1. Call to Order/Pledge of Allegiance

2. Approval of Minutes of Regular Meeting on August 19\textsuperscript{th}, 2019 - Tab A

3. Agenda Additions/Deletions

4. Public Hearing: None

5. New Business:
   A. DQ and Coborn’s Pylon Sign – Tab B
   B. Site Plan Review for Aero Business Park First Addition, Lot 1, Block 1 & Admin. Lot Split – Tab C
   C. Noise Barrier Program – Tab D

6. Old Business:
   A. Land Use Map – Tab E

7. Communication and Reports:
   A. Verbal Report
      1) MN-1 Industrial District Ordinance Discussion – Tab F
   B. City Council Minutes for September, 2019 – Tab G

8. Adjournment
THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION HELD ON AUGUST 19, 2019, AT 7:00 P.M., AT THE CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBERS

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 P.M., by Dan Erickson. Members present were Scott Moller, Victoria Hallin, Eldon Johnson, and Gene Stoeckel (Princeton Twp. Rep). Staff present were Robert Barbian (City Administrator), Stephanie Hillesheim (Community Development Specialist), and Mary Lou DeWitt (Comm. Development).

Absent was Jeff Reynolds.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING ON JULY 15, 2019
HALLIN MOVED, SECOND BY MOLLER, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF JULY 15, 2019. UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 4 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

AGENDA ADDITIONS / DELETIONS:
HALLIN MOVED, SECOND BY JOHNSON, TO ADD UNDER VERBAL REPORT, ITEM 3, MARCIA ANDERSON. UNDER NEW BUSINESS, ITEM A, REMOVE FROM THE AGENDA THE FAÇADE GRANT APPLICATION AT 519 FIRST STREET. UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 4 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

PUBLIC HEARING:
A. #19-03 Interim Use Permit for Chickens at 414 7th Avenue South

Mary Lou DeWitt, Comm. Dev. Memo:

BACKGROUND
Ashleigh & Robert Blasey have submitted an Interim Use Permit application for the raising and keeping of chickens on their property located at 414 7th Avenue South. The property is zoned R-2, Residential District.

The public hearing notice has been sent to the properties 350 feet from this site. Two neighbors have contacted staff and said the applicants already have the chickens and they are in support of allowing the Interim Use Permit.

ANALYSIS
The housing and keeping of chickens in the R-2 District requires an Interim Use Permit. Chapter VI.BB lists the review criteria for the housing of chickens:

No person shall own, keep, harbor, or have custody of any live chickens without first obtaining an Interim Use Permit in writing from the City, in accordance with the provisions of Section IV.6 of the Zoning Ordinance and subject to the following conditions:

a. The keeping of any poultry besides chickens is prohibited.
Comment: This shall be conditions of approval.
b. **Roosters are prohibited.**
   
   **Comment:** This shall be a condition of approval.

   
c. **No more than four (4) chickens shall be housed or kept on any one residential lot in any area of the city zoned R-1, R-2, or R-3.**
   
   **Comment:** The applicant is requesting to have 4 (four) chickens and understands this is the allowed limit, and will be a condition of approval.

   
d. **Chickens shall only be allowed on single family home lots.**
   
   **Comment:** This condition is met, still will be a condition of approval.

   
e. **Outdoor slaughtering of chickens in city limits is prohibited.**
   
   **Comment:** This shall be a condition of approval.

   
f. **Chicken fighting shall not be allowed within city limits.**
   
   **Comment:** This shall be a condition of approval.

   
g. **Leg banding of all chickens is required. The bands must identify the owner’s name, address, and telephone number.**
   
   **Comment:** This shall be a condition of approval.

   
h. **Chickens shall not be housed in a residential house or an attached or detached garage.**
   
   **Comment:** The applicant has provided a layout of a chicken coup and run area that will be installed, still will be a condition of approval.

   
i) **A separate coop is required to house the chickens. Coops must be constructed and maintained to meet the following minimum standards:**
   1) **Located in the side or rear yard.**
   
   **Comment:** The applicant will have the coop located in the fenced area of their rear yard.

   
   2) **Meet the accessory structure setback requirements.**
   
   **Comment:** The proposed location meets the setback requirements.

   
   3) **Construction shall be adequate to prevent access by rodents.**
   
   **Comment:** Per the proposed coop design, the coop will be anchored on four post that will be 24” inches above the ground.

   
j. **A run or exercise yard is required to be provided and must be enclosed by a fence.**
   
   **Comment:** The applicant’s back yard is fenced and the run area will have its own fencing.

   
k. **All premises on which chickens are kept or maintained shall be kept clean from filth, garbage, and any substances which attract rodents. The coop and its surrounding much be cleaned frequently enough to control odor. Manure shall not be allowed to accumulate in a way that causes an unsanitary condition or causes odors detectible on another property.**
Comment: This shall be a condition of approval.

1. All food shall be stored in an enclosed, rodent proof container.
   Comment: This shall be a condition of approval.

m. Dead chickens shall be disposed of in accordance with the Minnesota Board of Animal Health rules, which require chicken carcasses to be disposed of as soon as possible after death, usually within 48 to 72 hours. Legal forms of chicken carcass disposal include offsite burial, offsite incineration or rendering, or offsite composting.
   Comment: This shall be a condition of approval.

Interim Use Permit Review Standards: When reviewing the application for an interim use, the City shall base its judgement on the following factors it may deem appropriate for the specific property. The interim use may be granted if:

1. The proposed use is an interim use listed in the district in which the application is being made.
   Comment: The keeping of chickens is an Interim Use in the R-2 District.

2. The date or event that will terminate the use can be identified with certainty and continued.
   Comment: The Planning Commission shall recommend to the City Council a date or event that will terminate the keeping of chickens. Staff would recommend that the keeping of chickens terminate when the current property owners sell the property. The Interim Permit can also be reviewed upon complaints.

3. The interim use does not result in adverse effects on the public health, safety and welfare nor does it create additional pollution for ground and surface waters.
   Comment: If the listed conditions are met, the interim use does not appear that it will result in adverse effects on the public health, safety, and welfare, nor does it create additional pollution potential.

4. Permission of the use will not impose additional costs on the public if it is necessary for the public to take the property in the future.
   Comment: It does not appear the use will impose additional costs on the public if it is necessary for the public to take the property in the future.

CONCLUSION/RECOMMENDATION
Based on the findings that the proposed Interim Use appears to meet the standards for the keeping of chickens and the general review standards for an Interim Use Permit, as listed in the Zoning Ordinance. Staff would recommend the Planning Commission approval of the proposed Interim Use Permit to keep chickens at 414 7th Avenue South, subject to the following conditions (as listed in the Ordinance):

1. The keeping of any poultry besides chickens is prohibited.
2. Roosters are prohibited.
3. No more than four (4) chickens shall be housed.
4. Outdoor slaughtering is prohibited.
5. Chicken fighting shall not be allowed.
6. Leg banding of all chickens is required. The bands must identify the owner’s name, address, and telephone number.
7. A separate coop is required to house the chickens. Coops much be constructed and maintained to meet the following minimum standards:
   a) Located in the side or rear yard.
   b) Meet the accessory structure setback requirements.
   c) Construction shall be adequate to prevent access by rodents.
   d) If the coop is 120 SF or larger, a building permit is required.
8. A run or exercise yard is required to be provided and must be enclosed by a fence.
9. All premises on which chickens are kept or maintained shall be kept clean from filth, garbage, and any substances which attract rodents. The coop and its surroundings must be cleaned frequently enough to control odor. Manure shall not be allowed to accumulate in a way that causes an unsanitary condition or causes odors detectible on another property.
10. All food shall be stored in an enclosed, rodent proof container.
11. Dead chickens shall be disposed of according to the Minnesota Board of Animal Health rules, which require chicken carcasses to be disposed of as soon as possible after death, usually within 48 to 72 hours. Legal forms of chicken carcass disposal include offsite burial, offsite incineration or rendering, or offsite composting.
12. The keeping of chickens terminate when the current property owners vacate the property.
13. The Interim Permit can be reviewed upon complaints.

The Planning Commission recommendation shall to the City Council at their August 22, 2019 meeting.

*End of Memo*

Ashleigh Blasey, Applicant’s Memo:

I, Ashleigh Blasey would like to have the allowed amount of 4 chickens on my own property. I have read the rules and the stipulations of the Ordinance 691. I also have made my thoughts known with close neighbors, and they think it’s a great idea. I will keep my coop clean and closed up to deter predators, and if any mice get in the coop, I’m sure the chickens will them, because they’re little dinosaurs.

*End of Memo*

Two of the neighbors each wrote a letter of support that was brought into City Hall today, August 19, 2019:

Marlys Baldwin
607 4th Street South
Princeton
I have no problem with the neighbor having chickens in their yard.

Gloria Bromberg
412 7th Avenue South
Princeton

Dear Hearing:
I am the next door neighbor and I have no problem of them getting chickens. I also talked to some of the neighbors and they all approve of the ones I have talked to. I will be fun to hear some chuckling again.

DeWitt explained to the Planning Commission the Ordinance for the raising and keeping of the chickens. An Interim Use Permit will be reviewed by the Planning Commission tonight and final approval will be by the City Council. A public hearing notice had been sent out to the neighboring properties 350 feet from the site and staff did receive two notes from neighbors that were dropped off at City Hall and phone calls also from them saying they support their neighbor having chickens. The two memos where handed out to the Planning Commission Board. Robert Blasey the applicant was present to answer any questions the Board may have.

Barbian asked what will the materials be for construction.

Blasey said plywood and FRP material and also green treated wood. The design of their coop is almost exact to the plans shown.

Moller asked if the city residents have to apply for an Interim Use Permit to raise chickens.

DeWitt said yes, and the Council will have final approval. If approved the Interim Use Permit will be recorded with Mille Lacs County.

HALLIN MOVED, SECOND BY MOLLER, TO OPEN THE PUBLIC HEARING. UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 4 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

There was no one present with any comments.

HALLIN MOVED, SECOND BY MOLLER, TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING. UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 4 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

HALLIN MOVED, SECOND BY JOHNSON, TO FORWARD TO THE CITY COUNCIL WITH THE RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL OF ITEM #19-03 INTERIM USE PERMIT FOR CHICKENS AT 414 7TH AVENUE SOUTH, FOR ASHLEIGH & ROBERT BLASEY, IN THE R-2 RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:
1. THE KEEPING OF ANY POULTRY BESIDES CHICKENS IS PROHIBITED.
2. ROOSTERS ARE PROHIBITED.
3. NO MORE THAN FOUR (4) CHICKENS SHALL BE HOUSED.
4. OUTDOOR SLAUGHTERING IS PROHIBITED.
5. CHICKEN FIGHTING SHALL NOT BE ALLOWED.
6. LEG BANDING OF ALL CHICKENS IS REQUIRED. THE BANDS MUST IDENTIFY THE OWNER’S NAME, ADDRESS, AND TELEPHONE NUMBER.
7. A SEPARATE COOP IS REQUIRED TO HOUSE THE CHICKENS. COOPS MUST BE CONSTRUCTED AND MAINTAINED TO MEET THE FOLLOWING MINIMUM STANDARDS:
   A) LOCATED IN THE SIDE OR REAR YARD.
   B) MEET THE ACCESSORY STRUCTURE SETBACK REQUIREMENTS.
   C) CONSTRUCTION SHALL BE ADEQUATE TO PREVENT ACCESS BY RODENTS.
   D) IF THE COOP IS 120 SF OR LARGER, A BUILDING PERMIT IS REQUIRED.
8. A RUN OR EXERCISE YARD IS REQUIRED TO BE PROVIDED AND MUST BE ENCLOSED BY A FENCE.
9. ALL PREMISES ON WHICH CHICKENS ARE KEPT OR MAINTAINED SHALL BE KEPT CLEAN FROM FILTH, GARBAGE, AND ANY SUBSTANCES WHICH ATTRACT RODENTS. THE COOP AND ITS SURROUNDING MUST BE CLEANED FREQUENTLY ENOUGH TO CONTROL ODOR. MANURE SHALL NOT BE ALLOWED TO ACCUMULATE IN A WAY THAT CAUSES AN UNSANITARY CONDITION OR CAUSES ODORS DETECTIBLE ON ANOTHER PROPERTY.
10. ALL FOOD SHALL BE STORED IN AN ENCLOSED, RODENT PROOF CONTAINER.
11. DEAD CHICKENS SHALL BE DISPOSED OF ACCORDING TO THE MINNESOTA BOARD OF ANIMAL HEALTH RULES, WHICH REQUIRE CHICKEN CARCASSES TO BE DISPOSED OF AS SOON AS POSSIBLE AFTER DEATH, USUALLY INCINERATION OR RENDERING, OR OFFSITE COMPOSTING.
12. THE KEEPING OF CHICKENS TERMINATE WHEN THE CURRENT PROPERTY OWNERS VACATE THE PROPERTY.
13. THE INTERIM PERMIT CAN BE REVIEWED UPON COMPLAINTS.

UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 4 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

The Planning Commission Board reviewed the Findings of Fact:
1. Is the proposed use an interim use listed in the district in which the application is being made? Yes.
2. Is the date or event that will terminate the use can be identified with certainty and continued? Yes.
3. The interim use does not result in adverse effects on the public health, safety and welfare nor does it create additional pollution potential for ground and surface waters? No.
4. Would permission of the use not impose additional costs on the public if it is necessary for the public to take the property in the future? No.

The Commission recommends approval of a Interim Use Permit, based upon the Findings of Fact, with the noted conditions.
B. #19-04 Variance for Home Addition at 1302 Third Street North
Mary Lou DeWitt, Community Development Memo:

BACKGROUND
Jason & Deanna Stock have submitted an application for a variance for a rear yard setback of 14.5 feet from the required 30 foot setback, current setback is 18.5 feet from the property line. The property site is located at 1302 3rd Street North and zoned R-2 Residential District.

ANALYSIS
The subject parcel is located on a corner lot with the Mille Lacs County Fairgrounds on the west and 13th Avenue North on the east.

Jason & Deanna Stock currently have a breezeway that connects from the house to the single car garage. Their home was built in 1960 with 936’ square footage. They would like to expand the breezeway into a home addition where it would increase the size of the kitchen/dining room area and create a mud room and office. This expansion would be 4’ feet beyond the rear of the house and match up with the front of the house, with 8’ feet in width, that totals 240’ square feet. The applicants have expressed in the attached memo that the current kitchen is too small to cook in and lacks storage space as well as the dining room only accommodates three people at the table. Expanding the interior area will improve the function, enjoyment, and value of their home.

The proposed attached garage would be 28’ x 28’ area, a total of 784’ square feet, replacing the current attached one car garage west of the home. The new garage would allow both vehicles to be parked inside and accommodate storage for home and yard equipment. The extra 4’ feet to the rear allows space for the truck or boat. The current garage foundation and newly cemented driveway would stay to keep the cost down.

The R-2 Residential District rear yard minimum setback is 30 feet. The applicants have recently had their property surveyed and the rear yard setback is 18.5 feet. For this proposed addition, the current 18.5 foot setback would be reduced to 14.5 feet from the rear property line. The neighboring property owner that is adjacent to the back yard has given their written support of the variance, and this is provided for review.

The side yard setbacks are met with this addition as well as the front yard setback. The applicant will be building an attached 5’ x 20’ covered deck, total of 60 square feet. The requirement for the front yard setback can be reduced to 20’ feet for a porch. With the proposed porch, the setback will be 25’ feet.

Variance Review Standards: According to Section 2 of Chapter IV of the Zoning Ordinance, requests may be made for a variance from the literal provisions of the Zoning Ordinance in instances when the applicant for the variance establishes that there are practical difficulties in complying with the Zoning Ordinance.
A variance shall not be granted by the Planning Commission unless it conforms to the following standards:

1. **Is the variance in harmony with the general purposes and intent of the Zoning Ordinance?**
   Comment: One of the purposes of the Zoning Ordinance is to establish regulations to promote the public health, safety, morals, and general welfare of the residents of Princeton, which is accomplished through regulating the location of structures. This property was built in 1960 and has a rear yard setback of 18.5 feet. The proposed addition and attached garage would be built 4' feet into that setback, leaving 14.5 feet instead of the required 30' feet setback from the rear property line. The neighboring property owner has given written support for the variance.

2. **Is the variance consistent with the Comprehensive Plan?**
   Comment: The act of renovating/adding on to an existing home is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. The Comprehensive Plan identifies that the traditional neighborhoods are not designed for today's family and encourages the maintenance and enhancement of the older housing stock.

3. **Does the property owner propose to use the property in a reasonable manner not permitted by the Zoning Ordinance?**
   Comment: The property owner proposes to use this portion of the property as a single-family home addition, which is reasonable. The layout of the lot makes it difficult to meet the rear yard setback.

4. **Are there circumstances unique to this property not created by the landowners?**
   Comment: This property was built in 1960 with 936' total square footage. The current Zoning Ordinance requirement for a single-family dwelling minimum finished ground level main floor area shall be 1,000 sq. ft. with basement and 1,100 sq. ft. without basement. It is not unreasonable for the property owner to expand the living area of their home and be able to park both of their vehicles inside a garage.

5. **Will the issuance of the variance maintain the essential character of the locality?**
   Comment: The issuance of the variance appears that it will maintain the essential character of the locality. This is a residential neighborhood and the proposed addition would keep with the surrounding area.

6. **Does the alleged practical difficulty involve more than economic considerations?**
   Comment: Yes, the alleged practical difficulty involves more than economic considerations. The Comprehensive Plan support rehabilitation and upgrading of single-family housing as the family needs change.

**CONCLUSION**
To approve the variance request, the City must find that the proposal uses the property in a reasonable manner, and that the applicant has demonstrated that there are practical difficulties, unique to the property not created by the property owner, that interfere in using
the property in such a manner. The proposed use as a single family home addition is clearly using the property in a reasonable manner in a residential district in the City. The practical difficulty in this case is not caused by the property owner, but by the location of the home, which was constructed in 1960 prior to the current zoning regulations resulting in an 18.5 foot rear yard setback. It is not unreasonable for the applicant to request a variance for an addition of 4’ feet into the 18.5 foot rear yard setback.

RECOMMENDATION

Review standards:
1. The variance is in harmony with the general purposes and intent of the Zoning Ordinance.
2. The variance is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.
3. The property owner propose to use the property in a reasonable manner not permitted by the Zoning Ordinance.
4. There are circumstances unique to this property not created by the landowner.
5. The issuance of the variance will maintain the essential character of the locality.
6. The alleged practical difficulty involves more than economic considerations.

Based upon the above review standards, staff would recommend approval of the variance with the following conditions:
1. A Building Permit must be submitted and approved prior to construction.
2. 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, and consist of building materials in common use in residential construction.
3. The roof of the new living area or porch is properly proportioned to and integrated with the roof of the dwelling, and consist of building materials in common use in residential construction.
4. Sodding or seeding needs to be replaced in the areas that have been disturbed. If because of weather conditions sodding and/or seeding is unadvisable, it must be in compliance by no later than July 1st of the following year.

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

Jason and DeAnna Stock Memo dated July 29, 2019

Dear Zoning Administration,

We respectfully request a variance to the rear yard minimum setback requirement so that we can expand our home and garage. The expansion would reduce the current setback by 4 feet and increase the functionality, value and enjoyment of our home.

Currently we have a one car garage that is connected to our home by a breeze way. We would like approval to increase the size of the breeze way to the width of the home plus 4 feet to the rear. Also replacing the current 1 car garage with a 2 car garage which will also extend 4 additional feet to the rear of the home.
The additional garage space would allow us to park both our vehicles inside and accommodate storage for home and yard equipment. The additional 4 feet expansion to the rear allows adequate space for parking our truck or boat in the garage. Due to the front garage foundation, newly cemented driveway, and short length of the driveway; expanding the garage towards the front of the home would be costly and reduce parking area from the road. Expanding the garage further to the west of the property instead of to the rear would not allow the garage to accommodate parking larger vehicles or boat and would require a beautiful large tree be cut down. Being that our lot is on a corner and is small our family uses the area to the west of our garage for activities like having fires, family BBQs, and playing sports. My son often shoots hockey pucks into his net that would not be safe on the east side of the home due to the road.

The added interior space will allow us to increase the size of our kitchen/dining room, have a small mud room and office space. The office space could be converted to a main level laundry room when needed. Without expanding the breezeway to the width of the home plus 4 additional feet to the rear there will not be adequate square footage to allow for the added rooms to work as intended. Our home is a small two bedroom, one bath home. The current kitchen area is small, hard to cook in and lacks storage. The dining area is small and only accommodates 3 people at the table. Expanding the interior area will improve the function, enjoyment and the value of our home.

Thank you for your consideration for this variance application and we would greatly appreciate your approval to reduce the rear yard setback to allow for the expansion of our home/garage.

Sincerely, DeAnna Stock

DeWitt reviewed the variance request to the Planning Commission Board. The Planning Commission will have final approval of this variance and the City Council will receive information only on it. Jason and Deanna Stock are present to answer any questions the Planning Commission Board may have.

Hallin asked if there will be any tree removal.

Jason Stock said no.

MOLLER MOVED, SECOND BY HALLIN, TO OPEN THE PUBLIC HEARING. UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 4 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

Barbian asked the applicants who is doing the work on the addition.

Jason Stock said a friend who is a contractor and him.

HALLIN MOVED, SECOND BY MOLLER, TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING. UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 4 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.
MOLLER MOVED, SECOND BY HALLIN, TO APPROVE ITEM #19-04 A VARIANCE TO THE 30 FOOT REAR YARD SETBACK REQUIREMENT FOR A HOME ADDITION AND GARAGE TO BE 14.5 FEET FROM THE REAR YARD PROPERTY LINE IN THE R-2 RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT, LOCATED AT 1302 THIRD STREET NORTH, PID #24-033-1180. UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 4 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

The Planning Commission Board reviewed the Findings of Fact:
1. Is the variance in harmony with the purpose and intent of the Ordinance? Yes.
2. Is the variance consistent with the Comprehensive Plan? Yes.
3. Does the proposal put the property to use in a reasonable manner? Yes.
4. Are there unique circumstances to the property not created by the landowner? Yes.
5. Will the variance maintain the essential character of the locality? Yes.
6. Does the alleged practical difficulty involve more than economic considerations? Yes.

OLD BUSINESS:

A. Adoption of the Façade Design Guidelines & Grant Program
Community Development Memo:

BACKGROUND
City staff has been working with the Planning Commission & Economic Development Authority to set up a couple of downtown initiatives to assist property owners to reinvest in their storefronts.

In November of 2018 the city hired the architecture firm MacDonald and Mack to conduct an architectural case study of specific downtown facades, as well as create design guidelines to direct future improvements in the downtown. The original quote from MacDonald and Mack Architects was for $11,950. The finished product included “before and after” renditions of five sites as well as 15 copies of the design guidelines formed.

Subsequently, in January of 2019, the architecture firm visited the City of Princeton and began working on case studies of buildings identified through previous projects, staff and community recommendations, as well as the architect’s consideration. City staff and MacDonald and Mack Architects held a community meeting gathering ideas from building owners, businesses and community members.

ANALYSIS:
In June, Bob Mack from the architecture firm debuted the case studies and presented the proposed design guidelines for the Planning Commission and interested community members. Each member of the Planning Commission was furnished with a copy of the Design Guidelines and the document was also shared on Facebook and the City of Princeton website.
The role of the Planning Commission moving forward on this project will be to ensure downtown redevelopment projects requesting funding through the Façade Grant Program adhere to the guidelines created through this initiative.

RECOMMENDATION:
The recommendation from city staff is to consider the proposed Design Guidelines for adoption as well as provide input on necessary changes to the proposal. This should be followed by providing a recommendation to the Council.

Hillesheim said at last month Planning Commission meeting this was tabled so all the members could review the guidelines and address any questions they may have.

Hallin said the EDA Board approved with the guidelines with increasing the architect fee up to $500 and the remodel fee of $2,500.

Moller asked where we got the funds from.

Barbian said from the Capital Improvement Plan. If someone had a building and it was not included in the study, they could hire their own architect for design features. The architect fees will not exceed the $500 from the City.

Hillesheim said there were seven sites chosen for the design guidelines and a few of them are interested and we are in discussion with them.

HALLIN MOVED, SECOND BY JOHNSON, TO APPROVE THE FAÇADE GRANT PROGRAM GUIDELINES. UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 4 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

This will go to the City Council for final approval.

NEW BUSINESS:
A. Façade Grant Application at 519 First Street
Hillesheim said the applicant rescinded their application.

COMMUNICATION AND REPORTS:
A. Verbal Report
1) July Building Permit List
DeWitt gave a review of the July Building Permit list.
2) SOAR Women’s Conference
Hillesheim said the City is partnering with the Women’s Business Alliance and has setup a Women’s Conference. The date is October 10, 2019 at the Northern Lights Ballroom and Banquet Center in Milaca. The tickets are $69 and the time is 8:00 A.M. till 4:00 P.M. After is a social hour till 6 P.M. Everyone is welcome to attend. There will be seven speakers throughout the day. Good information will be shared.

3) Marcia Anderson – Princeton Township Property Owner
Marcia Anderson attended the February 25, 2019 Planning Commission meeting. At the end of the meeting she introduced herself. The minutes from that meeting state the following: Marcia Anderson lives at 8075 Bluff Road in Princeton Township and said she is here tonight representing a group of neighbors that are wondering what are the regulations to be annexed into the city. Is it a requirement to be connected to City sewer and water.

On August 15, 2019 Marcia Anderson came into City Hall and requested for this correction in the minutes is necessary as it has been reported in two local papers by City officials that she did ask for annexation. She would like the minutes to read as follows:

Some neighbors and I were wondering if an area is annexed if they are required to connect to city water and sewer. She did not seek and request annexation for this area.

DeWitt told Anderson that she will inform the Planning Commission of this request, but the February minutes have been approved and that her request will be in this Planning Commission minutes. She was fine with that.

B. City Council Minutes for July
The Planning Commission Board had no comments.

MOLLER MOVED, SECOND BY HALLIN, TO ADJOURN THE MEETING. UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 4 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED. THE MEETING ADJOURNED AT 7:43 P.M.

ATTEST:

______________________________    ______________________________
Dan Erickson, Chair                  Mary Lou DeWitt, Community Development
REQUEST
Coborn’s has submitted a permit application for a multi-tenant (MTB) pylon sign that will be shared with the future Dairy Queen. The front lot is owned by Coborn’s and they have sold it to the owners of Dairy Queen. This lot is west of Coborn’s front parking lot along 7th Avenue South, 1100 7th Avenue South, PID #90-409-0105. The Dairy Queen building has begun construction and they will be removing the current pylon sign that host Coborn’s only and be replaced with this proposed sign.

The property is zoned in B-2 Neighborhood Business District. The Zoning Ordinance requires a pylon sign be approved by the Planning Commission.

ZONING PROVISIONS
The applicants are proposing a multi-tenant pylon sign west of their site where it can be seen along Hwy. #169 and Rum River Drive South. MTB signage may only be located within 900 feet of the major interchanges of Trunk Highway 169 within the City of Princeton. This site is less than 700 feet from the interchange of Highway 169. MTB signage requires at least ten (10’) acres, not including public right-of-way and these two properties consist of 11 acres. The sign height of 60 feet meets the required maximum sign height with a minimum clear zone below the sign of ten (10’) feet in the B-2 District. The outermost edge of the sign face must be a minimum of ten (10’) feet from any road right-of-way. The total permissible sign face area on MTB pylon shall be no greater than five hundred (500) square feet per face. This pylon sign will have three Dairy Queen signs with a total of 210.2 square feet and Coborn’s will have two signs with a total of 282.4 square feet, both meet the required sign face. A portion of the sign will have changeable copy (electronic) non-pictorial text information in which it will display the gas price for Coborn’s and food specials for the Dairy Queen.

No MTB may be erected until a “MTB Plan” is signed by the owners of the two properties and is filed with and approved by the City. The MTB plan shall also specify standards for each MTB sign proportions and landscaping around the base of each MTB. The plan may contain other restrictions as the owners of the affected properties may reasonably determine, shall be signed by each of the owners and shall otherwise be in such form as required by the City.

CONCLUSION/RECOMMENDATION
The proposed multi-tenant pylon signage meets the zoning requirements and staff would recommend approval of the sign permit based on the following conditions:
1. Staff receives the “Multi-tenant Plan” is sign by the owners of the two properties and filed and approved by the City.

2. The building permit reviewed and approved by the Building Inspector and staff. The plans are Engineered signed.

Encl. Pylon sign plans and site plan
BACKGROUND
Dan Tveite, Chino Properties, Inc. is in the process of purchasing from the City of Princeton, Lot 1, Block 1, Aero Business Park First Addition, PID #24-070-0010. The property is zoned B-3 General Commercial District. This is a two (2) acre parcel that will have a lot split approximately in the center of the lot. The parcel is located on the corner of 21st Avenue South and First Street, addressed 101 21st.

SITE PLAN ANALYSIS
The Developer is proposing to develop this lot in two phases. The Site Plan Review will be for the first phase only. The first phase is for a 10,000 square foot commercial building positioned on the northern border of the property. The building will host a 10,000 square foot Health Club, two separate retail spaces of 1,325 square feet, and the furthest east section would be 1,350 square feet for a proposed tavern. All sites are compatible in the B-3 District.

LOT SPLIT
Staff has prepared an Administrator Lot Split for Lot 1 where Parcel A, the most northern border, will consist of 1.06 Acres and Parcel B will be .94 acre. The Developer will have first right of purchase of Parcel B.

LOT SETBACKS
Parcel A will be 46,021 square feet (1.06 Acres) exceeds the required 10,000 square foot minimum lot size for the B-3 District. The Ordinance requires a 20’ foot setback, five-foot side yard setback, and rear yard minimum of 20’ feet which all have been met. The minimum lot width of 75’ feet and the plans show 156’ feet. All setback requirements have been met.

The proposed lot coverage (percent of the lot occupied by buildings) is 21.8% and Impervious coverage (all structures and materials that resist water infiltration) is 65.9% and the Zoning Ordinance allows 60%. The plans show a future rain garden between the two parking lots and this will reduce the impervious coverage to meet the Zoning Ordinance.

DRIVEWAY EASEMENT
After discussions of alternative access options, it is recommended that a cross easement to designate a driveway that will service both Parcels A & B is recorded. Upkeep of the ingress and egress access will be the property owners shared responsibility when Parcel B is developed, and will be recorded with the County.

PARKING
The parking lot is positioned south of the building front with one shared ingress/egress access point from 21st Avenue South. The plans show a total of 54 parking spaces with two (2)
handicap parking stalls and the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) states a parking facility with 51-75 spaces needs three (3) handicap spaces. The Developer will need to add another handicap space to the plans. The parking spaces conform to the Ordinance with a width of nine (9) feet and depth of 18 feet, with a maneuvering lane of 26’ feet.

The entire parking area, including parking spaces and maneuvering lanes shall be provided with a durable, dustless surface. The parking area shall be hard-surfaced within one year of the date the permit is issued. Parking facilities designed for a capacity of five (5) or more parking stalls shall be a setback from all adjoining property lines of three (3) feet. The proposed plan has the parking lot five (5) feet from the property line lot split. In the future, if Parcel B were to develop there will be a shared access point and then the Planning Commission may approve the common parking areas.

Bicycle racks are required to accommodate bicycles and is to be located near the entrance of the Health Club.

LIGHTING
Off-street parking shall be illuminated to a minimum level of one (1) foot candle at ground level over the entire surface of the parking area. Exterior lighting plans be submitted and approved by staff.

STORM WATER
The storm water plan is condition upon the City Engineers approval.

WATER, ELECTRICAL, AND SEWER
Princeton Public Utilities is to approve the proposed electric plans. The PUC strongly recommends submetering each unit for water and electricity. The Developer is required to extend sewer, water, and electric distribution to the site, appropriate shut offs and lateral extensions to the building at their cost including associated impact fees.

Sanitary Sewer for Parcel A will be serviced with the existing sewer stub. Parcel B shall be served from the sewer stub by setting a manhole in the right-of-way and extended south in the right-of-way to Parcel B.

BUILDING MATERIALS
The upper half of the building will have stucco panels in a light tan with stone veneer along the bottom half of the building. Each building section will have its own entry door. The roof material will be metal with standing seam, no exposed fasteners. A future outdoor patio on the east side of the building with fencing is on the plans and the applicant will need to apply for a fence permit prior to installation of fencing.

TRASH
The enclosed trash area is on the west side of the property that will be used for all four sites. The fencing will be painted gray cedar with a concrete slab. Size of the area will be 12’8” x 10’ with a 8’ x 6’ trash container.

LANDSCAPING
50% of the building perimeter shall be landscaped in an area not less than five (5) feet in width.
The site plan has landscape area along the two side and back of the building. Staff recommends tree coverage on the west side of the property to help reduce the winds pushing the snowfall into the parking lot. No landscaping or screening shall interfere with driver or pedestrian visibility for vehicles entering or exiting the premises.

SIGNAGE
The applicant is not seeking signage approval at this time. The applicant will likely utilize wall signage for each site along with a multi-tenant signage with the proposed location on the northeast corner of the site and will need to meet the Sign Ordinance requirements before bringing to the Planning Commission for review. All signage will need a building permit approval prior to installation.

CONCLUSION
Staff recommends approval of the site plan with the following conditions:

1. Shared access easement approved by the City Attorney and recorded with the County.

2. Bicycle racks shall be placed near the entrance of the Health Club.

3. The signage shall be reviewed and permits obtained prior to installation. The Planning Commission review required MTB pylon signage.

4. Staff approve landscaping and if because of weather conditions sodding and/or seeding along with landscape is unadvisable, a temporary certificate of occupancy may be issued subject to an escrow deposit to assure compliance by no later than July 1st of the following year.

5. The City Engineer’s review on the stormwater plans shall be met prior to the issuance of the Building Permit.

6. The Developer extend sewer, water, and electric distribution to the site, appropriate shut offs, and lateral extensions to the building at their cost. Connection to the sewer and water be in the utility easement inside the property line along 21st Avenue.

7. All necessary permits shall be applied for and approved prior to construction, including, but not limited to: building, signage, Water Access Charge (WAC), and Sewer Access Charge (SAC).

8. Any consultant costs over and above the original escrow fee shall be the responsibility of the applicant.

9. The Developer needs to contact Princeton Fire Chief for the purchase and placement of a Knox Box by the front door entrance which will contain a master key for sites.
August 27, 2019

To: Planning Commission / Mayor / City Council of Princeton, MN

From: Dan Tveite, President Chino Properties, Inc.

Re: Aero Business Park, Lot #1

We are interested in developing Lot 1 of the Aero Business Park with a groundbreaking yet this year. We believe that we can bring several benefits to the City of Princeton by creating a cornerstone development at this visible site including:

- Construction of an attractive development that will attract unique commercial participants in 2 phases; the first consists of a 10,000 square foot building positioned along the northern border of the property that will provide space for Anytime Fitness and up to 4,000 square feet for lease. The second phase of the development will be another 10,000 square foot building mirroring the first building along the southern border of the property with parking provided between the buildings. (see site plan and elevations).

- By use of the TIF district, we will be able to attract beneficial tenants with an attractive rent structure. For example, I have had conversations with the owners of Aegir Brewing in Elk River and Lupulin Brewing in Big Lake to determine how to attract a Brew Pub to this site. They provided some good information as to how to construct the facility to have the best chance to attract a Brew Pub such as providing a large door to bring brewing vats into the facility. Further outdoor seating on a patio will be provided. A Brew Pub is our priority to provide a new type of business to Princeton. Brew Pub’s typically don’t serve food but they often work in conjunction with the local restaurants to have food delivered or brought onsite so this could be an asset to local restaurants.

- Use of a portion of the green space as a Community Garden space to be used by Princeton residents. We will work jointly with the City of Princeton to determine an appropriate number of spaces available and how to allocate spaces. To be clear, we will finance the construction of the agreed upon facility.

- We look forward to working with the city council and staff to revising our plan to ensure that the facility we construct creates a desirable first impression of the Aero Business Park including mutually agreeable landscaping suggestions and signage. Nobody wants to create a “bare minimum” – we want something that makes us all proud.

Offer:

We understand that Lot 1 is the most desirable lot in the development and that our first phase will only require about 50% of the available land. For that reason, we are offering 2 alternatives:

1) We acquire the norther part of Lot 1 for a price of $10,000 through a Tax Increment Financing program. This would be accompanied with an up-front TIF grant as well as a TIF agreement for the cost of land. Access from 21st Avenue would be on the Northern half of the property.
2) There will be a 3 year exclusive grant to another company with a similar TIF agreement and requirements for the Northern part of the lot. There will be a separate access point from 21st Avenue for the southern portion of the lot.

Please review the proposal along with the Site Plan and Elevations and let me know if there are any concerns.

Summary:

We are offering an opportunity to work with the city to kick off the development of the Aero Business Park with a quality development that will hopefully attract other development to the Park and offering very close to asking price for the property.

Attachments:

- Site Plan
- Architectural Drawings
ADMINISTRATIVE LOT SPLIT RESOLUTION #19-05

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING A LOT SPLIT FOR PROPERTY LOCATED AT 101 21st AVENUE SOUTH, AERO BUSINESS PARK FIRST ADDITION, PID #24-070-0010

Existing Legal Description:
PID #24-070-0010, Lot 1, Block 1, Aero Business Park First Addition, Mille Lacs County, Minnesota

WHEREAS, the splitting of this property will not conflict with the City of Princeton Zoning Ordinance; and

WHEREAS, the splitting of this property will not conflict with the City of Princeton Subdivision Development Ordinance; and

WHEREAS, this property is owned by the City of Princeton and will result in an additional commercial lot; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Planning Commission approves hereby approve the splitting of the above described property, and the new legal description for the newly split portions will be as follows:

Revised Property Description:
Proposed Parcel A:
The North 156.00 feet of Lot 1, Block 1, Aero Business Park First Addition, Mille Lacs County, Minnesota

Proposed Parcel B:
That part of Lot 1, Block 1, Aero Business Park First Addition, Mille Lacs County, Minnesota, which lies South of the North 156.00 feet of sold Lot 1.

ADOPTED this 21st day of October, 2019

This instrument was drafted by:
City of Princeton
705 2nd Street No.
Princeton, MN 55371

ATTEST:

Robert Barbian, Administrator

Dan Erickson, Chairperson
MnDOT GREATER MN STAND-ALONE NOISE BARRIER PROGRAM

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

12 September 2019
MINNESOTA’S EXPERIENCE WITH HIGHWAY NOISE MITIGATION

The Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT) has been constructing noise walls and barriers during roadway construction projects since the mid-1970. In 1974, the MN State Legislature directed the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) to adopt state noise standards (M.S. 116.07, Subdivision 2). Federal noise standards specific to highway traffic noise are codified in 23 CFR 772. Both standards are used to determine noise impacts and mitigation in Minnesota.

In 1995, the MN State Legislature directed MnDOT (MN Statute 161.125 Sound abatement along highways) to develop a statewide priority list to direct state resources to mitigate traffic noise for locations not adjacent to new roadway construction, when mitigation may be required by federal law. To date, only the Metro District has funded stand-alone noise “retrofit” barriers.

In October 2013, the Office of the Legislative Auditor released the evaluation report: MnDOT Noise Barriers¹. The report recommended that “MnDOT should create a pathway for communities outside of the metropolitan area to become eligible for state-fund noise barrier project.”

This document outlines the MnDOT process for stand-alone noise barriers in greater Minnesota.

NOISE ABATEMENT CRITERIA AND STANDARDS

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) noise abatement criteria (NAC) differ by the type of land use, apply to all hours of the day and night, and identify where noise abatement should be considered. The FHWA NAC, based on the hourly $L_{eq}$ is used in Minnesota. The $L_{eq}$ is the sound level in dBA, equivalent to the total sound energy over a stated period of time. The $L_{eq}$ (h) designates the hourly value of the $L_{eq}$. In effect, the $L_{eq}$ is analogous to a time averaged sound level over a given period of time.

¹The full audit report is available at http://www.auditor.leg.state.mn.us/ped/2013/mndotnoise.htm
### FHWA NOISE ABATEMENT CRITERIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Category</th>
<th>Activity Criteria 1, 2 (\text{Leq(h) dBA})</th>
<th>Evaluation Location</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Exterior</td>
<td>Lands on which serenity and quiet are of extraordinary significance and serve an important public need and where the preservation of those qualities is essential if the area is to continue to serve its intended purpose.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>Exterior</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>Exterior</td>
<td>Active sport areas, amphitheaters, auditoriums, campgrounds, cemeteries, day care centers, hospitals, libraries, medical facilities, parks, picnic areas, places of worship, playgrounds, public meeting rooms, public or nonprofit institutional structures, radio studios, recording studios, recreation areas, Section 4(f) sites, schools, television studios, trails, and trail crossings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Interior</td>
<td>Auditoriums, day care centers, hospitals, libraries, medical facilities, places of worship, public meeting rooms, public or nonprofit institutional structures, radio studios, recording studios, schools, and television studios.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Exterior</td>
<td>Hotels, motels, offices, restaurants/bars, and other developed lands, properties or activities not included in A-D or F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Agriculture, airports, bus yards, emergency services, industrial, logging, maintenance facilities, manufacturing, mining, rail yards, retail facilities, shipyards, utilities (water resources, water treatment, electrical), and warehousing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Undeveloped lands that are not permitted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
(1) \(\text{Leq(h)}\) shall be used for impact assessment
(2) \(\text{Leq(h)}\) Activity Criteria values are for impact determination only, and are not design standards for noise abatement
(3) Includes undeveloped lands permitted for this activity category

### FEASIBLE NOISE MITIGATION MEASURES

Earthen berms and noise walls, or a combination of the two, are eligible to be used as a mitigation measure through this program. Earthen berms can be very cost effective, but are less common because sufficient land is not commonly available.

Noise walls are normally the most cost effective and constructible form of a noise mitigation measure. However, even noise walls are not effective in all cases because of limitations on controlled highway access and right-of-way.
Application for Stand-Alone Noise Barrier Mitigation

1. Name of governmental authority submitting the application and agreeing to local cost share:

2. Interstate/Freeway adjacent to area for which the application is being made:

3. Limits of area of application: a map is required; aerial photo is preferred:
   Side of Freeway(s):
   (N, S, E, W, Both)
   Starting Point:
   (Cross roads, etc.)
   Ending Point:

   Estimated length of proposed noise barrier (in feet)

4. Are the residential units located in an incorporated area? Yes/No
   (Note: Only incorporate areas are eligible.)

5. Were the majority of the residential units constructed prior to 1997? Yes/No
   (Note: Only residential areas constructed prior to 1997 are eligible.)

6. What fiscal year(s) are you applying for funding?

7. Number of residential units (homes and/or apartment buildings) adjacent to the highway/freeway:

8. Estimated existing noise level (utilize MnDOT’s Flat Earth Noise Level Estimating Spreadsheet: available at: www.dot.state.mn.us/environment/noise/)

9. I certify that all the application information provided is correct.

Print name and title of local official

Signature and title of local official

Date

Date
INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING APPLICATION
FOR STAND-ALONE NOISE BARRIER MITIGATION

1. Name of governmental authority making application and agreeing to 10% cost share:

   Name of the township, city, county, etc. applying for a noise mitigation project and accountable for 10% of total cost of the project. For estimating noise wall costs, use $36/ft².

   Example: length of barrier x 20 foot height x $36

2. Freeway adjacent to area for which application is being made:

   Identification number for the limited access freeway thought to be the source of the noise. Per Statute 161.125, stand-alone noise barrier mitigation is available only for limited access freeways or expressways. Note: gaps from driveways, etc., reduce the effectiveness of the noise barriers.

3. Limits of area of application on a map (required) or aerial photo (preferred):

   Side of Freeway:

   The side of the freeway along which the noise mitigation is desired. If there are eligible residents on both sides of the freeway, enter "Both."

   Beginning Point:

   A landmark or feature, such as a cross road, distinguishing the beginning point of the area to be mitigated by the potential noise barrier. Mile or reference point is preferred.

   Ending Point:

   See Beginning Point information above.

   Estimated length of proposed noise barrier (in feet).

   The estimated length of the proposed noise barrier in feet.

4. Are the residential units in an incorporated area?

   Confirm that the residential units are within the official city limits with a governmental authority. Per MN Statute 161.125, stand-alone noise barrier mitigation is available only in incorporated areas.

5. Were the majority of the residential units built prior to 1997?

   This is a confirmation of the number and location of the dwelling units which were constructed prior to 1997 as documented in County records. MnDOT requires dwelling units to be constructed prior to 1997 as MN Statue 161.125 was passed in 1997.

6. Which fiscal year are you applying for?
Indicate which fiscal year you intend to apply for?

7. Number of residential units adjacent to the highway/freeway:

This is the number of dwelling units immediately adjacent to the freeway; no intervening structures.

8. Existing noise levels:

Existing noise levels must approach (66 dBA) or exceed 67.0 dBA $L_{eq}$ Use MnDOT’s Flat Earth Noise Level estimating spreadsheet available at www.dot.state.mn.us/environment/noise.

9. Signature and Title of local official and Date:

Signature and title of the official validating that the included information is accurate and the City Council funding resolution/project support are approved. Include copies of official approval documents.
Stand-alone Barrier Project Procedures and Rules

1. Applications will be accepted annually from October 1st through December 31st.

2. Applications not selected will need to resubmit to be considered again for future years.

3. The proposed area must not be adjacent to a future Type I project identified in the 10-year work plan or other projects where MnDOT funding will be used.

4. Existing noise levels must approach (66 dBA) or exceed 67.0 dBA $L_{eq}$.

5. For screening, the applicant can compute this cost by taking the assumed barrier cost (length x 20 feet in height x $36$/ sq. ft.) and then dividing that number by the number of homes and/or apartment buildings adjacent to the barrier. MnDOT uses a maximum cost effectiveness value of $78,500 /benefited location.

6. MnDOT will verify the area to decide the number of eligible dwelling units and the approximate the cost of noise abatement. MnDOT will release results of all noise surveys to the applicants.

7. MnDOT will create an eligibility list ranked using both the cost effectiveness of the barrier and the loudness of the noise.

8. MnDOT will propose noise mitigation projects for the highest priority locations from the eligibility list, within the given funding limitation. Final eligibility will be confirmed upon MnDOT completion of a final noise analysis.

9. Projects would typically be constructed 3-4 years out from the time of selection.

10. All noise mitigation will be designed by MnDOT following MnDOT design specifications.

11. MnDOT will maintain the structural soundness of the noise mitigation structure and will be accountable for the aesthetic quality of the structure on the freeway facing side only. The local governmental authority is required to maintain the resident side of the barrier.

12. If the project meets MnDOT's Noise Policy standards for a stand-alone noise barrier, local authorities must agree to contribute 10% of the total cost of the construction (as noted in the agreement). In addition, local authorities will also be responsible for the construction contract costs, which is typically 8% of the local authority's share of the construction costs. (Example: local authority's total project cost is $100,000, then $100,000 x 8% = $8,000 additional project contract costs)

Failure to comply with all of the above specifications will make the noise mitigation project ineligible for MnDOT funding (“unreasonable”).
Definitions

The following definitions are set forth in MnDOT Noise Policy.  
(See www.dot.state.mn.us/environment/noise/pdf/guidance/noise-glossary.pdf)

**Benefited Receptor:** The receptor of an abatement measure that receives a noise reduction at or above the minimum threshold of 5 dBA.

**Existing Noise Level:** The worst noise hour resulting from the combination of natural and mechanical sources and human activity usually present in a particular area.

**Impacted Receptor:** A receptor that has a traffic noise impact (see definition for traffic noise impacts).

**Leq:** The equivalent steady-state sound level which in a stated period of time contains the same acoustic energy as the time-varying sound level during the same time period, with Leq(h) being the hourly value of Leq.

**Multifamily Dwelling:** A residential structure containing more than one residence. Each residence in a multifamily dwelling shall be counted as one receptor when determining impacted and benefited receptors.

**Noise Area Classification (State):** The Noise Area Classification as identified in Section 4, Table 2, are groupings of land use activities established in the State Noise Rules.

**Noise Barrier:** A physical obstruction that is constructed between the highway noise source and the noise sensitive receptor(s) that lowers the noise level, including stand-alone noise walls, noise berms (earth or other material), and combination berm/wall systems.

**Noise Level (A-weighted):** The sound pressure level obtained through use of A-weighting characteristics. The unit of measure is the decibel (dB), commonly referred to as dBA when A-weighting is used.

**Noise Reduction Design Goal:** The desired dBA noise reduction determined from calculating the difference between future build noise levels with abatement, to future build noise levels without abatement. The noise reduction design goal is 7 dBA (must be achieved at a minimum of one receptor for each proposed barrier to achieve reasonableness).

**Noise Sensitive Area:** A geographic area containing a collection of noise sensitive receptors that might be protected behind a single noise barrier, such as a continuous neighborhood of homes abutting one side of the highway between two interchanges.

**Owner:** An individual or entity that is named on the deed of a benefited receptor as an owner, or listed as the owner on tax rolls.

**Owner/Resident:** An individual or entity that is named on the deed of a benefited receptor as an owner, and resides in that same benefitted receptor.

**Reasonableness:** The combination of social, economic, and environmental factors considered in the evaluation of a noise abatement measure. MnDOT uses a maximum value of $78,500/Benefited location.

**Receptor:** An outdoor place where frequent human use occurs and a lowered noise level may be of benefit.
Residence: The official location of a household or dwelling unit. Either a single family residence or each dwelling unit in a multifamily dwelling.

Resident: An individual or entity that resides in or utilizes a benefited receptor via contract (i.e. a legal renter of a benefited residence). This includes a legal renter when a commercial establishment has been determined to be a benefited receptor.

Traffic Noise Impacts: Design year build condition noise levels that approach or exceed the FHWA NAC for the design year build condition; or design year build condition noise levels that show a substantial increase over existing noise levels.

Type I project: A Type I project is a proposed Federal or Federal-aid highway project for the construction of a highway meeting one or more of the following conditions:

1. The construction of a highway on new location; or,
2. The physical alteration of an existing highway where there is either:
   i. Substantial Horizontal Alteration- A project that halves the distance between the traffic noise source and the closest receptor between the existing condition to the future build condition; or,
   ii. Substantial Vertical Alteration- A project that removes shielding, therefore exposing the line-of-sight between the receptor and the traffic noise source. This is done by either altering the vertical alignment of the highway or by altering the topography (not including the addition or removal of vegetation) between the highway traffic noise source and the receptor; or,
3. Bridge replacement projects that satisfy item (2), above,
4. The addition of a through-traffic lane(s). This includes the addition of a through-traffic land that functions as a HOV lane, contraflow lane, High-Occupancy Toll (HOT), bus lane, or truck climbing lane; or,
5. The addition of an auxiliary lane, except for when the auxiliary lane is a turn lane.
6. The addition or relocation of interchange lanes or ramps added to a quadrant to complete an existing partial interchange; or,
7. Restrriping existing pavement for the purpose of adding a through-traffic lane or an auxiliary lane; or,
8. The addition of a new or substantial alteration of a weigh station, rest stop, ride-share lot or toll plaza.
9. If a project is determined to be a Type I project as defined above, then the entire project area as defined in the environmental document is a Type I project.
Example application

Application for Stand-Alone Noise Barrier Mitigation

1. Name of governmental authority submitting the application and agreeing to local cost share:
   City of Anywhere

2. Interstate/Freeway adjacent to area for which the application is being made:
   Highway 900

3. Limits of area of application: a map is required; aerial photo is preferred:
   Side of Freeway(s): (N, S, E, W, Both) North
   Starting Point: (Cross roads, etc.) 1st Avenue
   Ending Point: Main Street
   Estimated length of proposed noise barrier (in feet) 1,400'

4. Are the residential units located in an incorporated area? (Note: Only incorporated areas are eligible.)
   Yes

5. Were the majority of the residential units constructed prior to 1997? (Note: Only residential areas constructed prior to 1997 are eligible.)
   Yes

6. What fiscal year(s) are you applying for funding? 2024 x Other (list year) 2025

7. Number of residential units (homes and/or apartment buildings) adjacent to the highway/freeway:
   13

8. Estimated existing noise level (utilize MnDOT’s Flat Earth Noise Level Estimating Spreadsheet) available at: www.dot.state.mn.us/environment/noise/
   68.5

9. I certify that all the application information provided is correct.
   John Doe
   Date 1/1/20

Print name and title of local official

John Doe
Date 1/1/20

Signature and title of local official
Landuse Map

Hello Planning Commission Members:

Please review the attached Landuse Map and review what is proposed for the outside of City limits.

Thank you!!!
MEMORANDUM

TO: Planning Commission
FROM: Mary Lou DeWitt, Comm. Dev.
SUBJECT: MN-1 District Site
DATE: October 17, 2019

The property in review is located at 700 Old County Road #18, (Simplified Construction Services). Dating back to 2011, the City has been had numerous complaints on the particles and remnant of the sheetrock grinding process be deposited on neighboring properties and personal property. Staff has had many conversations with the owner of the business and has sent many letters to come to a resolution of this matter.

The site is currently for sale, but staff still needs to address the situation and would like the Planning Commission’s direction. Current photos are attached.

City Code states:
Section 600.04 of the City of Princeton City Code states that dense smoke, noxious fumes, gas, and soot or cinders in unreasonable quantities are declared to be nuisances affecting health.

In addition, Chapter VI.2.B of the City Zoning Ordinance states that any use established, enlarged, or remodeled after the effect date of this ordinance shall be so operated as to control the emission of smoke or particular matter to the degree that it is not detrimental to the normal senses or shall endanger the health, safety, comfort, or general welfare of the public.

MN-1 INDUSTRIAL DISTRICT

A. Intent
The intent of the MN-1 Industrial District is to provide a district for the development and operation of manufacturing, storage, and distribution type business. This district shall encourage the development of industrial uses which promote high-tech quality uses more likely to be compatible with existing uses and which shall be free of hazardous or objectionable elements such as noises, odor, dust, smoke, glare, or other pollutants.

Manufacturing uses with exterior storage is permitted as an accessory use to the permitted use, provided that:

(a) The exterior storage area must be located to the rear of the building or site;
(b) The exterior storage area must be fenced and fully screened from view.

C. Prohibited Uses
The following uses are not permitted:
* No noxious or offensive trades, services, or activities, and nothing which may become a nuisance or annoyance-unsightliness, excessive emission of odors, dusts, fumes, smoke, or noise.
D. **Conditional Uses** (Rev. 6-14-12; Ord. 687)

The following uses are permitted subject to the issuance of a Conditional Use Permit:

* Any use in which over 50% of the site would be used for uncovered outside storage, provided that:

  (a) The exterior storage area must be located to the rear of the building or site;
  (b) The exterior storage area must be fenced and fully screened from view.
MINUTES OF A STUDY SESSION OF THE PRINCETON CITY COUNCIL
HELD ON SEPTEMBER 5 2019 4:30 P.M.

Mayor Brad Schumacher called the meeting to order. Council members present was Jack Edmonds, Jenny Gerold, Jules Zimmer and Jeff Reynolds. Staff present, Administrator Robert Barbian, Finance Director Steve Jackson, Public Works Director Bob Gerold, Police Chief Todd Frederick, Community Development Specialist Stephanie Hillesheim, Clerk Shawna Jenkins, Wastewater Plant Manager Chris Klinghagen, Liquor Store Manager Nancy Campbell and Fire Chief Ron Lawrence.

Zimmer stated he would like to give an announcement on the retirement of Karen Michels and the hiring of Kim Young as the new Chamber Director.

Princeton Public Utilities Audit

Keith Porter with Mayer, Porter & Nelson, Ltd are certified public accountants and completed Princeton Public Utilities 2019 audit.

Schumacher asked why the City Council Members and administrator was removed from the Organization page, when they have been there in previous years. Porter responded that the financial statements are owned by the Utility company. He is actually seeing a lot of instances where the organizational page is removed from the financial statements entirely.

Porter went through the Audit in detail.

Zimmer asked when the last discussion of the “Payments in Lieu of taxes” was. Jackson responded that it was last looked at in 2007. Butcher added that the Princeton Public Utilities is the only Utility company that he is aware of that is paying both “In lieu of Taxes” and a franchise fee. Edmonds added that they are also collecting the City’s sewer fees and not collecting anything to cover administrative costs of doing that.

Schumacher questioned how their long-term debt compares to others. Porter responded that he does not believe they are overextended, but there is a fair amount.

Zimmer questioned if it is standard to have an agreement that goes out to 2050. Butcher responded it is common. The previous agreement was from 1980 to 2030. Zimmer asked when they would usually start contacting companies to extend the contracts. Butcher replied that it is usually looked at about 12-15 years prior.

Schumacher asked how Rochester is getting out of SMMPA. Butcher replied that they did not renew the contract past 2030, so they will be out at that time. Schumacher asked if the other cities will bear a burden when a large municipality is no longer buying power. Butcher stated that if the plant is still working well at that time, the remaining cities may actually have a financial benefit. However, SMMPA may go out and add members.

Barbian wondered what the Industry standards are for an average requested reserve. Porter responded that a lot if based on the utility and their future projects. Butcher added that it really varies on expenses, depreciation, and what kind of large overlay is planned in the near future. Depending on where those are, you would determine whether to pay cash or bond.

Porter stated that he works with a lot of smaller cities, and for an example, they may need to replace a sewer system that was not planned. Since there are not any funds set aside, then the sewer rates would likely need to be increased several times to cover the cost. The PUC is keeping current with things, so there should not be any unexpected projects.
Certificate of Utility and City Officials

Barbian advised that this is the agreement to extend the contract. The bond would be sold on the 24th. The communities usually provide approval.

Butcher the agreement essentially says we are under obligation to buy power from SMMPA until 2050. The agreement is giving the investors proof that their investment is secure. Schumacher asked how the City will benefit. Butcher replied that SMMPA is the one who will see the savings directly, but it may allow them to keep the City’s rates from going up. When a utility refinances, the rates and savings are looked at.

Barbian asked how Rochester getting out of the agreement. Butcher would have to look into the details on that.

Schumacher stated he would like to table the item and have the City Attorney review the agreement. He would like to know how much money this will save the residents. Porter said saves SMMPA money, not the city. However, it likely means they can pass their savings down by holding the rates down.

Butcher asked if it would help to have a SMMPA representative at the meeting, as he can ask someone to attend. Schumacher stated it would be nice to have someone attend.

Barbian said in regard to the two sections he reviewed, he thinks the agreement looks good.

SCHUMACHER MOVED TO TABLE THE AGREEMENT UNTIL SEPTEMBER 12TH AT 7PM SYSTEM. REYNOLDS SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Board Book Proposal

Hillesheim advised that the City of Princeton recently purchased notebooks for the Mayor and Council Members in step towards paperless meetings. Notebooks have the ability to increase efficiency and to improve communication. With security, confidentiality and efficiency as vital components to this change, City Staff have been looking at ways to make the system more effective and streamlined for staff, Councilors and the public. BoardBook was recommended to the City from the School District and is an online software system that increases ease of use.

Analysis:
BoardBook costs $3,250 per year. This allows for an unlimited number of meetings, minutes, boards and users. It is easily linked to the website to allow Public Viewing of all agenda items and minutes. The program would also be a beneficial tool for other boards and commissions of the city. Some other benefits of BoardBook include:

- The Packet is available that makes it easy for users to move between Tabs with a click and limits scrolling through a continuous PDF.
- Staff have the ability to make additions until the meeting without having to print additional paperwork or send updated versions.
- Everything is automatically available once posted in the portal.
- Email notifications can notify members when agenda packets are posted and when other changes are made.
- Historic information is easily searchable and always automatically archived.

**City Staff also researched:**

**BoardPaq: $3,588/year for 50 users.**

**Recommendation:**
City Staff recommends purchasing BoardBook for $3,250 based upon the very positive recommendation from School Board members and the affordability compared to other software.

Schumacher asked if there are funds available for this type of software. Jackson responded that there were some funds set aside for the tablet purchase and software in the CIP.

ZIMMER MOVED TO APPROVE THE PURCHASE OF THE BOARD BOOK AGENDA SYSTEM FOR ONE YEAR. REYNOLDS SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**Announcements / updates**

Barbian stated that in regard to Aero Business Park, an agreement with the interested party should be coming soon. One question that comes up is some of the companies have talked about large projects. He wanted to let the Council know that the EDA has discussed some TIF, Tax Abatements and other ideas to cut costs for prospective businesses.

Edmonds said he gets questions all the time about the Shopko building, and asked if staff has heard anything. Hillesheim responded that she has talked to a few people, but nothing concrete so far.

Zimmer commented that he would like to know when these types of meetings are happening, so they are in the loop when people ask. Barbian gave an example. They may get a call from DEED asking if the city has anything available for a 150,000 square foot building. Staff provides them the information on the lots that are available.

Barbian said many times, businesses want their names and business kept quiet in the early discussions. Staff was contacted by another that produces a product and has a small sale area in front, and an industrial business that may be interested.

Hillesheim reported that there are two ground breakings coming up. One for the Great Northern Trail and the other for the new Dairy Queen. Also coming up soon is the Soar Conference on October 10th at the Northern Lights Ballroom.

**Miscellaneous**

Zimmer advised that Karen Michels retired and Kim Young is the new Chamber Director.
Barbian reported that the letter to Princeton Township was sent out. It has been discussed if the letter should be changed slightly, and sent to the School Superintendent, as well as Senator Andrew Mathews and Representative Sondra Erickson.

Barbian stated he does not believe the Township has made any decisions as of yet. Zimmer questioned if the City should be sending the letter if the Township would be taking the lead. Edmonds suggested that the letter come from the City and the Township.

**Adjournment**

ZIMMER MOVED TO ADJOURN THE STUDY SESSION AT 6:23PM. REYNOLDS SECOND-ED THE MOTION. MEETING ADJOURNED

Respectfully Submitted,

__________________________
Shawna Jenkins Tadych
City Clerk

ATTEST:

__________________________
Brad Schumacher, Mayor
MINUTES OF A BUDGET STUDY SESSION OF THE PRINCETON CITY COUNCIL HELD ON SEPTEMBER 12, 2019 5:00 P.M. AT PRINCETON CITY HALL

Mayor Brad Schumacher called the meeting to order and led the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag. Council members present were, Jack Edmonds, Jenny Gerold, Jules Zimmer, and Jeff Reynolds. Others present: City Administrator Robert Barbian, Finance Director Steve Jackson, Police Chief Todd Frederick, Public Works Director Bob Gerold, Community Development Specialist Stephanie Hillesheim, Clerk Shawna Jenkins and Fire Chief Ron Lawrence. Absent was Liquor Store Manager Nancy Campbell.

1. Call to Order – Pledge of Allegiance

2. CIP Planning

Barbian asked the Council to come up with some projects they would like to see done. The council will think on that until the next budget session.

3. 2020 Capital Improvement Discussion

Frederick, Gerold and Lawrence went over their Capital Improvement Plans.

The New items added for this year:

Police Department: an office phone upgrade, software upgrade and tasers replacement.

Fire and Rescue, Emergency Management: Command squad, hoses and drop tank, storage building, Rescue boat, extrication tools, and Emergency Management training.

Public Works and Parks: Brush Mower, 1 ton truck, hard surface area for concession stand area at Mark Park, Concession stand soffit repair and paint, and the proposed project for Riverside-Riebe Park.

In terms of the Storage building for Public Safety, the Council asked if the current building could just be expanded, instead of using the adjacent lot. Lawrence stated that they would still need part of the adjacent lot, as there is not enough room to expand. They would like to use the back portion of the adjacent lot, so the front portion would still be available.

Zimmer questioned B Gerold on the road grader that is scheduled for 2021. When the time comes, is there enough money in the fund. Jackson explained that with CIP funds, it is just part of the fund balance, it is not separated, so the funds are there.

4. Adjournment

J GEROLD MOVED TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 6:42PM. REYNOLDS SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Respectfully Submitted,

Shawna Jenkins Tadych
City Clerk

ATTEST:

Brad Schumacher, Mayor
MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING OF THE PRINCETON CITY COUNCIL HELD ON SEPTEMBER 12, 2019 7:00 P.M. AT PRINCETON CITY HALL

Mayor Brad Schumacher called the meeting to order and led the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag. Council members present were, Jack Edmonds, Jenny Gerold, Jules Zimmer, and Jeff Reynolds. Others present: City Administrator Robert Barbian, Finance Director Steve Jackson, Police Chief Todd Frederick, Public Works Director Bob Gerold, Community Development Specialist Stephanie Hillesheim, Clerk Shawna Jenkins, Liquor Store Manager Nancy Campbell, Fire Chief Ron Lawrence, Engineer Jen Edison and Attorney Damien Toven.

AGENDA ADDITIONS/DELETIONS

Schumacher stated he would like to add the Liquor Store Fire Department Fundraiser after the Consent Agenda, move Ordinances up to be discussed after the Public Hearings so Tammy Omdal can answer any questions, and the SMMPA Certificate of Utility after that.

REYNOLDS MOVED TO APPROVE THE AGENDA AS AMENDED. EDMONDS SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES

A. Regular Meeting Minutes of August 22, 2019
B. Study Session Meeting of September 5, 2019


CONSENT AGENDA

A. Permits and Licenses
B. Personnel
   1. Police Officer Cole Wubben Step Increase effective 9-24-19

ZIMMER MOVED TO APPROVE THE STEP INCREASE FOR COLE WUBBEN EFFECTIVE 9-24-19. REYNOLDS SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

C. Donations
   1. Resolution 19-35 – accept donations from Lion’s for Airport Fuel Facility

EDMONDS MOVED TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 19-35 ACCEPTING DONATION FROM THE LION’S FOR THE AIRPORT FUEL FACILITY. J GEROLD SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

D. Miscellaneous
   1. Approval to Sign FAA Grant for Runway 15-33 Reconstruction Project

EDMONDS MOVED TO APPROVE THE SIGNING OF THE FAA GRANT BY THE MAYOR AND CLERK. ZIMMER SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Liquor Store Fundraiser
Dylan Donner, Assistant Liquor Store Manager reported on the Miller-Coors that does a fundraiser for the local fire departments. They put our donation buckets and an event is held where there is free hotdogs and the Fire Department brings a truck out for people to see. So far, $285 has been collected and Donner provided the donations collected so far to staff.

OPEN FORUM

Lee Steinbrecher 620 4th Ave South wanted to talk about the issue with the Shopko parking lot. It is really causing a hardship for some people. The two prominent signs posted state “no Overnight parking”. There is some no parking anytime signs, but they are very small and hard to read. He is wondering if Public Works can put barrier’s there that say no parking. He hopes it would stop people from parking there and getting their vehicles towed. He would also ask that Staff talk with the owners of the lot.

Nicholas Taylor added that he understands it is private property, but we want Princeton to be a place where people want to stop. Instead, word is getting out about this and it is keeping people from stopping.

Tim Hennagir from the Union Times would like to ask the Mayor about the email he was copied on to PUC Manager Keith Butcher. The Mayor talked about a state investigation into no bid contracts, and the PUC chairperson. He asked if there has been a complaint filed with the state. Schumacher stated he has not filed anything with the state. He has asked the PUC to provide any bid information on these amounts. He stated Edmonds had said he would get that information, and he has not seen anything.

Hennagir stated that he is very aware of the Open Meeting Laws and emails can violate those laws. He asked the City Attorney to explain how emails can violate the Open Meeting Law. Toven responded that if a Council member sent an email to the whole council, or a “reply all” was hit and city business was discussed, it would be a violation. Hennagir said it could happen accidentally, but still be a violation.

Barbian responded that the Council is aware of that, and reminded them to be very mindful of this. Staff is also aware, and emails are usually sent out via Blind Copy.

Kevin Gerrard asked about Data Request statute that was brought up at the last meeting, as he has still not been able to get the documents he has requested.

Edmonds stated at the PUC meeting, it was asked if there is a definition for a “reasonable request”. Toven replied that there is not an exact definition. A person does have the option of filing a complaint with the state when a data request is not fulfilled. He added that Data Practice requests can be very expansive and take a lot of work. Depending on the nature of the data, it could contain, public and private information, so staff would need to go through everything and remove any private data.

Barbian told Gerrard that the City is not the appeal agency, he will need to contact the appropriate authority. Gerrard says he has asked for one document, and he received half of what he was looking for. He claimed that the City Council is telling Princeton Public Utilities not to provide him the information. Schumacher stated that he will need to file a complaint with the state.
Barbian spoke about the Shopko issue. There is one instance where it is believed that there was a violation of a state statute. The County Attorney is determining if charges will be filed.

Zimmer stated that Steinbrecher is correct that it is private property, so the city doesn’t have a whole lot of say. If the property owner would allow it, he is in favor of a larger sign to let people know that they cannot park there.

Steinbrecher asked if the City has approached the owner. Zimmer and Schumacher stated that staff has been in contact with the property owner on a few occasions, and has extended a lot of effort to try to resolve the issue. Barbian added that the City does recognize this has a problem, and has also tried to talk with McDonalds and Caribou to see if something can be worked out.

Staff will have some additional discussion with the property owner to discuss larger signs or the possibility of barricades.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. TIF 8-4 – Resolution 19-37 – approving TIF 8-4 Tammy Omdal

Tammy Omdal provided the details of the proposed TIF. The School District and the County have received the documents and staff has not received any comments. The school or county received of the TIF district, and staff has not received any comments, questions or concerns.

ZIMMER MOVED TO OPEN THE PUBLIC HEARING AT 7:43PM. J GEROLD SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Barbian advised that the prospective buyers are here if the Council has any questions. Staff is steadily progressing with the plans and the development agreement.

ZIMMER MOVED TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING AT 7:44PM. EDMONDS SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

ZIMMER MOVED TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 19-37 APPROVING TIF DISTRICT 8-4. EDMONDS SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

ORDINANCES AND RESOLUTIONS – Moved up

A. Resolution 19-36 IRS Compliance with reimbursement

This is a standard resolution to establish procedures relating to compliance with reimbursement bond regulations under the Internal Revenue Code.

REYNOLDS MOVED TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 19-36. J GEROLD SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY
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B. Resolution 19-38 – West Birch – Assignment of Development and TIF District 7-1

Omdal advised that Resolution 19-38 approves the assignment of the development agreement, assignment of Tax Increment Financing, allonge endorsement to Tax Increment Revenue Note and Master subordination agreement and Estoppel Certificate.

J GEROLD MOVED TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 19-38. ZIMMER SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

C. Resolution 19-39 – approve modification of TIF Plan 7-1

Omdal advised that Resolution 19-39 is modifying the Tax Increment Financing Plan for district 7-1. The change includes some minor changes to Table A, which shows the projected tax increment for West Birch Estates.

ZIMMER MOVED TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 19-39 MODIFYING THE FINANCING PLAN FOR TIF DISTRICT 7-1. REYNOLDS SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

D. Resolution 19-40 – approve Interfund Loan for TIF 7-1

Omdal advised that this is the standard resolution that authorizes interfund loan for advance of certain costs in connection with TIF district 7-1.

ZIMMER MOVED TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 19-40. J GEROLD SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

UNFINISHED BUSINESS – moved up

A. SMMPA Certificate of Ability and City Agreement

SMMPA Representative Dave Geschwing gave an update on the proposed Badger Transmission Line project that SMMPA is looking to do, and discussed the agreement that they are looking for the City to sign.

Schumacher said there is a big communication breakdown between the City Council and the PUC. He appreciates Geschwing coming up for the meeting tonight. He would like to see PUC Manager Butcher, staff and 1-2 council members to sit down for a meeting and discuss this.

Geschwing stated that all SMMPA members would benefit, as this will help keep their bills lower. The Cities of Austin and Rochester will not be renewing their standard contracts, but they have entered into separate contracts relating to this transmission line. Schumacher asked what the deadline to sign is. Geschwing responded that they would like all of them back by October 4th.

Edmonds questioned if there was any problem with the Council approving and signing the document today. Toven said he has reviewed the contract, and is fine with the Council sign-
ing it as it is written.

EDMONDS MOVED TO SIGN THE AGREEMENT. ZIMMER SECONDED THE MOTION. VOTE 2:3. EDMONDS AND ZIMMER IN FAVOR, SCHUMACHER, GEROLD AND REYNOLDS OPPOSED. MOTION FAILED.

Schumacher would like that discussion set up. He has concerns with how this was moved through the process. He would like to be there, along with Butcher and Erickson from the PUC, and J Gerold, Jackson and Barbian in attendance for the City.

SCHUMACHER MOVED TO TABLE THE ITEM UNTIL THE OCTOBER STUDY SESSION. REYNOLDS SECONDED THE MOTION. VOTE 3:2 SCHUMACHER, REYNOLDS AND GEROLD IN FAVOR, EDMONDS AND ZIMMER OPPOSED. THE MOTION CARRIED

PRESENTATIONS

A. Boy Scout Volunteer Alex Nutt Eagle Scout Project of Ga Ga Ball Court

Schumacher presented the plaque to Alex Nutt for his donation of the Ga Ga Ball Court in Rainbow Park.

Nutt stated that he had contacted the Park Board to talk about his idea for an Eagle Scout Project. The Ga Ga Ball is in and read to be used.

FYI – REPORTS, ANNOUNCEMENTS, CORRESPONENCE AND BOARDS / COMMITTEES

A. Aero Business Park Lot Sale, TIF update and Development Agreement Draft
B. EDA Board Meeting of August 15, 2019
C. Planning Commission Meeting of August 19, 2019
D. Park Board Meeting of August 26, 2019
E. Princeton Public Utility Meeting packet for August 28, 2019

PETITIONS, REQUESTS, AND COMMUNICATIONS

A. Chamber of Commerce Request for use of city’s generator for Chili Fest

Kim Young reported she is the new executive director for the Chamber of Commerce. She is requesting the use of the generator for the chili fest from noon to 4pm on September 21st.

ZIMMER MOVED TO APPROVE THE REQUEST TO USE THE GENERATOR FOR THE CHILI FEST ON SEPTEMBER 21, 2019. REYNOLDS SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

B. Wine and Spirits Request from Princeton Outback Dancers

Jenkins advised that this request came in the mail. Twenty-two girls for Princeton and Zimmerman have been selected to participate in the Outback Bowl Pregame and Halftime shows on New Years Day in Tampa, FL. To make the trip possible, they are asking for local businesses to sponsor these dancers.
ZIMMER MOVED TO APPROVE a WINE AND SPIRITS GRANT REQUEST IN THE AMOUNT OF $200. J GEROLD SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

NEW BUSINESS

A. Assessments on Sierks, Price Custom Homes

Jackson advised that when parcels 24-550-0160 and 24-550-0170 were purchased as tox forfeited property from the County, the unpaid assessments were eliminated. Tax forfeiture eliminations whatever certified assessments existed prior to the date of the forfeiture. However, the County continued to show the assessments on their site.

Even though those assessments are eliminated during the legal process of the forfeiture, the city has the right to recertify the assessments to the County after going through the notification and public hearing process of the assessment certification. The assessments were for street, curb and gutter, and storm sewer improvements in the area.

The Council needs to decide to begin the process of calling for a public hearing to recertify the assessments or to allow the elimination of the assessments to remain.

J Gerold asked if the buyers knew there were assessments when they purchased the properties. Jackson responded that the advertisement that the county puts out usually includes the assessments.

Edmonds had wondered why it was not recertified when Sierk’s purchased the land. He questioned why it is being looked at now.

Zimmer stated he does not feel comfortable putting an assessment back on that was removed.

JULES motion not to reassess. Jack seconded. Motion carried unanimously

ZIMMER MOVED NOT TO RECERTIFY THE ASSESSMENTS. EDMONDS SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

B. CDB Loan Subordination for Daniel and Jessie Hollenkamp

Barbian advised that the owners of 605 Central S, Milaca, MN 56353, Daniel Hollenkamp and Jessie Hollenkamp received two loans from the Small Cities Community Development Block Grant Program (CDBG) program. The original loan amounts were: 2,900.00 and 14,030.00. The current payout of the loans is 290.00 and 5,612.00 respectively. The owners now wish to refinance their home and have requested a subordination.

After the Cities or Milaca and Princeton completed putting the original improvement projects and loans in place with the assistance of Lakes & Pines the City of Princeton became the program oversight agency. This includes making determinations on requests for subordinations.
Analysis:

To consider the request the Policy & Procedures Manual was reviewed and Lakes & Pines was contacted to verify this was a local decision. This was confirmed.

To complete the process the establishment of reasonable terms as follows were established:
1. That the total of all loans; the primary mortgage and the CDBG loan from the City not exceed a loan to value of 90%.
2. All taxes will need to be documented as current.
3. The home must remain the principle residence of the original loan makers.

In review of the loan repayment agreements and mortgage it was found that there was a typo in one of the documents filed showing a release prior to the end term. This warrants a correction and can be completed by requiring execution prior to and with the subordination.

The pending refinancing and request for a subordination of the CDBG loans can strengthen a household’s finances although is not always successful. The two loans are nearing the end of the repayment which end in 2020 for the smaller loan and 2023 for the larger loan. The subordination is viewed to have little impact on the City of Princeton CDBG assets.

Recommendation:

That the City Council approve the subordination provided that the borrower documents the terms below and execute a loan agreement and mortgage correction.
1. That the total of all loans; the primary mortgage and the CDBG loan from the City not exceed a loan to value of 90%.
2. All taxes will need to be documented as current.
3. The home must remain the principle residence of the original loan makers.

REYNOLDS MOVED TO APPROVE THE SUBORDINATION AGREEMENT. J GEROLD SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

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 $207,678.83 AND THE ITEMS LISTED ON THE LIQUOR BILL LIST AND GENERAL CITY BILL LIST WHICH WILL BE CHECKS 79859 TO 79953 FOR A TOTAL OF $339,792.90. REYNOLDS SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

MISCELLANEOUS

A. On Board Agenda Software system approval

Hillesheim stated that if the Council is happy with the agenda software we are trying, staff would like approval to sign the agreement. Zimmer stated he has started using and if he can use it, anyone can.

ZIMMER MOVED TO APPROVE THE ON BOARD AGENDA SOFTWARE. J GEROLD SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY
Barbian reported that there is a meeting on Monday, September 16th that everyone is invited to. It is in regard to the Princeton Airport and its needs. MnDOT will be at the meeting.

ADJOURNMENT
There being no further business:

ZIMMER MOVED TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 8:20PM. REYNOLDS SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Respectfully Submitted,                                      ATTEST:

Shawna Jenkins Tadych                                      Brad Schumacher, Mayor
City Clerk
MINUTES OF A STUDY SESSION OF THE PRINCETON CITY COUNCIL
HELD ON SEPTEMBER 5 2019 4:30 P.M.

Mayor Brad Schumacher called the meeting to order. Council members present was Jack Edmonds, Jenny Gerold, Jules Zimmer and Jeff Reynolds. Staff present, Administrator Robert Barbian, Finance Director Steve Jackson, Public Works Director Bob Gerold, Police Chief Todd Frederick, Community Development Specialist Stephanie Hillesheim, Clerk Shawna Jenkins, Wastewater Plant Manager Chris Klinghagen, Liquor Store Manager Nancy Campbell and Fire Chief Ron Lawrence.

2020 Capital Improvement Discussion

Campbell, Klinghagen, B Gerold, Hillesheim and Barbian went over the new items that have been added to Capital Improvement for Liquor, Sewer, Finance, Community Development, Administration, Airport and Public Infrastructure.

Jackson advised that the increased amount needed from property taxes for 2020 is $131,925, and at a 98% collection rate that would be $134,617. The Levy increase percentage is 5.48%, however that may change once the City receives the valuations.

Edmonds stated he feels it is best to stay with the current increase, as the amount set for the preliminary cannot be increased.

Schumacher said he would like to see $100,000 in Liquor funds be used yearly to pay a bond fee on some needed projects.

Edmonds asked what percentage the City is at. Jackson responded that the City is at about 60%. The Auditor suggested that if the City is in a situation where we have more revenue or less expenditures, that some funds are transferred to the EDA, as they are carrying almost a 1.3 million negative fund balance.

Strategic Planning

The Council would like more time to review this, and discuss it at a study session meeting once the Budget is finished.

Edmonds asked if there is a meeting set up with PUC yet. Barbian responded that Butcher had a family emergency, so nothing is set up yet. Schumacher added that he would like Paul from Delano to come as well, and discuss how they have resolved their differences with their Utility Company and have a great relationship.

Edmonds stated he would like the Council to sign the SMMPA agreement, as the City Attorney has reviewed and approved of the agreement. Schumacher replied that he would at least like a goodwill gesture to set up the joint meeting.

Barbian said there are some issues that should be discussed and questioned if a joint meeting with the Council and PUC would be beneficial. Zimmer would like a joint meeting, with a list of items to discuss put on the agenda.

Edmonds said the agreement needs to be signed. Zimmer agreed.
Police K9 Program Update

Frederick reported that K9 Chico has been dealing with some hip issues over the last few months. There was a training incident where he hit his head, and while the vet checked him out and he appeared to be okay, they now believe it caused some nerve damage from his head all the way back to his tail. He has seen 3 vets and they do not believe it is fixable.

There is another dog available that was put on hold from another department. While the original intended handler is similar to Officer Cedarburg, they will make sure this dog would be a great fit. A standard cost for a dog is approximately $10,000, but could be cheaper in this situation. There are funds still available in the K9 program fund.

ZIMMER MOVED TO PURCHASE THE DOG. J GEROLD SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Adjournment

ZIMMER MOVED TO ADJOURN THE STUDY SESSION AT 6:23PM. J GEROLD SECONDED THE MOTION. MEETING ADJOURNED

Respectfully Submitted,

Shawna Jenkins Tadych  
City Clerk

ATTEST:

______________________________

Brad Schumacher, Mayor
MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING OF THE PRINCETON CITY COUNCIL HELD ON SEPTEMBER 26, 2019 7:00 P.M. AT PRINCETON CITY HALL

Mayor Brad Schumacher called the meeting to order and led the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag. Council members present were, Jack Edmonds, Jenny Gerold, Jules Zimmer, and Jeff Reynolds. Others present: City Administrator Robert Barbian, Finance Director Steve Jackson, Police Chief Todd Frederick, Public Works Director Bob Gerold, Community Development Specialist Stephanie Hillesheim, Clerk Shawna Jenkins, Fire Chief Ron Lawrence, and Attorney Damien Toven. Absent was Liquor Store Manager Nancy Campbell and Engineer Jen Edison

AGENDA ADDITIONS/DELETIONS

Schumacher would like update the Council of the School Districts Long range planning meeting, and Barbian would like to give an update on a joint meeting with the PUC.

J GEROLD MOVED TO APPROVE THE AGENDA. REYNOLDS SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES

A. Special Budget Session minutes of September 12, 2019
B. Regular Meeting Minutes of September 12, 2019
C. Special Budget Session minutes of September 19, 2019

REYNOLDS MOVED TO APPROVE SPECIAL BUDGET SESSION MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 12, 2019, REGULAR MEETING MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 12, 2019 AND SPECIAL BUDGET SESSION MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 19, 2019. ZIMMER SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

CONSENT AGENDA

A. Permits and Licenses
B. Personnel
   1. Police Chief Todd Frederick Step Increase effective 10-1-19
   2. Approval to hire Liquor Clerk Shanon Gallager
   3. approval to hire Liquor Clerk Madalyne Norenlberg
C. Donations
   1. Resolution 19-41 – accept donation from Jaycee’s for Solheim field
   2. Resolution 19-42 – accept donation from the Little Britches Rodeo to Fire Department
   3. Resolution 19-43 – accept donation from Outlaw Grass Drafts to Fire Department

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

D. Miscellaneous

Zimmer, Edmonds and Schumacher provided an update on the School District long range planning meeting that they attended.

Barbian advised that he has finally been able to talk with the PUC about a joint meeting with the Council. The date suggested for the joint meeting is October 24th. Since the normal meeting starts at 7pm, a 5pm start time is suggested for the joint meeting. Staff will work on an agenda.
ZIMMER MOVED TO APPROVE THE A JOINT MEETING WITH THE PUC BE HELD ON OCTOBER 24TH AT 5PM. EDMONDS SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

OPEN FORUM

Kevin Gerrard at 411 North Rum River Drive stated that the PUC has not been posting their agenda and packet information. He would like to see more of that posted for the Public. Jenkins responded that they are included in the City Council packets and believes that the PUC posts them on their website as well.

PUBLIC HEARINGS - None

PRESENTATIONS

A. Coalition of Greater MN Cities – Elizabeth Wefel

Welfel is the President of the Coalition of Greater MN Cities for 2019-2020. Entering the 2019 legislative session the CGMC’s top priority was restoration of Local Government Aid (LGA) to his 2002 high. Because of CGMC’s efforts, governor Walz and the House Tax Committee made LGA restoration a top priority and a $30 million LGA increase was signed into law at the end of the session, restoring the LGA to the high in 2002.

In addition to LGA, the CGMC had a number of notable accomplishments this session. They secured $1.5 million in funding for child care training and business development. Unlocked $59 million in Public Facilities Authority funding tied up in litigation. Secured an additional $18 million for the Point Source Implementation Grant Program in the Legacy bill. Maintained $3.574 million in funding for the Greater Minnesota business Development Public Infrastructure Grant Program. Protected $25 million in annual funding for the Corridors of Commerce transportation program. Codified long-held CGMC goal to require independent scientific peer review when developing new water quality regulations.

CGMC also fought hard for a comprehensive transportation package that would provide additional funding for city streets, including a dedicated source of revenue for cities with populations of less than $5,000 that do not receive constitutionally dedicated funds. And while the Legislature did not pass a bonding bill this year, a draft bonding proposal that emerged during the late May special session revealed that the CGMC was successful in prioritizing projects that benefit Greater Minnesota, which we hope puts these projects in a strong position for inclusion in next year’s bill.

Schumacher mentioned the paid time off that the governor is pushing. It is not that the council doesn’t want to do those things, but it has to be planned for, it can’t be put into law in the middle of a year. He would like the CGMC to echo those concerns to the legislators.

Welfel responded that she does not see the Senate passing that, at least for now.

Schumacher and Edmonds said in terms of the gas tax, the residents will be paying a lot as many people travel to the Cities for work. With the Population under that 5,000 mark, the city won’t benefit from those additional funds.
Schumacher thanked Weifel for coming to the meeting to provide an update on what the CGMC is working on.

FYI – REPORTS, ANNOUNCEMENTS, CORRESPONDENCE AND BOARDS / COMMITTEES

A. Manufacturers Breakfast October 3 – 8am at Glenn Metalcraft 1502 14th Street
B. Princeton Public Utility Meeting packet for September 25, 2019
C. Airport Board Meeting Minutes of August 5, 2019

PETITIONS, REQUESTS, AND COMMUNICATIONS

A. Wine and Spirits Grant Request from Woman’s Business Alliance for SOAR Conference

Hillesheim reported that the Women’s Business and Alliance is holding an event at Northern Lights Ballroom on October 10th. They are asking for a Liquor fund grant of $1500 to assist in covering the fees for the speakers. So far, they have over 75 registered to attend, not including sponsors.

REYNOLDS MOVED TO APPROVE A $750 LIQUOR GRANT FOR THE SOAR CONFERENCE. J GEROLD SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

B. Pizza Barn request for use of Parking Lot for “Trunk or Treat” on Saturday October 26

Jody Stay is requesting closure of a portion of the Riverside Mall Parking lot for the Trunk or Treat event on October 26th.

B Gerold said we have done this in the past. They drop barricades the day prior for them to put up Saturday afternoon.

REYNOLDS MOVED TO APPROVE THE REQUEST TO CLOSE THE PARKING LOT FOR A FEW HOURS FOR THE TRUNK AND TREAT EVENT FOR SATURDAY OCTOBER 28. ZIMMER SECONDED THE MOTION.

Frederick suggested that the Pizza Barn contact the local businesses and let them know of their event. Zimmer suggested adding that they notify City hall that they have contacted the surrounding businesses for any of these types of requests.

Schumacher asked if Reynolds and Zimmer would accept a friendly amendment to require the applicant to contact the surrounding businesses.

REYNOLDS AND ZIMMER ACCEPTED THE FRIENDLY AMENDMENT. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

ORDINANCES AND RESOLUTIONS

A. Resolution 19-44 – approve preliminary levy
Jackson advised that the suggested preliminary levy is the one that was discussed at the last budget sessions. It can be lowered when the final levy is submitted, but it cannot be increased.

ZIMMER MOVED TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 19-44 APPROVING THE PRELIMINARY LEVY. REYNOLDS SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

B. Resolution 19-45 – MN Manufacturers Week

ZIMMER MOVED TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 19-45 PROCLAIMING OCTOBER 1<sup>ST</sup> THOUGH OCTOBER 7<sup>TH</sup> AS MINNESOTA MANUFACTURING WEEK. REYNOLDS SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

C. Resolution 19-46 – Infant and Pregnancy Loss day

ZIMMER MOVED TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 19-46 RECOGNIZING OCTOBER 15<sup>TH</sup> AS NATIONAL PREGNANCY AND INFANT LOSS AWARENESS DAY. J GEROLD SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

UN_FINISHED BUSINESS

A. Approve the old ladder truck to be sold at auction

Lawrence advised that he is seeking approval to sell the used ladder truck on an on-line auction website. The site will be www.govtdeals.com. He said he can put a reserve on the sale, and if it does not meet that amount, the city will not be charged.

ZIMMER MOVED TO APPROVE THE OLD LADDER TRUCK TO BE SOLD AT AUCTION. REYNOLDS SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

B. Streambank Repairs

B Gerold reported that the City has 5 streambank stabilization projects in place to comply with our wastewater permit for phosphorous reduction. These sites are inspected monthly for any erosion issues and to do minor repairs.

Three of the sites are in need of some repairs. We have budgeted $15,000 annually for this, staff has received one quote at the time of preparing this memo and awaiting one more. The quote received has not been attached to keep the bid process fair. The repairs would be done this fall by a contractor and assisted by Public Works Staff.

If the council agrees with spending these funds a motion to that affect would be in order.

EDMONDS MOVED TO APPROVE THE USE OF THE $15,000 BUDGETED ANNUALLY FOR STREAMBANK REPAIRS. ZIMMER SECONDED THE MOTION.
Edmonds asked if Mille Lacs Soil and Water is involved in the Streambanks. B Gerold replied that he has been there if he has questions, and they have assisted by providing plantings at a discounted rate. These repairs will be done yet this fall.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

C. SMMPA Agreement

Barbian advised that this has been discussed at 2 past meetings, and a SSMPA representative was at the last meeting to answer questions. Staff has reached out to the PUC and the joint meeting will be at 5pm on October 24th.

ZIMMER MOVED TO APPROVE THE SMMPA AGREEMENT. J GEROLD SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

D. Discussion on Fire Truck Contract

Lawrence said as the council knows, the townships have agreed into buying into a new engine. Staff from the department has gone through all the specs with a fine-tooth comb. The Pierce is the best price so far. The truck committee looked at what is needed now, and planned for in the future and kept

Talked to almost all the fire board members and they are in favor of moving forward, and will be voting on at the upcoming fire advisory board. Pierce’s fiscal year ends, so they cannot guarantee the price after October 1st.

By paying up front for the chassis, the Department can save about $9000. A couple of the townships have paid their whole 10 year up front, and another in just a couple of payments.

There could be some variations slightly depending on the options. Jerry Ruud who is on Blaine’s Fire Department has gone through all the specs. There are 7 or 8 Firefighters that are on the Truck Committee and they have spent a lot of time on this.

J GEROLD MOVED TO ACCEPT THE PIERCE QUOTE AND TO PREPAY FOR THE CHASSIS. ZIMMER SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

NEW BUSINESS

A. Citizen’s Academy

Schumacher stated Clerk Jenkins had seen this and brought it up to him. He thought it may be something to discuss at the October Study Session.

B. 2020 Volunteer Fire Assistance Matching Grant
Lawrence advised that the First Department received this grant. The grant was requesting a Backpack blower for wildland fires and safety equipment. The Fire Relief Association has agreed to pick up the City’s half.

ZIMMER MOVED TO ACCEPT AND EXECUTE THE GRANT. REYNOLDS SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

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 $153,901.15 AND THE ITEMS LISTED ON THE LIQUOR BILL LIST AND GENERAL CITY BILL LIST WHICH WILL BE CHECKS 79960 TO 80056 FOR A TOTAL OF $236,027.99. REYNOLDS SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MISCELLANEOUS

ADJOURNMENT
There being no further business:

REYNOLDS MOVED TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 8:10PM. J GEROLD SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully Submitted,

Shawna Jenkins Tadych
City Clerk

ATTEST:

Brad Schumacher, Mayor