIMATE #4 FOR $370,744.81. DOBSON SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

F. Public Safety Building – Greystone Invoice

WALKER MOVED TO APPROVE PAYMENT OF $50,114.13 TO GREYSTONE CONSTRUCTION COMPANY CONSTRUCTION SERVICES. ZIMMER SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

NEW BUSINESS

A. Elim Home Revenue Note Joint Powers Amendment – Resolution 13-40

Jackson reported that Elim Homes has requested that the City amend the Original Note to modify the provisions relating to the interest rate on the Original Note that the city participated with them in 2003. The City will be provided with a final copy of the note once it is finalized and closed on.

WALKER MOVED TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 13-40 AUTHORIZING AND ENTERING INTO AN AMENDMENT TO THE NURSING HOME REVNUE BOND OF 2003. DOBSON SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

B. Sharco Second Addition Pre-Plat

Fuhrman reported that John Peterson, on behalf of Great Northern Land, has submitted a preliminary plat application for Sharco Second Addition. The plat involves the creation of eight (8) single family home lots on the property currently described as Outlot E, Sharco Estates, which encompasses approximately 4.66 acres on the northwest corner of Meadow View Drive and 14th Avenue S.

The Planning Commission recently issued a variance to the Airport Zoning Ordinance that limited the density on this piece of property in order for it to be developed into single family homes. The applicant is now coming forward with the Preliminary Plat application.

The proposed eight single family home lots range in size from 13,137 to 31,170 square feet. The property is zoned R-2, Residential and planned for Mixed Residential on the Future Land Use Plan.

The City Engineer has reviewed the submitted plans and prepared a memo, dated August 29, 2013. The memo addresses: drainage clarification, drainage & utility easements, low building opening, drainage calculations, and detailed sanitary sewer connection information & shop drawings for sewer/water materials.

In addition, as was discussed at the Developer's meeting, the trail shall be reconfigured to connect with the sidewalk on the south side of Meadow View Drive in order to provide better pedestrian access. Staff is suggesting this be the responsibility of the developer.

PUC staff has also reviewed the preliminary plat. It is believed that three lots (Lot 5, 7, and 8) need to be wet tapped and curb stops installed. Electricity will have to be run into the plat. PUC has suggested that the sewer get stubbed in prior to the electricity.

Landscaping: A Landscaping Plan is required to be submitted. Although the applicant is not proposing to construct homes at this time, it is important that the Developer's Agreement also address the landscaping requirements for future builders.

- Each one family residential dwelling unit shall contain trees totaling at least 8 inches in diameter at installation with a minimum of 2 trees located in front of the home. Each tree must meet minimum size requirements as listed in the Ordinance.
- Landscaping shall provide for an appropriate mix of plantings around a minimum of 50% of the exterior foot print of all buildings.
- All open area of any site not occupied shall be sodded or seeded.
- Remainder of the provisions of Chapter VI.L. shall be followed.

Additional data is required to be provided on the preliminary plat drawings:

- Minimum front and side building setback lines with dimensions.
- The Subdivision Ordinance requires that in any area where lots are platted in excess of 24,000 square feet, a preliminary re-subdivision plan is required showing a potential and feasible way in which the lots may be re-subdivided in future years for more intensive use of the land. In addition, the placement of buildings or structures upon such lots shall allow for potential re-subdivision.

Comment: Lots 5-8 are fairly large in size. The developer and city staff have reviewed various other options for the layout of the lots, but without putting a new road in, a new configuration would be difficult.

Property owners to the north of the alley have approached the developer with interest in purchasing a portion of the northern parts of Lots 5-8 to "add" as additional yard to their properties, but the property owners have not followed up with the developer, and so he is proceeding as originally planned. If this were to proceed, the preliminary plat would need to come back in front of the Planning Commission for another public hearing.

- The applicant had indicated a potential for increasing the depth of Lots 1 and 2, which would decrease the size of Lots 5 and 6 potentially.

The Building Inspector has asked for clarification on the Plans as to whether the proposed homes are look-outs or walk-outs.

As a part of the Final Plat requirements, the applicant shall be responsible for following the final plat procedures identified in the Subdivision Ordinance, including the requirement to enter into a Developer's Agreement, obtaining appropriate signatures, submittal of three Mylar's (two copies for the County; one for the City records), etc. The City Attorney has begun reviewing the Title Work.

If at the time the builder is requesting a Certificate of Occupancy and the landscaping and driveways are not finished, a $3,000 escrow shall be required to be submitted.

The Princeton Park Board met and recommended acceptance of the park dedication fee in an amount of $4,880, versus park land to meet the park dedication requirements.

As the plans indicate, Outlot A contains a trail that was constructed some years back. It is unclear if an easement was obtained for this trail. This issue will need to be cleared up – whether the city obtains ownership of Outlot A, or an easement is obtained. This has been discussed with the developer.

The proposed homes and accessory buildings shall meet all regulations, including setbacks, height, type, minimum floor area, parking, driveway, etc. This shall be addressed in the Developer's Agreement.

The City is in the process of obtaining the majority of the large drainage pond that serves Meadow View and Sharco Estates after the parcel went into tax forfeiture (Outlot D, Sharco Estates). Outlot A, Meadow View 5th Addition (just south of Outlot D – see aerial photo) is currently coded tax exempt, and the developer has verbally agreed to transfer the ownership of Outlot A, Meadow View 5th Addition to the City as a part of this project. This will ensure that the majority of the pond is in the City's hands as they are already maintaining the pond and is not available for future redevelopment. This shall also be addressed between the applicant and City.

The Planning Commission met and held a public hearing on September 16th and recommended approval of the Preliminary Plat, subject to the conditions stated below. If the recommended conditions are met, the Preliminary Plat appears to meet the Zoning and Subdivision Ordinance standards; therefore, staff recommends approval to the City Council of the Preliminary Plat, subject to the following conditions:

1) Applicant shall address the City Engineer's comments outlined in the memo dated August 29, 2013.
2) The trail shall be reconfigured to connect with the sidewalk on the south side of Meadow View Drive in order to provide better pedestrian access. This shall be shown on the Preliminary Plat.
3) Applicant shall address the PUC's comments.
4) Landscape Plan shall be submitted prior to Final Plat review.
5) Plans shall clarify if the proposed homes are look-outs or walk-outs.
6) Additional required data shall be added to the Preliminary Plat drawings (setbacks, re-subdivision plan, etc).
7) Applicant shall meet the park dedication requirements with the cash in lieu of land dedication.
8) Applicant shall be responsible for following the final plat procedures identified in the Subdivision Ordinance.
9) Applicant shall enter into a Developer's Agreement with the City.

Next steps: If approval is granted by the City Council, the applicant will then submit the application for the Final Plat, which shall be reviewed by the Planning Commission and City Council.

Walker asked if there is a reason that this property was not developed prior. Fuhrman responded said the crosswind zoning was preventing it from being developed prior, so the planning commission approved a variance which now allows it to be developed.

DOBSON MOVED TO APPROVE THE PRELIMNARY PLAT FOR SHARO SECOND ADDITION WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

1) Applicant shall address the City Engineer's comments outlined in the memo dated August 29, 2013.

2) The trail shall be reconfigured to connect with the sidewalk on the south side of Meadow View Drive in order to provide better pedestrian access. This shall be shown on the Preliminary Plat.
3) Applicant shall address the PUC's comments.
4) Landscape Plan shall be submitted prior to Final Plat review.
5) Plans shall clarify if the proposed homes are look-outs or walk-outs.
6) Additional required data shall be added to the Preliminary Plat drawings (set-backs, re-subdivision plan, etc).
7) Applicant shall meet the park dedication requirements with the cash in lieu of land dedication.
8) Applicant shall be responsible for following the final plat procedures identified in the Subdivision Ordinance.
9) Applicant shall enter into a Developer's Agreement with the City.

WHITCOMB SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

C. Participation in a Regional Housing Study

Fuhrman reported that Lakes and Pines Community Action Council and the Minnesota Housing Partnership (MHP) are looking at doing a regional Housing Study in East Central Minnesota. The study would encompass cities, counties, and non-profit organizations.

With the recent up-swing in the residential market as our economy begins to turn around, it is crucial to have a clear understanding of the housing needs of our community (backed up by data). It will help in establishing priorities and projects. Not to mention, it should help greatly with our NSP projects, other future development projects, and potentially open the doors for additional funding that we are missing out on as we do not have this type of updated study/plan. This will provide the data needed to help solve housing related issues.

In order to capitalize on potential funding opportunities this spring, they would like to get the study started in late fall/winter, and so they are looking for a financial commitment from communities and counties that are interested in participating. Keep in mind that the City of Princeton could easily spend between $10-15,000 in conducting their own study, and so sharing in the costs makes fiscal sense. At this time, I am recommending the City allocate $2-3,000 towards the Housing Study. After speaking with Steve Jackson, the following options are available for sources of funding:

- Potentially using some of the contingency fund. Being this came up unexpectedly from an outside source, use of this fund can be justified.
- The other possibility would be from the amount that was set aside for the industrial park study. We are just in the beginning stages of this and could re-budget for it next year.

Each large community in the region will get a more focused look at their particular community. Keep in mind that Sherburne County would not be included in the regional study. However, I did verify that the information obtained could be used in a further in-depth study if Princeton were to choose to do so at a future date.

Walker said he feels that we do need this beneficial information.

WALKER MOVED TO APPROVE THE CITY'S PARTICIPATION IN THE REGIONAL HOUSING STUDY AND TO ALLOCATE $2000-3000 TOWARDS IT. ZIMMER SECONDED THE MOTION.

Karnowski agrees and thinks if we have a housing study completed; it will show the developers that there is a need for certain housing. Walker added that even though it is a housing study, it will have an effect on other investments as well.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

D. Reallocation of Cemetery Funds

Gerold requested approval to reallocate $5000 from the Cemetery Fence fund to the Equipment Fund. Some of the natural fencing they have been trying has been successful so far, so he would like to utilize those funds for equipment.

WALKER MOVED TO APPROVE THE REALLOCATION OF $5000 FROM THE CEMETERY FENCE FUND TO THE EQUIPMENT FUND. DOBSON SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

MISCELLANEOUS

BILL LIST

ZIMMER MOVED TO APPROVE THE BILL LIST WHICH INCLUDES THE MANUAL CHECKS AS LISTED ON THE MANUAL BILL LIST FOR A TOTAL OF $111,158.83 AND THE ITEMS LISTED ON THE LIQUOR BILL LIST AND GENERAL CITY BILL LIST WHICH WILL BE CHECKS 68688 TO 68741 FOR A TOTAL OF $149,879.97. DOBSON SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business:

DOBSON MOVED TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 8:06 PM. WALKER SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Respectfully Submitted,

_____
Shawna Jenkins
City Clerk
ATTEST:

_____
Paul Whitcomb, Mayor