MINUTES OF A STUDY SESSION OF THE PRINCETON CITY COUNCIL
HELD ON JULY 6 2017 4:30 P.M.
******************************************************************************
Mayor Paul Whitcomb called the meeting to order. Council members present was Jack Edmonds, Jules Zimmer, and Jeff Reynolds. Staff present, Administrator Mark Karnowski, Finance Director Steve Jackson, Public Works Director Bob Gerold, Police Chief Todd Frederick, Community Development Director Jolene Foss, Clerk Shawna Jenkins, and Fire Chief Ron Lawrence. Absent was Thom Walker.

League of MN Cities Insurance Trust Presentation to Mark Karnowski

Todd Praffke LMCIT Board Chair, Pete Tritz LMCIT Administrator, Dan Greensweig LMCIT Assistant Manager, Dave Unmbach Executive Director and Laura Honeck LMCIT Operations Manager wanted to thank Mark Karnowski on the 8 years that he has served on their Board. Insurance is complicated and very important. The LMCIT has over 1000 member cities, and they all share in risks, rewards, and loss control efforts. Cities receive dividends when possible. They thanked Karnowski, and the City Council for allowing him to serve on their board. Karnowski did a fantastic job.

Karnowski stated that it is complicated and takes a while to get up to speed. Even after 8 years, he doesn’t know if he entirely got up to speed. There were always wrinkles and things to research and work through. He thanked them for allowing him to serve.

ASR Radio Discussion with Mille Lacs County

Karnowski reported that on Monday, June 19th, he, Mayor Whitcomb, Councilman Zimmer, Police Chief Frederick, Fire Chief Lawrence, and Finance Director Jackson met with Mille Lacs County Sheriff Brent Lindgren and several of his staff to discuss the feasibility of installing a ARMER ASR radio set-up in Princeton which would improve the County’s Sheriff’s radio reception in the Princeton area as well as improve the Princeton Police, Fire, Public Works and PUC’s radio coverage within the larger buildings in our area.

Apparently, late last fall, Mille Lacs County applied for a $600,000 50/50 state grant to fund the proposed system. Originally, the city was advised the city’s share of the local share would be half of the local match requirement or $150,000. The County needs to make a decision on accepting or rejecting the grant this week. The city’s agreement to participate may factor into that decision.

Prior to the meeting on the 19th, the city was advised that the city’s share would actually be closer to $60,000-$75,000. But then, on the 19th, the city’s share went back to something just under $150,000 when one figures in the cost of erecting an antenna support system and the other related equipment.

One of the issues is that the County put in a similar system (that, reportedly, covers a larger area with a taller antenna) in the north end of the County without requiring any of the other benefitted entities to contribute to that project. So the city is wondering why we’re being treated differently than the other entities on the north end of the County. The city was advised that the County paid for all of it because their radios didn’t work well in the north part of the County and there were no other departments that would benefit from that new tower.
Also, the city (actually Relocation) has already purchased a radio signal enhancement system to be located in the High School that actually provides radio coverage within buildings in a lot of the south end of the city. We’re investigating whether the installation of a second system in the north part of the city would give the city all the coverage it needs. The cost of that second system would be around $15,000.

At issue is finding a source for the requested city share of the matching funds. As the Council is aware we already have some new fiscal demands for the 2018 budget (and beyond). Those include:

1. The necessary local share for the TH95/21st Ave. roundabout project ($400,000±), and
2. The local share of the Bike Trail grant ($545,800±), and
3. The additional cost of participating in the Sherburne County Drug Task Force Program ($110,000/yr.).

Mayor Whitcomb and Councilman Zimmer rightly advised the Sheriff that a decision on committing to the estimated $150,000± was a decision only the full City Council could make.

Lawrence stated that there are pros and cons to both this system and the small unit that will be installed in the high school.

Edmonds asked if the school district is sharing costs of the unit being installed in the high school. Karnowski replied that the High School is designated for the relocation program, so those funds pay for it.

Al Fjerstad with the Mille Lacs County stated that the unit in the high school will likely provide coverage into the hospital and a few other buildings, but it is only one channel. The system is good and has been deployed in a few counties and work well for emergencies.

Reynolds asked how he would compare the high school unit to this $150,000. Fjerstad replied that it will really benefit the city, firefighters and public works. The larger unit would also greatly assist the county, state patrol, and others in the event of a major situation, Lawrence stated that the small system may not provide coverage in all buildings.

Whitcomb said if he remembers right, even a new tower could be an issue in the industrial area. Fjerstad responded that the proposed site of a new tower system would be the public safety building, so the industrial park would benefit and there should be very good service in those buildings. The tower will need to be reinforced to handle a microwave dish, and the estimated cost is really a best guess. The other piece is the county will be picking up the yearly maintenance on the tower, which can be $75,000 - $100,000 a year.

Reynolds asked what the useful life of this type of system is. Fjerstad said the school system is a typical radio repeater. The tower proposed would be as well, but if the city wanted to change it to a to the simulcast system, it could be tied into several other towers.
Zimmer stated that it appears that even if we do all this improvement, there is no guarantee that it will greatly improve the service. Fjerstad replied that if the city decided to move forward with the project, he would put some more research into the coverage of the area. He is pretty certain that while it would probably not be 100%, we would likely have very good coverage with the proposed site.

Zimmer said if this had come up during the budget process, he would be in favor of putting money aside in the CIP for this. The county applied for the grant in October, and approved in April and we just now became aware of it. He understands that something like this is needed for public safety, but the funds are not available right now.

Zimmer asked Jackson where these funds come from if the project was approved. Jackson replied that the only option would be to make a special allocation out of the CIP fund. There are enough funds in the CIP, but it would move some other priority items. The council could put away some extra over the next few years to put those funds back. Zimmer said if we do not take the opportunity now, there may not be another grant to assist in the cost.

Fjerstad stated that they did have a meeting with Motorola, and they were informed about a municipal lease program for the extra costs. They call it a lease, but it is essentially a 0% loan over a couple years. Kanabec County did something similar. There are no penalties to pay off early, and it is at 0%. It would be for the non-grant portion of the project. So it would cover the work that Motorola would need to do. The grant money will buy the equipment but not pay for the installation.

Karnowski asked Fjerstad what the grant amount is and required match. Fjerstad replied that the grant received is for $270,000 and has a 50-50 match. The County was willing to split that 50%. Karnowski said one thing staff is confused about, is they have yet to see what the exact cost will be. Fjerstad stated that if the city will partners with the county, then he can look into it more and narrow down the costs. He wrote down a lot of information on the municipal loan program, but could set up an appointment with them and city staff to find out more details.

Jackson said if the council wanted to go ahead with the project if the no interest loan was available, they could motion to approve pending the approval of the 7 year interest free loan.

Foss asked if they have done the coverage study yet. Fjerstad responded that the did a coverage test 3-4 years ago on the north side with a different type of antenna, and that one showed little coverage in the buildings. They are hoping this antenna in the proposed location will provide much better coverage.

Zimmer said if we were in the budget process, we could budget for it and start setting funds aside, but we do not have funds to do this now.

Whitcomb asked what the cost would be today if we committed to the project. Fjerstad responded that the grant is for $270,000, with a 50% match. Half of that would be to the city, so would be $67,500. The Tower will be about $34,000, and his best guess would be another $40,000 for installation. The City could possibly finance about $80,000 through Motorola.
Zimmer said there in the meeting there was some discussion that the county would want about $80,000 up front. He asked how soon the City would have to pay their portion. Frederick added that if he recalls, the $135,000 would need to be paid by the completion of the project.

Frederick asked for an estimate on the cost of the entire project. Fjerstad remembers it to be approximately $280,000 - $300,000.

Zimmer asked if it would be bonded for. Jackson replied that it would not be at that small amount, unless it was rolled in with another project.

Fjerstad said he is not here to talk the city into the project, just to provide information.

Karnowski stated that the main issue staff has is that the same type of tower was erected on the north side of the county and they paid the full amount. It seems strange that the county will pay for the full amount for one on the north side, but Princeton does not get the same accommodations.

Fjerstad reiterated that there are no hard feelings if the city does not want to move forward with the project.

Reynolds said in the event of a serious event, we would really dislike not having good radio coverage.

Whitcomb said you don’t put a price on public safety, but when an exact cost can’t be provided he thinks it would be best to wait on the project. Zimmer agreed and suggested that the council start planning for this by putting it in the CIP.

Edmonds said he agrees he would like to see other avenues be looked at. Possibly partner with Sherburne County and start planning for it with a CIP.

Lawrence asked Fjerstad if they would be applying for another grant. Fjerstad replied that they may, but usually when you return grant money, it is a strike against you in the future.

Reynolds asked if it would be okay to approve it contingent on it being $60,000 - $65,000, and it would be up to the county to keep it to a certain amount. Fjerstad doesn’t not think the grant will dry up and go away tomorrow, but they do need to know by the beginning of the week.

Frederick asked if the County has voted yet and when their next meeting is. Fjerstad said they had not voted yet, and the next meeting is July 18th.

Karnowski said he understands the counties reluctance to return grant money, as the city has been dealing with that as well. The City has substantial grants for the bike path and the roundabout. He just does not know where the city would come up with the $60,000 that is needed for this.

Zimmer asked if all the large purchases are done via CIP. Jackson said they do have money set aside for 800mgz radio replacements. Frederick added that Chief Warnake had started that fund and money is put into it each year. They were told the current radios would not be
serviced at some point, so they would need to be replaced. Whitcomb said the thing is, we are prepared for that, where this is out of the blue.

Zimmer said the cleaner way to do it is to start budgeting for it, and get it done whether there is a grant or not. Karnowski stated if the county would have said the south side will need an aerial at some point, the city could have start budgeting for it. Zimmer agreed and said they should have let the city know they were applying for the grant.

Zimmer stated that it can be looked into more if the council is in favor of this type of project. Frederick responded that he feels this type of a tower is a hard sell, as it would not reach the other counties.

Karnowski stated that in regard to grants, the Public Safety building Grant that was applied for was originally approved, but the governor line item vetoed it. It was stated that it was a local need verses a regional need. It might be interesting to pursue state bonding money as a simulcast system would link 3 counties and a several law enforcement and fire departments. He suggested talking to state representatives to show this is a regional need. He thinks it would be a good option to go for a 50-50 match on a larger simulcast system.

Frederick agreed a simulcast tower would be very beneficial, as it would be used well into Isanti and Sherburne County and even partially into Benton County.

Zimmer asked if we pursue the simulcast system, it may be beneficial to look into setting up a committee. Frederick commented that the last he heard, a simulcast system process usually takes a couple years.

WHITCOMB MOVED TO NOT PARTICIPATE IN THE PROJECT AT THIS TIME, AND TO HAVE STAFF BEGIN LOOKING AT THE IDEA OF A SIMULCAST SYSTEM AND BEGAN PLANNING FOR IT IN THE CIP. ZIMMER SECONDED THE MOTION. VOTE: 3; 1, REYNOLDS OPPOSED, MOTION CARRIED

Airport Master Plan Discussion with Airport Board

Kaci Nowicki from S.E.H advised that the Princeton Municipal Airport serves the general aviation air transportation needs of central Minnesota. A Master Plan study is currently being completed to determine the facilities needed to meet the projected aviation demand in the 20-year planning period (2015 – 2035). This planning study is a cooperative effort between PNM, The Federal Aviation Administration, the Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT) Office of Aeronautics, and the consultant (S.E.H. Inc).

Effective airport planning ensures that an airport is developed in a logical manner that coincides with the demand for facilities. Typically, planning efforts are performed approximately every five to fifteen years. An Airport Master Plan study has never been completed for the Princeton Municipal Airport. The Master Plan effort has been undertaken to ensure that the planning recommendations and alternatives are consistent with the current and future needs of the Airport and community.
As part of this study, aviation activity forecasts were prepared based on responses to user survey’s, the airports service area, and on analysis of local and national general aviation trends and socioeconomic data. PNM is home to 45 single engine aircraft, one multi engine aircraft and three helicopters. The Airport is served by one runway; Runway 15/33. Runway 15/33 is 3,900 feet long and 75 feet wide, and is paved and lit. ONM has a total of 37 hangars; two T-hanger buildings (4 units and 15 units), a single t-hanger unit, and 18 box style hangars on the airfield. The number of based aircraft at PNM is forecasted to increase from 49 in 2015 to 63 by 2035. Aircraft operations are expected to increase at an annual average growth rate of 2.10%, from 12,606 in 2015 to 19,095 in 2035.

The following are future development recommendations outlined in the Master Plan. These recommendations are based on the anticipated needs at the airport over the next 20 years.

Runway 15/33
1. Update runway 15/33’s designation to Runway 16/34
2. Reconstruct Runway 15/33
3. Replace runway lighting as part of the Runway 15/33 reconstruction project
4. Add a non-precision approach with vertical guidance to Runway 15

Taxiway System
1. Reconstruct Taxiway A, A1, A2, A4, A5 and C
2. Update taxiways system design and marking standards
3. Install taxiway lights on all taxiways

Miscellaneous
1. Relocated the AWOS (weather station) southwest of Runway 33 to make the existing location available for future hanger development
2. Plan for short-term, mid-term, and long-term hanger development, and construct when demand warrants
3. Install eight additional tie down (aircraft parking) spaces (total of 24) by 2035, or as needed
4. Redesign and expand existing apron to meet spacing standards and add tie downs
5. Monitor the FAA’s and EPA’s progress for updated regulations and replacements for Aviation Gas (100LL)
6. Add one additional automobile parking space (total of 25 spaces) by 2035 to the existing A/D building parking lot.
7. Install full perimeter fencing around the airport property
8. Remedy possible encroachments to Airport Property
9. Mitigate wildlife attractants and hazards
10. Implement sustainability initiatives

11. Update zoning ordinance to reflect the ultimate Runway 15/33 conditions and removal of Runway 4/22

Runway Development and Alternatives Analysis

During the Master Plan meetings with the Airport Advisory Board (AAB), it was determined that the AAB would like to plan for an ultimate runway length of 4,900 feet, as well as add an additional instrument approach procedure (procedure guides pilots to the runway in inclement weather and reduced visibility). While a runway extension is not currently forecasted to be needed in the next 20 years, the AAB felt it was important to protect for an ultimate extension so that the airport could accommodate it should the need arise. This alternatives analysis, and the focus of the Council Work Session with the AAB, examines potential improvements to instrument approaches and runway length.

The sections examine the current conditions at the Princeton Municipal Airport, and the alternatives considered for Runway 15/33. Runway extensions were considered to both ends of the existing runway, however only extensions to runway 33 end were evaluated since any extension to the 15 (north) end would require multiple road relocations due to Runway Protection Zone (RPZ) requirements.

Instrument Approach Considerations

Instrument approach procedures can be broken down into precision instrument or non-precision instrument approaches. Precision instrument approaches are those approaches that provide both vertical and horizontal guidance to the runway. An Instrument Landing System (ILS) is a common example of a precision approach. Most non-precision approaches have only directional guidance to the runway (as with the current approach). The newest approach published at airports is a Localizer Performance with Vertical Guidance (LPV) approach. An LPV approach is considered a non-precision approach yet it provides both horizontal and vertical guidance to pilots. Most LPV approaches require non-precision design standards at an airport.

Alternative 2A – 4,400’ Runway

Alternative 2A includes an extension of 500 feet to the south for a total length of 4,400 feet, and 1-mile non-precision approaches to both ends. This 500 foot extension is the maximum extension that can be accomplished within the existing airport property. A Length of 4,400 feet is slightly longer than the length needed for a King Air 200 (small aircraft with less than 10 passenger seats). Although non Kind Air 200 (or similar) users are requesting a longer runway at this time, it is feasible that a King Air 200 user would require 4,400 feet at Princeton Airport in the future.

The 500-foot runway and taxiway extensions would require approximately 0.37 acres of wetland fill to accommodate the required grading standards to the safety areas. Additionally,
this alternative would impact the existing service road leading to the Flight Service Station (FSS) equipment on the southwest side of the runway. This road will need to be relocated as it will continue to be needed for the FSS equipment. Because alternative 2A keeps the RPZ within airport property, no property acquisition is required.

Since the Airport Zoning Safety Zones extend proportionately with runway length, the Airport Zoning would be impacted on both runway ends. New incompatible land uses would result. On the north (Runway 15) end, there is a residential area that would be a new use within Zone B and the church would also be a new use within Zone B. While these uses would be “grandfathered” into the new zoning, no expansion of these sites would be permitted. On the south (Runway 33) end, Prairie Restorations would be encompassed within Zone B. The area currently in agricultural use (a compatible use) by Prairie Restorations would be limited for future development to uses compatible with Zone B.

This alternative would cost approximately 1.65 million in 2017 dollars. Based on current anticipated funding ratios, the City of Princeton would be expected to pay 10%, or $165,000.

**Alternative 2B – 4,900’ Runway**

Alternative 2B maximizes the runway length permitted (4,900 feet) without a precision approach per MnDOT Aeronautics requirements by increasing the runway extension to the south. As such this alternative includes a 1,000 foot extension for a total runway length of 4,900 feet while keeping the existing approach minimums of 1-mile. A 4,900 foot long runway is longer than that required for a King Air 200 type aircraft (which requires 4,400 feet) but less than the next FAA grouping of aircraft (large aircraft weighting between 12,500 and 60,000 pounds) which typically require around 5,500 feet at locations similar to Princeton.

This longer extension would increase wetland impacts to 0.53 acres of wetland fill and require 4.7 acres of property acquisition. Similar to Alternative 2A, the access road to the FSS equipment would need to be relocated or removed.

**Alternative 2C – shifted 4,900’ Runway**

To avoid impacting the church on the north (Runway 15) end, Alternative 2C reexamines Alternative 2B by shifting the 4,900 foot runway south. Alternative 2C shifts the entire runway south approximately 1,000 feet, which is enough to match the outer edge of the future MnDOT Safety Zone B with the outer edge of the existing Zone B.

**Alternative Analysis 2 – Preferred Alternative**

The AAB chose Alternative 2C as the preferred ultimate runway condition for Runway 15/33 as it provides the maximum length (4,900 feet) without a precision approach, and minimizes impacts to the church on the north end of the runway.
Nowicki did speak to Prairie Restoration and it was indicated that some of their land on the north side is being looked at for possible development. They are not considering any change in use, at this time, but things can change so would not want to make a commitment.

Karnowski added that some of that land is wetland, so it would never be developed. Its ultimate use is agricultural. However, some of the land that would need to be rezoned if the longer runway was put in is property that could be developed.

Karnowski and Nowicki stated that the city is allowed to go into Baldwin Township to zone properties for the airport.

Airport board Jeff Dotseth questioned if it was easier to get the zoning now, verses down the road. Nowicki responded that it is usually better received when there is a current needed use.

Karnowski stated if the master plan did not anticipate a longer runway, but then the northern part of prairie restoration where to get developed into industrial, you could zone for a longer runway, and those industrial companies would be grandfathered in.

Sharon Sandberg commented that the large airports want those smaller jets out, and Princeton could be an option for them. Nowicki said many of them fly out of Anoka, and they have corporate hanger space.

Whitcomb asked for some criteria on when to expand runways. Nowicki replied that from the FAA’s point of view, they want to see a well-documented need (500 operations per year) and local support for the project to line up the funding to expand a runway.

James Ferlaak said if we were just looking at what it should be today, it would leave it at the current 3900 feet. However, this plan is looking at the next 20 years, and for that he feels the city should go to the 4400 feet, or even the 4900. He would like to see the city make it as long as you can now, in case it is needed down the road. If we were to see a lot of industrial growth, we will need it for the corporate airplanes. The flight school is great, but the corporate airplanes are what really support the airport.

Edmonds said he feels the runway can stay the same for now. He cannot support compromising someone’s property use for 20 years for something unknown. He can support the other projects, just not the expansion of the runway at this time.

Zimmer said FAA stated they felt the current airport is adequate until 2035. He agrees with Edmonds on imposing zoning on a property owner. He is also in favor of leaving it the way it is at 3900 and also supports the other projects.

Karnowski restated that even if we leave it at 3900, if we really need the 4400 feet, you are not precluded from starting the zoning process and if you can demonstrate to the FAA it is needed. If something was built during on those properties during that time, it would be grandfathered in.
EDMONDS MOVED TO NOT EXPAND THE RUNWAY AND LEAVE IT AT 3900 FEET IN THE AIRPORT MASTER PLAN. ZIMMER SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

**Aero Business Park Broker Contract**

Foss reported that the Aero Business Park lots have been available for sale for numerous years. Previous attempts at selling the lots have not been successful. In an attempt to revitalize the efforts, the Economic Development Authority has reached out to numerous real estate brokers. The response was minimal, but included was a proposal from Coldwell Banker Commercial Broker, Ms. Wendy Hendricks. Ms. Hendricks offices out of St. Cloud and is a Princeton native.

The marketing that the Aero Business Park lots will receive with Coldwell Banker Commercial is considerable. Ms. Hendricks publishes the Business Central Magazine, which is a publication of the St. Cloud Area Chamber of Commerce. Business Central was established in January 2000 and has been produced bi-monthly ever since. The goal of the magazine is to provide reliable local business information to companies in Central Minnesota. The Aero lots would have a featured ad in the magazine, along with numerous other outlets that are used by Coldwell Banker Commercial.

Ms. Hendricks is proposing a fee of $5000 per lot sold in Aero Business Park. Staff is requesting the approval of the Exclusive Listing Agreement to continue with the marketing of the Aero Business Park Lots.

Whitcomb asked why the cost is listed as negotiable. Foss replied that the lots vary in assessment costs, and if it was listed as $1, many people would assume it was not “shovel Ready”

Jackson asked if the realtor was aware of the requirements. Foss replied she has provided all the information to the Ms. Hendricks.

ZIMMER MOVED ACCEPT THE AERO PARK REALTOR CONTRACT WITH MS. HENDRICKS. EDMONDS SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

**Princeton Fireworks Donation Request**

Karnowski reported that when the letter was sent a few months ago, it was routed to the EDA in error. A new one was dropped off Friday last week.

Historically the city has donated $1000 from the Liquor fund, and last year it was $1500.

Edmonds said he was there for a few hours and there were a lot of people.

Zimmer said he would like to donate the $1500 if we did last year, and work the publicity in for liquor store donation next year.
ZIMMER MOVED TO APPROVE A $1500 DONATION FROM THE PRINCETON WINE AND SPIRITS FUND TO THE PRINCETON FIREWORKS. REYNOLDS SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**TAP Bikepath Grant Update**

Foss reported that she has requested an extension as the cities portion has increased. They are going to make a formal request to Sherburne County for assistance and are also considering applying for a grant through Otto Bremer and possibly contacting MN DNR.

ZIMMER MOVED TO ADJOURN THE STUDY SESSION AT 6:24PM. EDMONDS SECONDED THE MOTION. MEETING ADJOURNED

Respectfully Submitted,

_________________________
Shawna Jenkins
City Clerk

_________________________
ATTEST:

_________________________
Paul Whitcomb, Mayor