1. Call to Order/Oath of Office

2. Approval of Minutes of Regular Meeting on January 23rd, 2017 - Tab A

3. Agenda Additions/Deletions

4. Public Hearing:
   
   A. Rezoning 907 2nd Street South to Essential Services Overlay District - Tab B
   
   B. Ordinance Amendment for R-2 Residential District creating a non-conforming lot - Tab C

5. Old Business:
   
   A. Pole Type Construction Prohibited in B-2 District (continued discussion) – Tab D
   
   B. Mini Storage Moratorium – Tab E

6. New Business: None

7. Communication and Reports:

   A. Verbal Report

   B. City Council Minutes for January, 2017 - Tab F

8. Adjournment
THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION BOARD HELD ON JANUARY 23, 2017,
AT 7:00 P.M., AT THE CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBERS

******************************************************************************************************
The meeting was called to order at 7:00 P.M., by Jeff Reynolds. Members present were Faith
Goenner, Victoria Hallin, and John Roxbury Jr. (Princeton Township Representative). Staff
present were Jolene Foss (Comm. Dev. Director) and Mary Lou DeWitt (Comm. Dev. Assistant).

Absent was Dan Erickson.

OATH OF OFFICE:
Victoria Hallin and Jeff Reynolds took the Oath of Office.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS:
REYNOLDS NOMINATED VICTORIA HALLIN FOR PLANNING COMMISSION CHAIR. REYNOLDS
MOVED, GOENNER SECOND, TO CLOSE THE NOMINATIONS. UPON THE VOTE FOR VICTORIA
HALLIN FOR PLANNING COMMISSION CHAIR, THERE WERE 3 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

HALLIN NOMINATED JEFF REYNOLDS FOR PLANNING COMMISSION VICE CHAIR. HALLIN
MOVED, GOENNER SECOND, TO CLOSE THE NOMINATIONS. UPON THE VOTE FOR JEFF
REYNOLDS FOR PLANNING COMMISSION VICE CHAIR, THERE WERE 3 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION
CARRIED.

HALLIN NOMINATED FAITH GOENNER FOR PLANNING COMMISSION SECRETARY. HALLIN
MOVED, REYNOLDS SECOND, TO CLOSE THE NOMINATIONS. UPON THE VOTE FOR FAITH
GOENNER FOR PLANNING COMMISSION SECRETARY, THERE WERE 3 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION
CARRIED.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING ON DECEMBER 19TH, 2016
REYNOLDS MOVED, SECOND BY GOENNER, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF DECEMBER 19TH,
2016. UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 3 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

AGENDA ADDITIONS / DELETIONS
GOENNER MOVED, SECOND BY REYNOLDS, TO APPROVE THE AGENDA. UPON THE VOTE,
THERE WERE 3 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

PUBLIC HEARING: None

OLD BUSINESS:
A. Antenna / Tower Request and Solar Zoning
Community Development Director Memo:

A request was received by the City of Princeton for the construction of a mono-pole type
antenna tower of 75 feet in height in the R-3 Multi-family Residential. The proposal was to
locate it in City’s right-of-way.
The request prompted City staff to look into the current AT Antenna Overlay District Zoning Ordinance. The Ordinance was written and has not been revised since 2004.

After meeting with the company and gaining clarification, their request has been revised. They are requesting the opportunity to lease space on a light pole for the equipment that they need to increase data availability for the area.

I am reviewing language for a street light attachment agreement and will likely be presenting that to Council.

WSB will continue to evaluate the best locations for Tower/Antenna Overlay District, as well as Solar Zoning as we progress into the Comprehensive Plan Update this year.

Foss said she spoke to them previously about this request. Since then she met with the individual and they are not looking at constructing a tower in the right-of-way. There are light pole attachment agreements. Ours might or may not hold them and if not, they could construct a new pole that looks like the light pole and will handle the weight. She will present this to the Council. We will not address antennas at this time and it will be looked at with the Comprehensive Plan. Data is needed to be boosted in this area by Fairview, McDonalds, and Shopko where it benefits the city by leasing of space. This is not for cell phones, but for mobility data usage.

Reynolds said in the initial proposal it looked like cell phones towers.

Goenner asked if they will be very visible.

Foss said a two foot by two foot box with an antenna.

Goenner asked if more companies will want to add those antennas.

Foss said it could so they have to determine how many should be in the city.

**NEW BUSINESS:**

A. Pole Type Construction Prohibited in B-2

Community Development Director Memo:

Due to the fairly recent allowance of pole type construction in B-3, staff thought it would be beneficial to clarify that this type of construction will not be allowed in B-2 Neighborhood Business District.

Here is a sample of the Ordinance Amendment. If the Planning Commission is satisfied with
this amendment, a Public Hearing will be noticed for the February meeting.

9. B-2 Neighborhood Commercial District

G. Exterior Building Materials

Buildings within the Neighborhood Business District shall be designed so as to be compatible with the surrounding residential uses. High quality, exterior building materials shall be limited to one or combination of the following:

a. Face brick;

b. Natural or synthetic stone;

c. Stucco or EFIS;

d. Glass and or curtain wall construction;

e. Decorative concrete block;

f. Fiber-cement siding;

g. Windows are required in the front of the building pending planning review and demonstration of need; e.g. security, etc;

h. Or other materials approved by the Planning Commission if determined to have a similar or better longevity and durability as material listed above.

i. Pole type construction prohibited.

**********************************************************************End of Staff Memo**********************************************************************

Foss said we had an Ordinance amendment for alternative building materials and this was allowed in B-3 District and the Industrial Districts, but not allowed in the B-2 District. So we want it to be clear in the B-2 District. This will go the Planning Commission for approval in February.

Reynolds said he brought a couple pole building photos to show the Planning Commission and thinks they should be allowed.

Foss said there was concern in allowing it in the B-3 District. She wanted to clarify it in B-2 District where it is not allowed.

Hallin said she understands it is not allowed because of the building materials and deciding
what should be allowed.

Reynolds feels that it will look good to have a concrete pole type constructed building.

Hallin said it should be clarified in the Zoning Ordinance.

GOENNER MOVED, SECOND BY HALLIN, TO CLARIFY IN THE B-2 ZONING DISTRICT TO PROHIBIT POLE TYPE CONSTRUCTED BUILDINGS. UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 2 AYES, 1 NAY. AYES-GOENNER AND HALLIN, NAY-REYNOLDS.

GOENNER MOVED, SECOND BY HALLIN, TO REVISIT THE DISCUSSION ON THE B-2 DISTRICT IN REGARDS TO PROHIBITING POLE TYPE CONSTRUCTED BUILDINGS AT THE FEBRUARY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING. UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 3 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

Foss will bring back more information that shows what other cities allow in the B-2 District.

B. Comp Plan Kick Off Joint Meeting
Community Development Director Memo:

WSB and Associates, Inc. is beginning the work of updating the City of Princeton’s Comprehensive Plan.

They would like to invite the Planning Commission to the February 9th City Council meeting at 7:00 P.M. to have a joint meeting and discuss goals and visions.

Foss said that this is for their information only. The Planning Commission is welcome to attend. The discussion will be on the timeline of events and public engagements on this. There will be Planning Commission collaboration on this.

John Roxbury said they will have a couple representatives from the Princeton Township Planning Commission Board attending the meeting.

**COMMUNICATION AND REPORTS:**
A. Verbal Report
Foss said she did not have a verbal report.

B. City Council Minutes for December, 2016
The Planning Commission had no comments.

Roxbury asked what number is it for a quorum for the Planning Commission Board.
DeWitt said three board members is needed for a Planning Commission quorum.

GOENNER MOVED, SECOND BY REYNOLDS, TO ADJOURN THE MEETING. UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 3 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED. THE MEETING ADJOURNED AT 7:25 P.M.

ATTEST:

_____________________________________________  _______________________________________________________
Victoria Hallin, Chair                               Mary Lou DeWitt, Comm. Dev. Assistant
MEMORANDUM

TO: Planning Commission
FROM: Jolene Foss, Community Development Director
SUBJECT: Rezoning from R-3 to ES Essential Services
DATE: February 27th, 2017

REQUEST
The PUC has submitted an application to rezone from R-3, Multi-Family Residential District, to ES, Essential Services Overlay District, at 907 2nd Street South, on the property described as Lots 7-9, Block 5, Ex E 30 Feet, Cater’s Second Addition, City of Princeton, Mille Lacs County, Section 33, Township 36, Range 26, (PID #24-161-0390).

BACKGROUND
This parcel was previously owned by Mille Lacs County and was used as a recycling site.

Applicant Request. The applicant has met with the Community Development Assistant explaining the rezoning request. The applicant purchased the property in 2016. The usage for this parcel includes storage of transformers, poles, etc. The PUC intends to construct fencing similar to that which is found at substations.

ANALYSIS

Existing Conditions. The neighborhood in which the parcel is located contains mostly single family homes, some two-family homes and some multi-family housing.

Future Land Use Plan (Comprehensive Plan). The City engaged in a Comprehensive Plan update back in 2009 that identified the long-range goals for development within the City. The proposed use aligns with the goals of the Comprehensive Plan.

Review Standards. The Zoning Ordinance does not list review standards for rezoning applications. However, many communities utilize the following factors as review standards in rezoning requests, which are being provided as information:

1. The proposed action has been considered in relation to the specific policies and provisions of and has been found to be consistent with the official city comprehensive plan.
2. The proposed use is or will be compatible with present and future land uses of the area.
3. The proposed use conforms to all performance standards contained in this code.
4. The proposed use can be accommodated with existing public services and will not overburden the city’s service capacity.
5. Traffic generation by the proposed use is within capabilities of streets serving the property.

CONCLUSION/RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval of the rezoning request from R-3 to include an Essential Overlay District.
CITY OF PRINCETON, MINNESOTA

ORDINANCE # 747

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE ZONING ORDINANCE CHAPTER V (ZONING DISTRICTS), SECTION 5 OF R-2 RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT ZONING ORDINANCE ALLOWING LOT WIDTH THAT CREATES A NON-CONFORMING LOT IN SPECIFICALLY DEFINED CIRCUMSTANCES FROM CITY OF PRINCETON ZONING ORDINANCE #538

*********************************************************************************************

SECTION 1. Chapter V (Zoning Districts) of the Zoning Ordinance is amended as follows (underline indicates additions; strikethrough indicates deletions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Lot area minimum square feet</th>
<th>One Family</th>
<th>Two-Family Dwelling</th>
<th>Twin Home</th>
<th>Townhouse</th>
<th>Accessory Use</th>
<th>Other Building</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9,800</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Interior lots - 3,000</td>
<td>End lots - 6,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| B. Lot width minimum feet 1,12 | 66         | 80                  | 40        | End lots (street side) - 50 ft | End lots (non-street side) - 40 ft | Interior lots - 25 ft |

| C. Maximum lot coverage | 40%        | 30%                 | 30%       | 35%       |               |               |

| D. Front yard minimum setback (living area) 2 | 25         | 30                  | 20        | 30        | NA           |               |
| E. Front yard minimum setback (front porch) 3 | 20         |                     |           |           |              |               |
| F. Side yard minimum setback (living area) | 10         | 10                  | 10 7      | 10        | 5 7          |               |
| G. Side yard minimum setback (garage) 4 | 5          | 10                  |           |           |              |               |
| H. Street side yard minimum setback | 20         | 20                  | 20        | 20        | 20           |               |
| I. Rear yard minimum setback 5 | 30         | 30                  | 30        | 30        | 5            |               |
| J. Rear yard minimum alley setback 11 | 5          | 10                  |           |           |              |               |
1. Lot width shall be taken at building setback line,

2. If at the time of an application affecting the front yard setback, 50% or more of the then existing dwellings having frontages on the same side of the street or road for three (3) blocks have an average front yard setback different from that specified herein, then all buildings thereafter erected, altered, or moved may conform to that average front yard depth as a minimum.

3. Front yard setback may be reduced to twenty feet (20') if the setback reduction is for an attached living area or porch to the principal structure, not including the garage, which does not exceed a total of one hundred twenty (120) feet of above grade finished livable space. The exterior materials of the new living area or porch shall be consistent or complementary in color, texture and quality with those visible at the front of the dwelling. The roof of the new living area or porch is properly proportioned to and integrated with the roof of the dwelling.

4. The side yard setback may be reduced to five feet (5') if the setback reduction is for the attached garage structure.

5. The rear yard setback may be reduced to twenty feet (20') if the setback reduction is for an attached living area to the principal structure (unless this reduction would encroach on an existing utility easement), not including the garage, that does not exceed a total of three hundred (300) square feet of above grade finished livable space. In addition, there shall be a minimum of forty feet (40') measured at the closet point, between the attached living area and the neighboring principal.

6. No accessory structures shall be allowed prior to the construction of the principal structure. No more than one principal building may be located on one lot in a Residential district.

7. An accessory building, which is structurally attached to a principal building, shall be subject to, and must conform to, all regulations of this ordinance applicable to the principal building. Any accessory building with sewer and water extensions shall be by conditional use permit.

8. Accessory buildings for townhouses or twinhomes may be constructed up to the interior lot line.

9. Where townhouses/twinhomes abut, no setback is required at the abutment.

10. See Conditional Use conditions chapter 4.
11. When the garage door opens into the lot the setback shall be 5 feet; when the garage door opens into the alley the setback shall be 10'.

12. Lot width could be subject to variance by Planning Commission when there are conditions that prevent meeting the lot width requirement such as existing structures, preservation of a natural feature or to avoid a natural feature that may cause problems in the future (steep slopes, wetlands, water courses).

**EFFECTIVE DATE.** This ordinance shall take effect upon its summary publication in the City’s official newspaper. Said publication shall read as follows:

AN ORDINANCE # 747 AMENDING THE ZONING ORDINANCE CHAPTER V (ZONING DISTRICTS), SECTION 5 OF THE R-2 RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT ZONING ORDINANCE ALLOWING LOT SPLITS THAT CREATE A NON-CONFORMING LOT IN SPECIFICALLY DEFINED CIRCUMSTANCES FROM CITY OF PRINCETON ZONING ORDINANCE #538

ADOPTED by the City Council of the City of Princeton this 9th day of March 2017.

______________________________
Paul Whitcomb, Mayor

**ATTEST:**

______________________________
Shawna Jenkins, City Clerk
MEMORANDUM

TO: Planning Commission
FROM: Jolene Foss, Community Development Director
SUBJECT: Alternative Building Materials
DATE: February 27th, 2017

At the January 2017 Planning Commission meeting, there was a proposed amendment to prohibit pole-type construction in the B-2 Zoning District. This suggested amendment was not approved and questions were asked regarding why the Planning Commission would not want to allow this type of development in B-2. A request to see if other communities allow this type of construction in B-2 was made.

In looking into this request, Staff was reminded of the information gathered from communities when searching for the allowance of alternative building materials in B-3 Zoning District. The other communities that were surveyed did not distinguish between the B-2 and B-3 Zoning District.

Please see below:

Staff contacted several communities that are in the region or are of similar size and this is what was found:

Zimmerman: Pole frame construction is allowed in industrial and commercial, some standards on sheet steel exterior

Elk River: Pole type structures are allowed in Industrial

Milaca: Pole type structures are allowed in commercial and industrial

Cambridge: Nothing that states pole type structures are not allowed. Architectural metal siding as an accent only, no more than 35% on exterior

Circle Pines: Nothing in ordinance regarding pole type structures

Baxter: Nothing specific in place regarding post frame construction. Architectural standards put in place. Non Architectural sheet metal in MN-1 up to 20% on front façade and up to 100% on other facades. MN-2 -40% on front.

St Cloud: The Land Development Code only addresses exterior materials in the industrial districts. Any internal structure allowed by the Building Code is permitted.

B. Design Standards The following design standards apply: 1. All exterior wall finishes on any building must be any single one (1) or combination of the following: a. Face brick b. Natural stone or cultured stone c. Specially designed pre-cast concrete units, if the surfaces have been integrally treated with an applied decorative material or texture d. Membrane e. Factory fabricated and finished metal-framed panel construction, if the panel materials are any of those named in Paragraphs 1 through 3 above, glass, pre-finished metal (excluding unpainted galvanized iron), or plastic f. Other material as may be approved by the Zoning Board of Appeals. 2. All subsequent additions and outbuild-
ings constructed after the original building(s) must be harmonious in architectural design and general appearance. 3. Any other exterior wall finishes or any changes in architectural design must be approved by the Zoning Board of Appeals.

In the City owned business parks, the covenant does not allow pole type structures.

Maple Grove: Prohibits pole type construction by reference to exterior standards, no types of sheet metal for exterior in Commercial or Industrial

Little Falls: The City of Little Falls' ordinance doesn't really treat pole buildings differently than other buildings in commercial and industrial developments – at least not from a zoning perspective. All buildings are subject to the building code and if you had specific questions about how that is handled the City's contracted building inspector is David Barsody at 612-219-2252.

Staff has determined that there is no significant difference in other communities regarding B-2 versus B-3 Zoning Districts and alternative building materials. The City of Princeton has been encouraging growth and development, especially in the B-3 Zoning District. The allowance of alternative building materials, including pole type construction, is a way the City can encourage growth. By extending the allowance into the B-2 will allow for some redevelopment and in-fill development, but there is not a lot of undeveloped acreage in B-2 at this time. It is staff's recommendation to leave the B-2 chapter as stated in the existing Ordinance. This does not prohibit this type of building material, but it maintains the language that states, "Or other materials approved by the Planning Commission if determined to have a similar or better longevity and durability as material listed above." in the General Design Criteria. Any proposed development in B-2 will be subject to a Site Plan Review by the Zoning Administrator and would be presented to the Planning Commission for approval. If there was a request to use alternative building material, a thorough review and verification that the developer will meet all of the design criteria will be completed.
On December 8th, 2016 the City Council approved a moratorium on the issuance of any interim use permit within the City of Princeton and, further, the City Council requires its staff to initiate a study regarding the impacts of storage facilities within the city.

Prior to the moratorium, mini-storage facilities were allowed with an interim use permit in B-3 General Commercial District.

* Mini-storage facilities, including exterior and interior only accessible facilities provided that:

   (a) No building to exceed 4,000 square feet with no more than 4 buildings per site

   (b) No site shall be closer than 1,000 feet from another mini-storage facility.

   (c) No buildings shall be closer than 50 feet from a neighboring residential zone.

   (d) Units are to be used for dead storage only. Units are not to be used for retailing, auto repair, human habitation, or any commercial activity. Storage of any flammable or hazardous material is prohibited.

   (e) No outdoor storage is permitted.

   (f) The facility shall be secured by either the walls of the structure and/or fencing. All doors on the units shall face inward and away from the street.

Upon further research, it was clear that issuing an interim use permit for mini-storage was not the correct procedure. Interim Use Permits are for temporary use of a property until a particular date, until the occurrence of a particular event or until zoning regulations no longer permit it. A Conditional Use Permit (CUP) is a more appropriate permitting process as CUP's are a property right that runs with the land so it attaches to and benefits the land and is not limited to a particular land owner.

In researching the existing mini-storage ordinance, Staff created a map that shows the existing storage facilities, highlighting the 1000 foot buffer required around them. Staff also created a map showing where the remaining B-3 zones are and where potential storage facilities could be allowed.

Staff is requesting the Planning Commission evaluate the remaining locations where storage facilities could be located and determine if that would be the best use of that land.
These are the three existing mini-storage in B-3. The purple represents the 1000 foot buffer required.
This map represents the remaining B-3 that is not within the 1000 foot buffer. Storage facilities could be allowed here if they remain allowed with a permit in B-3.
MINUTES OF A STUDY SESSION OF THE PRINCETON CITY COUNCIL
HELD ON JANUARY 5 2017 4:30 P.M.

Mayor Paul Whitcomb called the meeting to order. Council member present was Thom Walker, Jack Edmonds, Jules Zimmer, and Jeff Reynolds. Staff present, Administrator Mark Karnowski, Finance Director Steve Jackson, Public Works Director Bob Gerold, Community Development Director Jolene Foss, Police Chief Todd Frederick, Clerk Shawna Jenkins, Engineer Andy Brotzler and Attorney Damian Toven

Swearing in of New Members

Karnowski swore in new council members Jack Edmonds and Jeff Reynolds

Aero Business Park Development Criteria

Foss stated that the City Council recently decided that in an effort to encourage development in Aero Business Park, they would sell the Aero Business Park lots for $1 plus the cost of the remaining assessments.

Staff thinks it would be appropriate to set development criteria for the sale of these lots.

The suggested development criteria is being discussed as:

1. Sale is contingent upon a minimum tax value increase agreement for the proposed facility of $400,000. With the current class rate, we should see the previous investment that the City made in preparation for these lots recovered in approximately 10 years.

2. Buyer shall obtain a contractor and lender and prepare plans for development of the property in full compliance with City, local and State building codes and zoning ordinances, to be constructed within one year of the closing approved by the Planning Commission and Council. The Purchase Agreement shall establish minimum requirements prior to closing including size of building, type of construction and intended development purpose.

3. At the time of closing, Lender and Buyer shall fund the development costs in escrow with the title company, assessments shall be paid to the seller and seller shall provide a limited Warranty Deed to Buyer. The limited Warranty Deed will assure completion of construction of a development that meets the previous criteria including the $400,000 minimum tax value increase requirement.

The Communities goals focus on job creation, recovery of expended costs and tax base development, as well as increased livability, improved amenities and increased quality of life. These development incentives are being offered in the hope that increased development in Aero Business Park will motivate development in Rivertown Crossing and throughout the community.

If Council finds this development criteria satisfactory, Staff will request completion of legal documents.

Reynolds asked if this would be $1 plus assessments and will the cost remain the same, or decrease in the future. Foss replied that the plan is to keep the costs the same for all 7 lots,
which would be the $1 plus the cost of the assessments as of today.

Edmonds asked about the privately owned lots on the other side of 21st. Foss said the majority is owned by the city. Karnowski stated that there is an issue on the east side of 21st. The distance from the right of way to the back lot line is not very deep, and there is a fiber optic cable that services the school district and the old flight service station that runs through the area. When the cross wind runway is removed from the Airport plan, a large piece of that land will become buildable. When people decide to develop that, he is anticipating that the city could sell those lots at that time.

Walker said his concern is that if all these all don’t sell, the assessment amount would lower as the time goes on. Whitcomb said he believed it was originally discussed to be the current cost of assessment today, regardless of when it sold.

Reynolds said his only concern was if it will affect the value of other properties that are for sale. If builders are interested in building, they are going to snap up these city lots first.

Edmonds asked how much the lots were originally priced at. Walker believes the recent cost was at $1 per square foot plus the assessments. Foss said they have not had any interest in the lots at that price.

Foss said one consideration that has been brought up, is if a nonprofit were to purchase a property that would not allow the city to recoup those costs through taxes. She is going to work with the attorney’s to determine how to handle that if it were to occur.

Walker asked what happens if the property is not developed. Foss said with it being a warranty deed, she believes that the land would then come back to the city if the criteria was not met

ZIMMER MOVED TO ACCEPT THIS CRITERIA. EDMONDS SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

**Roundabout Easement Acquisition options discussions**

Nielson reported that on September 22, 2016 City Council authorized presentation of offers to owners of the three parcels from which easements for the project are required and on October 3, 2016 offers were presented. One of the owners has signed the easement needed. On December 8, 2016 Council authorized purchase of remaining easements through eminent domain, if necessary. Staff had significant conversations and negotiations with the owners of the two parcels remaining from which easements are needed and is seeking direction from City Council concerning next steps in completing the acquisitions.

**SOUTHWEST QUADRANT PARCEL:**

Some distance separates the City’s offer from the counter offer of the Soule Trust, the owner of the parcel. Following is a history of offers made:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Offered Price</th>
<th>Price per square foot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City offer- owner rejected</td>
<td>$1,450</td>
<td>$.70 per square foot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soule counter offer</td>
<td>$8,525</td>
<td>$4.00 per square foot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff proposal- owner rejected</td>
<td>$4,250</td>
<td>$2.10 per square foot</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Soule accepts the method used by the City in its appraisal to convert land value to compensation for the temporary easement. Soule believes, however, that the City appraisal significantly undervalues their land. Following are facts Soule indicated the City should take into account in considering their counter offer:

- Walmart paid $4.21 per square foot for 14.62 acres in the area in April 2012.
- Advanced Auto paid $9.49 per square foot for .95 acres in the area in 2007.
- The City of Princeton paid $8.96 for 1.02 acres in the area for its liquor store in May 2006.
- Soule granted an easement of approximately 2.1 acres to the City in December 2002 from the same parcel affected by the subject easements, for all of County Road 157 (21st Avenue South) south of Trunk Highway 95 for no compensation.

Following are other facts the City may want to take into account in considering the counter offer:

- Soules were awarded compensation by condemnation commissioners in 2011 for a utility easement purchased by the City across the south edge of this parcel, apparently based on a July 2006 taking date, based on approximate value of $2.10 per square foot. Soule’s appraisal indicated that the parcel was worth $3.80 per square foot.
- A 19.37 acre parcel in the northeast quadrant of Trunk Highway 95 and County Road 157 was listed for sale for $650,000 at the time the City’s appraisal was prepared, equating to a value of $.69 per square foot.
- 3 comparable sales ranging from .69 to 2.07 acres were identified in the City appraisal ranging from somewhat less than $1 to somewhat less than $1.50 per square foot.

It can be argued that the values of parcels identified by Soule above are not comparable to the value of the subject parcel because each is a platted, fully developed lot in a platted, developed area of the City. It can also be argued that $650,000 asking price for the parcel in the northeast quadrant of this intersection should be adjusted upwards to compensate for the subject parcel having a greater percentage of usable land and being access-ready.

Given the City’s need for a temporary and permanent easement from the Soule Trust, the following three options appear to be available:

1. Move forward with eminent domain of the easements;
2. Agree to match the Soules $8,250 asking price for the easements; or
3. Increase the City’s offer to the Soules for the easements.

The City of Princeton is required by State law to reimburse the Soules for up to $5,000 of having their own appraisal completed and the Soules have engaged an appraiser to prepare an appraisal. Consequently the City may be required to reimburse the Soules as much as $5,000 under eminent domain, probably somewhat less if the City agrees to the owner’s counter offer and probably somewhere between the two if agreement is reached based on an increased offer from the City. The Soules have been requested to hold up on the ap-
praisal and let the City know how much has been invested in the appraisal to date, but they have not responded to this request. If the City acquires through eminent domain significant legal costs could be as high as $15,000 to $20,000 and commissioner fees and appraisal testimony costs would be additional.

Following are a listing of pros and cons of each of the options that appear to be available to the City:

**PROS OF OPTIONS**

**Eminent Domain-**
Appraisal supports offer of $1,450 for easements

**Match Counter Offer-**
Resolves matter immediately
Lower net cost than eminent domain option

**Increase City Offer**
If accepted would be the lowest net cost option

**CONS OF OPTIONS**
Net cost of acquiring easements will likely be greater than acquiring by other options even if the City pays its appraised value for the easements

May make acquisitions more difficult or more expensive in the future for the City
Unreasonably compensates owner

Results are uncertain and will take time to ascertain

**NORTHWEST QUADRANT PARCEL-**
The owner of this parcel was offered $15,800 in compensation by the City for easements and damages to trees and shrubs in the easements, based on the City's appraisal. The $1,950 offered for easements is acceptable to Jeanette Oakes, the owner of the property, but Ms. Oakes feels the $13,850 offered for damages to trees and shrubs undervalued some items and undervalued others. Following is a history of offers made:

City offer- owner rejected $15,800
Owner's counter offer $21,200
Staff proposal- owner rejected $17,000
Owner's revised counter offer $18,800
Staff revised proposal- owner rejected $18,000

Significant movement towards settlement by both the owner and the City acting through staff has occurred and the $800 difference separating the owner's last offer from the staff's last proposal is about 5% of the initial offer. Staff believes that the owner's contention that the original offer undervalued some trees and shrubs and undervalued others has some validity. The same options are open to the City on this parcel as is the case on the parcel in the southwest quadrant and the pros and cons of each are similar.
Karnowski stated that if the city ends up paying one property owner more per foot than another property owner, it can skew things a bit. However, he believes the city can make an argument in this case for the recognition of the previous contribution to the improvements in the general area.

Walker added that $4000 for 2 acres is not a lot if you add in the previous easement that they offered to the City.

Brotzler said there is some temporary easements that will be needed as well, but these are permanent.

Zimmer said he does not feel like these amounts are unreasonable. Each situation is going to be different. Whitcomb added that he would like if they would settle for a little lesser amount, but if they will not than he is okay with this amount.

Edmonds asked how much the other property owner settled for. Brotzler responded that it was very similar to the original offer that the city made to Soule’s.

Karnowski added that when 21st Ave was originally built, the engineer objected to the request for a direct driveway from 21st to the gas station. The city agreed to put that driveway in for that property owner, so he feels that may have been remembered when this easement was requested.

WALKER MOVED TO APPROVE THE OFFER WITH SOULES AS DISCUSSED AND RECOGNITION OF THE PREVIOUS EASEMENT, AND THE SUGGESTED OFFER TO THE SECOND PROPERTY AS WELL. REYNOLDS SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

**School District Assessment Partial Pay**

Karnowski advised that when the School District set up their 2016 budget, they did not anticipate there being three change orders relating to the 7th Avenue North sewer and water project and budgeted only for the anticipated $260,000 project assessment.

Accordingly, they are requesting that the City allow them to pay the $260,000 now and have the balance ($60,194.01) placed on the assessment roll. The city has checked with the County Auditor’s office and they’ve indicated they can still modify the assessment paperwork.

So, if the Council is willing to allow the partial pay of the School District’s assessment, a motion to adopt the appropriate resolution accepting the School District’s partial payment of $260,000 and, accordingly, amend the assessment roll adopted at the November 22, 2016 City Council meeting such that the assessment reflects that partial payment setting the new assessed amount at $60,194.01 would be in order.

Walker asked if they are in agreement with the change orders on the project. Karnowski responded that they had a meeting today and there may be an adjustment on the balance.

Zimmer asked if not getting the full amount hurts the city. Jackson said the intention all along was for them to pay the full amount. However, the city does have a fund that is meant for assessments and there should be enough in there to fund the $60,000 for the short term. It is not what the original plan was, but the city can adapt.
ZIMMER MOVED TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 17-1 FOR A PARTIAL PAY BY THE SCHOOL DISTRICT. WALKER SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

**Goal Setting Discussion**

Karnowski reported that in the past the City Council has reviewed the list of goals from the previous years and, individually rated them.

Because we have 2 new members this year, staff thought it would be a refreshing exercise to have each of the Council members each write down their top five (5) goals they'd like to see accomplished in 2017. Council members can certainly list more than five.

The plan would then be to compile the list and then have the Council prioritize them so staff knows where to concentrate our efforts in 2017.

Walker stated that he would like to see the list start fresh. There are 2 new council members now, so it may be nice to have some fresh eyes on the various projects.

Karnowski asked for the council members to share their top 5 projects.

Whitcomb said his list would include a 21st Ave extension, development of the Arcadian Homes site, a walking bridge over river, and a boat launch and new restroom in Riverside Park.

Zimmer stated his would be the Roundabout on Highway 95 and 21st, help lessen the traffic on Rum River Drive by extending 21st Ave, development in Aero Business Park and Rivertowne Crossing, the Drug Task Force, and completion of a bike trail from Crystal Cabinets to Mark Park.

Walker commented his would be the development of Aero Business Park and Rivertowne Crossing, the bike trail, sidewalk to the grocery store, resolve airport boundary issues and have a written plan on file, develop a process for budget surplus and liquor store proceeds (whether assessment relief, etc.) and some additional rental units in the city.

Karnowski responded that the City is currently working on the Airport master plan and as part of that process, those issues will be taken care of. The Airport Master Plan should be done at by the end of 2017. He added that in regard to the Liquor Store proceeds, it entirely pays for the new Public Safety building, which in terms saves the residents money on their taxes.

Walker added that he would also like to work on an Infrastructure plan, and a plan to replace and repair the sidewalks.

Reynolds stated that his goals would be the same as many mentioned. He would like to see more middle income housing and if we were to get up to that 5000 population, it would give the city more funds to work with for our roads. He feels the city should market the parks and trails a bit more as well.
Edmonds said that he did not write down any talking points, but agrees with much of what has been said. He isn't sure how the city could climb to a population of 5000 without annexing some land, but agrees that the state aid money would be very helpful. He would also like to see an extension on 21st and the sharp corner fixed near Sterling Pointe. He was involved with the Arcadian site while on the Planning Commission and agrees that it should be developed. In talking to people in town, he hears many comments on why the roads are so rough. He said he has explained that many of the roads were gravel roads at one point and are now many layers of seal coat.

Foss reported that the owners of the old Steven's Building have met with the building inspector, so they can begin doing the work that they were wanting to do.

Carroll Ossel asked if the council's goals can be put on the city's website. Staff agreed.

**Replacing 2002 Police Chevrolet 4 wheel Drive Tahoe**

Frederick advised that Ranger GMC is now the new Chevrolet state bid program for ordering a scheduled replacement squad for the year of 2017. The total purchase price including delivery is approximately $37,000.00 for a 2017 Chevrolet Police Pursuit 4 wheel drive Tahoe. The add on options for the squad have been limited to items such as, removing carpet and adding rubber floors, adding LED spot lamp to driver's side door, wiring package, wiring tunnel (front engine compartment to rear cargo). In addition to the price of the squad there is approximately 13,000.00 budgeted for replacement of the equipment as well as conversion cost.

The Princeton Police Department will be replacing the 2002 4 wheel drive Chevrolet Tahoe which has approximately 120,000 thousand miles on it. This squad has been used as a patrol squad and Reserve Squad.

Frederick stated that he is also seeking council authorization to dispose of the 2002 Chevrolet Tahoe.

He said he is attempting to negotiate the sale of the above squad car again to the Mille Lacs County Animal Control Officer or another interested Public Safety Department. If he cannot reach a satisfactory sale price based off of Kelly Blue Book Value, he would like to take it to Public Auction. He will be trying to still be cognitive of getting the most out of the police department's used equipment for transfer.

Walker and Zimmer both agreed that the police need a large vehicle and in 4 wheel Drive.

Zimmer moved to approve the purchase of a Ranger GMC, not to exceed $37,000 for the vehicle and $13,000 for added equipment and to sell the 2002 Tahoe. Walker seconded the motion.
Frederick stated the issue they have had with the Chevy’s is that they deal more with a broker instead of a standard dealer. Currently they have a contract with Rum River Auto, and that includes Rum River taking it to a dealer for any warranty work, so that is helpful.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Ernholtz Subordination Agreement

Jackson reported that this was a Small Cities Development loan that developed rapidly and just came to staff today. Because of the timeline, if the Council is comfortable, he is asking for approval contingent in it being a straight refinance and no cash being taken out. This was a Small City’s Development program loan.

Walker asked if we were first in line. Jackson responded said we are second in line, the original mortgage is first. If it is a straight refinancing he doesn’t see a problem. He thinks they may not even continue with it if they cannot get any cash out. He will confirm with the loan company before any documents are sent out.

ZIMMER MOVED TO ADJOURN THE STUDY SESSION AT 5:35PM. WAER SECONDED THE MOTION. MEETING ADJOURNED

Respectfully Submitted,

Shawna Jenkins
City Clerk

ATTEST:

Paul Whitcomb, Mayor
MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING OF THE PRINCETON CITY COUNCIL HELD ON
JANUARY 12, 2017 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, Jack Edmonds, Jules Zimmer and Jeff Reynolds. Others present: Administrator Mark Karnowski, Finance Director Steve Jackson, Police Chief Todd Frederick, Development Director Jolene Foss, Public Works Director Bob Gerold, Clerk Shawna Jenkins, Engineer Andy Brotzler, and Attorney's Kelli Bourgeois and Jamian Toven.

AGENDA ADDITIONS/DELETIONS

CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES

A. Regular Meeting Minutes of December 22, 2016
B. Study Session Meeting Minutes of January 5, 2017

WALKER MOVED TO APPROVE THE REGULAR MEETING MINUTES OF DECEMBER 22, 2016 AND THE STUDY SESSION MEETING MINUTES OF JANUARY 5, 2017. REYNOLDS SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

CONSENT AGENDA

A. Permits and Licenses
   1. Firehouse BBQ Annual Food Vendor License
B. Personnel
C. Donations/Designations
   1. Resolution 17-02 accept donation to the Fire & Rescue Department

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. Planning Commission Meeting of December 19, 2016
B. EDA Board Meeting of December 15, 2016

PETITIONS, REQUESTS, AND COMMUNICATIONS

ORDINANCES AND RESOLUTIONS

A. Resolution 17-02 - Annual Council Designations

Karnowski reported that this resolution is done yearly to designate the various depositories, collateral authority and the official newspaper.

ZIMMER MOVED TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 17-03 ADOPTING THE RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR THE CITY COUNCIL, DESIGNATION OF OFFICIAL DEPOSITORIES, COLLATERAL AUTHORITY AND THE OFFICIAL NEWSPAPER. REYNOLDS SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

B. Joint Resolution 17-04 - Anderson / Swanson detachment

Karnowski advised that at the December 22, 2016 meeting the Council was in agreement to approve the detachment of the Anderson and Swanson properties. There has been some discussion regarding this orderly annexation agreement not being appropriate for this situation. Karnowski called the state in regard to the orderly annexation to find out if they were ap-
provable by the state. He spoke to Star who is head of the department. She advised that using an orderly annexation agreement does not meet the state guidelines. The City attorney will speak to Star at the state tomorrow. The goal is to approve the detachment, and include the proper verbiage to meet the council's requirements if the property was developed in the future.

Bourgeois stated that at the last meeting there was discussion in how to put in the agreement that if the land were to be developed it would need to be annexed back into the City. Toven and she came up with the orderly annexation agreement, which they felt would meet what the Council had desired. If they can continue to the next meeting, they can speak with Star at the state to find out how those requirements should be met.

Greg Anderson said they requested the detachment at the last meeting. All the council needs to do is approve a detachment, and the family and the city can come up with a separate agreement to meet the other requirements. They would like a nice simple detachment resolution done tonight so they can move on with the process.

Toven added that the underlying issue is the Council's requirement that the property reverts back to the city if the property were developed in the future. The only way to ensure that happens is to tie that requirement legally to the land.

Whitcomb questioned Walker if he was okay with just approving the simple detachment being the original motion was to include the future development annexation requirement. Walker said he doesn't feel waiting 2 more weeks is a big deal. If the land ever was developed it wouldn't be likely that any staff or Council would be still around to remember there was an agreement. If by the next meeting something isn't drafted that meets those requirements, he would agree to approve the simple detachment.

Greg Anderson was not in favor tabling the detachment until the next meeting, and argued that the council did approve the detachment at the last meeting.

Walker replied that the City has approved the request, but that they also want to make sure the future development requirement is documented.

Whitcomb asked Anderson if the Township would be in favor of this type of agreement. Anderson replied that he is not sure, but it is his opinion that if that property were to develop it would have to come back into the city regardless of an agreement being in place due to the Township's zoning.

Edmonds said he agrees with Walker that if the property was ever developed it would not be likely that anyone here or in the Township would still be around. He is in favor of just approving the detachment.

Zimmer commented that it was a 4 to 1 vote at the last Council meeting, but agrees with the Attorney that the city should take some precaution on the future annexation agreement.

Karnowski stated that in talking to Star at Boundary Adjustments, he was informed that the city does not have to do anything at this point. The Township could submit the request to the State and then the City would be contacted. Anderson replied that he also talked with Star and she told him to send the Township and City Resolution along with his petition.

Walker stated that the City is 90% there, he just wants the resolution to state that if that property develops it would need to come back in the city. He understands Anderson wants to get it done tonight, but it is important to him to try to get this in the resolution. If it doesn't happen by the next meeting, he is in favor of just passing a detachment.
Whitcomb asked for clarification that there would be 2 resolutions, one for the detachment and one with the future annexation requirement. Bourgeois replied that was correct, one to detach, then one as an orderly annexation if the property was ever developed. The detachment would be dependent on the orderly annexation being approved. Boards, Council’s, Staff and zoning changes over the years. This agreement would protect the property even 50 years from now.

WHITCOMB MOVED TO APPROVE THE DETACHMENT REQUEST. EDMONDS SECONDED THE MOTION. VOTE: 4:1, ZIMMER OPPOSED. THE MOTION CARRIED

Walker asked Anderson if he would bring an Orderly Annexation Agreement to the Township for approval. Anderson replied he will absolutely present it to the Township for approval.

C. Ordinance 744 – lot width amendment – FINAL READING

Foss reported that there has been no changes since this was introduced. This amendment will allow lot width that creates a non-conforming lot in specifically defined circumstances by a variance.

ZIMMER MOVED TO APPROVE ORDINANCE 744 AMENDING ZONING ORDINANCE CHAPTER V (ZONING DISTRICTS), SECTION 5 OF R-2 RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT ZONING ORDINANCE ALLOWING LOT WIDTH THAT CREATES A NON-CONFORMING LOT IN SPECIFICALLY DEFINED CIRCUMSTANCES FROM CITY OF PRINCETON ZONING ORDINANCE #538. REYNOLDS SECONDED THE MOTION.

Walker questioned if this would allow any lot to be changed. Foss replied that in R2, any natural features that would cause an issue will be looked at and if they present an issue, a non-conforming lot may be approved. Walker asked if there would still be a size requirement. Foss replied that is correct, this amendment would only allow a smaller width in some cases.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

D. Ordinance 745 – rear yard setback amendment

Foss advised that there are no changes since the introduction of this ordinance. This will allow a rear yard setback at 15 feet when measured from a rear attached garage. The code originally read that the rear setback was 30 feet. The Planning Commission has requested that if you have a rear facing garage, you are allowed to have a 15 foot setback. We are encouraging them to have a rear attached garage, without creating an accessory building.

WALKER MOVED TO APPROVE ORDINANCE 745 AMENDING ZONING ORDINANCE CHAPTER V (ZONING DISTRICTS), SECTION 5 OF R-1 AND R-2 RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT ZONING ORDINANCE ALLOWING REAR YARD SETBACK AT 15 FEET WHEN MEASURED FROM A REAR ATTACHED GARAGE FROM CITY OF PRINCETON ZONING ORDINANCE #538. ZIMMER SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

E. Resolution 17-05 – Tax forfeited property purchase

Foss stated that Mille Lacs County has a parcel of land located to the east of Aero Business Park that has gone into forfeiture. The City has been budgeting and planning for the purchase of the three remaining parcels along that eastern side of the street for numerous years.
The long term intended use of this property would be for access into the R-3 Multi Family Zoning District that is east of 21st Ave.

Staff is requesting that the City of Princeton offer to buy the land at the purchase price of $1,800.00. The special assessments on this particular parcel is $2,024.46 and would be paid in full.

The acquisition of these parcels have been budgeted for in the 2017 Capital Improvement Plan.

WALKER MOVED TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 17-05 APPROVING THE PURCHASE OF THIS TAX FORFEITED PROPERTY FOR THE PURCHASE PRICE OF $1,800. ZIMMER SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. Main sanitary Lift station Pay Voucher #7

Karnowski advised that this is pay voucher #7 in the amount of $8,851.96. The quantities completed to date have been reviewed and agreed upon by the contractor and the City Engineer. The project is completed, minus a 5% retainage. They will be doing a punch list and those items will be completed in the spring.

WALKER MOVED TO APPROVE PAY VOUCHER #7 IN THE AMOUNT OF $8,851.96. EDMONDS SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

B. Soule Roundabout easement agreement

Brotzler advised that as the council directed at the last meeting, an agreement has been made with Robert and Madelyn Soule. Full compensation for the conveyance of said property, the city of Princeton shall pay the owners the sum of eight thousand two hundred and fifty dollars ($8,250) and the city will reimburse the owner for up to five thousand dollars ($5,000) of cost incurred for the partially completed appraisal in the amount of three thousand dollars ($3,000). They did receive invoices from the Soule's appraiser in regard to their costs incurred.

Karnowski stated that since the Oak's have also agreed to a cost, it may be a good idea for the Council to approve that agreement as well so the bid requests can go out.

WALKER MOVED TO APPROVE THE MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT WITH ROBERT AND MADELYN SOULE AND MS. OAKS WITH THE TERMS DISCUSSED AT THE LAST MEETING, FOR THE EASEMENTS NEEDED FOR THE TH95 AND CR157 ROUNDABOUT ON CONDITION THAT STAFF APPROVES AND THE DOCUMENTS ARE SIGNED. ZIMMER SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

NEW BUSINESS

A. Board and Commission Liaisons and acting Mayor

Karnowski advised that at the first meeting of every year, the liaisons and acting mayor need to be appointed.

EDMONDS MOVED TO APPOINT THE FOLLOWING LIAISONS
PLANNING COMMISSION – JEFF REYNOLDS
PARK BOARD – JULES ZIMMER
AIRPORT ADVISORY BOARD – THOM WALKER
PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION – JACK EDMONDS
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION – THOM WALKER AND JULES ZIMMER
FIRE ADVISORY BOARD – PAUL WHITCOMB
HOUSING AND REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY – JEFF REYNOLDS
TREE BOARD – JEFF REYNOLDS
CABLE COMMISSION – THOM WALKER
MILLE LACS CO HISTORICAL SOCIETY – JEFF REYNOLDS
LIBRARY (P.A.L.S.) - JACK EDMONDS
ECRDC BOARD – THOM WALKER
CHAMBER OF COMMERCE – PAUL WHITCOMB
ZIMMER SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

WHITCOMB MOVED TO APPOINT THOM WALKER AS THE ACTING MAYOR FOR 2017.
ZIMMER 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 $127,722.23 AND THE ITEMS LISTED ON THE LIQUOR BILL LIST AND GENERAL CITY BILL LIST WHICH WILL BE CHECKS 74849 TO 74953 FOR A TOTAL OF $990,870.15. WALKER SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

ADJOURNMENT
There being no further business:

WALKER MOVED TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 7:49 PM. REYNOLDS SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Respectfully Submitted, ATTEST:

__________________________
Shawna Jenkins
City Clerk

__________________________
Paul Whitcomb, Mayor