



MINNESOTA OFFICE
 305 ST. PETER STREET
 ST. PAUL, MINNESOTA 55102
 651.227.7773
 FAX 651.223.5646
 WWW.WOLDAE.COM
 MAIL@WOLDAE.COM

MINNESOTA TO: Taskforce Members
 ILLINOIS FROM: John McNamara *jm*
 MICHIGAN
 COLORADO DATE: June 2, 2009
 COMM. NO: 082137

SUBJECT: City of Northfield – New Public Safety Facility Taskforce
 May 28, 2009 Meeting Minutes

Attendants:

Gerry Franek – Fire Chief
 Joel Walinski – City Administrator
 Andrew Yurek – Committee Member
 Fred Rogers – Committee Member
 Jon Denison – Committee Member/ Council
 Kris Vohs – Committee Member/ Council
 Greg Colby – Committee Member
 Jerry Anderson – Committee Member
 Mark Taylor – Police Chief
 Jenelle Teppen – Committee Member
 Ray Cox – Committee Member
 John McNamara – Wold Architects and Engineers

Absentees:

David Huistendahl – Committee Member

Discussion Topics:

- A. Wold confirmed distribution of meeting minutes from the last meeting and inquired regarding any comments:
1. It was clarified that the information regarding the change in flood elevation, was done by the DNR not Malt-O-Meal.
- B. At the request of the committee, Brian O'Connell, Community Development Director presented information regarding the existing Safety Center site and any constraints due to the proximity to the river. The following was discussed:
1. Current Safety Center site is located within the floodway fringe of the 100 year flood plain.
 2. Base flood elevation at the site is between 907.1 and 908.1.
 3. Buildings in the floodway fringe must be elevated one foot above the base flood elevation 15 feet out from the building.
 4. The lower level elevation was confirmed at 905 based on federal USGS bench mark information.
 5. Current building is classified as non-conforming, which makes it subject to flood plain regulations regarding what can be done to non-conforming buildings.



MINNESOTA
ILLINOIS
MICHIGAN
COLORADO

6. Regulations limit the amount of work that can be done to improve a structure. This limitation is 50% of the market value of the building and property.
 7. Subject to federal standards, the site could be filled or a levee constructed to remove the site from the floodway, thereby potentially allowing a greater level of improvement.
 8. The group questioned the valuation process used to determine value of the property, which has an impact on the amount of work that can be done.
 9. The group asked regarding how this building could have been built in non-conformance. This building was likely built pre-firm, before the maps were officially adopted by the City.
 10. Removing the building from the flood plain, would require redoing the flood maps. A hydro study would be needed for this to happen.
 11. The group again discussed this site as a legitimate site due to the constraints and would there be a better use for this property.
- C. There was a presentation by Dave Callister of Ehlers on bonding options for a Safety Center. In general, the city's ability to undertake projects, issue bonds and levy taxes is governed by state law. There most typical financing options are:
1. General Obligation Bonds (G.O. Bonds):
 - a. Requires an election typically referred to as a referendum. This takes a majority vote.
 - b. Requires a 49 day notification to the County Auditor.
 - c. Requires ballot language that assumes the whole debt service regardless of outside sources of funding.
 - d. Bonds are subject to net debt. Unused debt limit was calculated as just over \$45 million.
 2. Capital Improvement Bonds (CIP Bonds):
 - a. Approval required by 3/5ths of the City Council.
 - b. Does not require a referendum.
 - c. Needs to be part of a 5 year CIP plan.
 - d. Subject to a 30 day reverse referendum after a public hearing.
 - e. Bonds are subject to city levy limits. Unused levy limit was calculated as just over 2 million.
 3. EDA Lease Revenue Bonds:
 - a. Approval by the voters is not required.
 - b. City's EDA would provide financing through a lease arrangement.
 - c. The City has the ability to levy for the lease payments.
 - d. The City has an annual right to terminate the lease. This provision requires a larger initial cash contribution and interest rates are typically .4% to .5% higher resulting in higher debt service payments.
- Based on information provided by the City, Ehlers projected the potential tax impact of each option considering a \$10 million bond issue. It was pointed out that any cash upfront would reduce the amount of the bond, and that any annual contributions would reduce the amount of debt service needed for payments.
- D. The group asked regarding any other major projects that would impact city taxes. City administration shared the following projects:
1. City street reconstruction. Street reconstruction typically occurs each year. Typically these are paid through increases in utility bills.



MINNESOTA
ILLINOIS
MICHIGAN
COLORADO

2. Recreation Center. This project is a lower priority and will be further out.
 3. Library. This would be a \$9-10 million project. Is currently being studied.
 4. School may be looking at a bond issue soon.
- E. Wold distributed an updated Site Evaluation Matrix filled in based on input from the last meeting. The following was discussed:
1. The group discussed the merits of totaling the rows. The concern was expressed that the criteria are not weighted and some criteria would have a stronger negative or positive based on the weighting. For example a more expensive site would be more negative than a less expensive site.
 2. The group discussed that Furlong's GM Auto Sales would rank more negatively due to cost, but that is not reflected in the ratings.
 3. It was pointed out that the totals for Furlong's site was incorrect and should be adjusted to a 3. A revised matrix is attached.
 4. The group agreed to leave the totals on the matrix.
 5. It was shared that there have been some comments in the northern part of the City that the sites are too far south. It was commented that identifying a future 2nd Fire Station in the north part of the City would help with this concern and that if the City could identify the site and purchase it, this would help.
 6. The addition of opticon light controls would help with response time, but not with fire fighters getting to the site.
- F. Wold distributed a draft Taskforce recommendation document for review. The following were comments from the group:
1. It was discussed that a overall summary and recommendation should be included prior to all the detail.
 2. The group discussed the recommended building size and objected to including the square footage from the previous study, based on that they did not author those recommendations. This section will be revised to indicate the committee work on the revised program. A copy of the program will be attached.
 3. It was further discussed that adding the diagram indicating current fire vehicles should be attached as support for and explaining the need for apparatus space.
 4. It was questioned why there were not separate training spaces for police and fire as they have now. It was discussed that a shared training room was agreed on during the study. It was discussed that having training spaces for police and fire would be a benefit.
 5. Regarding operational models, a pro's and con's list was needed for both models.
- F. The committee requested a updated draft recommendation be sent out prior to the meeting scheduled for June 11 to allow time for each member to review and bring comments to the meeting. This will be sent out by June 8, 2009.
- G. Next Steps: A meeting with the City Council will be scheduled for their work session on June 22, 2009, with final council action occurring at the first Council meeting in July.

cc: Attendants
Michael Cox, Wold Architects and Engineers
Tyler Kavanaugh, Wold Architects and Engineers

DP/CI_Northfield/082137/min/5-28-09

NEW PUBLIC SAFETY FACILITY SITE EVALUATION MATRIX

SITE	Cost	Size	Location	Access	Aesthetics	Proximity to			Public	Safety	Parking	Noise	Concerns	Circulation	Security	Expansion	Best Use	Total
						Facilities	Water	Control										
1. Current Safety Center Site	+	-	+	0	+	0	0	-	0	+	-	0	0	-	0	-	0	-4
2. Highway 3 - Valley Co-Op	0	0	+	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3. Cowles Property Riverview Dr.	+	0	-	0	-	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	0	3
4. Furlong GM Auto Sales *	-	+	-	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	-	0	3

Criteria have equal weight and evaluation of +, 0, - is relative to other sites.

* Note: Furlong GM Auto Sales is an alternate site only if it becomes available.