

SEWER/WATER PUBLIC HEARING  
CITY OF CROSSLAKE  
SATURDAY, OCTOBER 30, 1999  
9:00 A.M. – CROSSLAKE COMMUNITY CENTER

Pursuant to due notice and call, a public hearing was held on Saturday, October 30, 1999 at 9:00 A.M. at the Crosslake Community Center for the purpose of obtaining public input in regards to the proposed sewer/water project currently being reviewed by the Sewer/Water Committee. Members present from the Committee were: Chairman Dean Swanson, Mayor Darrell Swanson, City Administrator Thomas Swenson, General Manager Kevin Larson, Bill Reed and Public Works Foreman Pat Hoag. Also attending was George Orning, Mark Hallan and Dave Reese of Widseth Smith Nolting. There were approximately 46 individuals in the audience.

Mayor Darrell Swanson opened the public hearing by welcoming everyone in attendance. He requested that everyone in attendance sign the sheet provided for names. He then turned the meeting over to Sewer/Water Committee Chairman Dean Swanson.

Dean Swanson stated that this meeting was the first of many meetings that will be scheduled to discuss this subject. He stated, that he himself, has been involved with this project for approximately six years, but for a period of time the project became stagnant. It has become active again upon the establishment of a committee appointed by the City Council. Widseth Smith Nolting has been contracted to work with the City to provide facts and figures pertinent to a sewer/water project.

George Orning, facilitator for the hearing, gave a recap of how the sewer project has evolved from 1996, when Widseth Smith Nolting became involved, until today. It was noted that the current Sewer Study being completed by Widseth Smith Nolting was funded in part by a grant from the Initiative Foundation. Initially, the City was looking at a cost of \$8.3 million dollars for the project. Stabilization ponds were considered, however, this option was too costly after meeting with the DNR. In 1998, the area was reduced to Phase 1 at a cost of \$4.3 million dollars. In 1999, a revision to Phase 1 put the cost at approximately \$3 million dollars. He stated that the cost for the collection system would be approximately \$1,280,000, the cost for the lift stations approximately \$325,000, the cost for the wastewater treatment facility at approximately \$675,000 and contingency costs of \$280,000. The total construction cost would be approximately \$2,560,000. Administrative/legal, engineering and construction observation would cost approximately \$440,000. The cost of the plant and lift station would be paid through a city-wide tax levy at an estimated cost of \$35 per \$100,000 residential evaluation. The estimated cost of hookup fees for those residing in Phase 1, the estimated monthly user charges for those connected to the system would be offset with the cost of depreciation of the present sewer system and an increase in property value. He showed the typical on-site sewer costs associated with a septic system and compared it with the cost of a municipal sewer system. He stated that the project was in line with the City's Comprehensive Plan and that the City is unique in that it is built around a major lake resource with a high volume of visitors and seasonal residents. The City has purchased 14 acres of land East of

County Road #3 for a treatment plant. The City will install service pipe to each parcel's lot line, however, the owner is responsible to install service pipe on private property.

The meeting was then opened to the public for comments.

Roger Roy asked what the administrative/legal, engineering and construction observation costs included. Mark Hallan stated that the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) requires that all construction, as well as laying of pipe requires monitoring by an engineering firm. Bidding, construction of the plant, startup of the plant and proper operation of the lift stations will all require administrative and engineering work.

Dick Steffans, of Garrison, stated that his community is facing the same situation as Crosslake and inquired as to the cost of removing the current systems. Mark Hallan stated that it would be the responsibility of the owner to pay any costs associated with abandonment of the current system. Crosslake is unique in that it has very sandy soil, unlike other communities. All abandoned systems will need to be pumped in order to remove polluted material. A raise of hands showed no one in attendance with a mound type septic system as is typical in Garrison where there is a concern for the high costs to remove such systems.

The Committee stated that input is needed from the public as to whether a water system should be considered along with a sewer system. It was noted that a water system would have an impact on fire rates and an increase in business growth in the Community.

John Huber asked what parts of the City were included in the other phases and he asked if a city wide tax would be imposed to pay for the system since people on the other side of the lake would be paying for something they wouldn't benefit from. Mayor Swanson commented that we all have a responsibility to protect the ground water for ourselves and for future generations. Phase 1 is the most densely populated area of the City, however, if only the property owners in that area were required to pay for it, the sewer system would not be affordable.

Daniel Brock (? Name not listed on sign in sheet) asked if there was any consideration given to imposing a half percent City tax to help pay for the system and whether the waste would flow into the Pine River. Mark Hallan commented that in 1996, effluent standards for the Pine River relating to phosphorus levels was given to the City by the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency. Design criteria for the treatment plant was also included with these standards. City Administrator Swenson commented that special legislation would be required to get a special tax imposed.

Roger Roy asked the definition of residential evaluation and whether it would affect every property owner. City Administrator Swenson stated that the \$35 per \$100,000 of evaluation was only an estimate since the tax structure is tiered where the first \$75,000 would be at one tax rate and any valuation above that could be at another rate. Hence, the \$35 is only an estimate. Roger Roy asked how much revenue this would generate and

Mark Hallan stated that figures from Ehlers & Associates, Inc. estimated the amount at \$1.9M over 20 years.

Jerry Bell (? Name not listed on sign in sheet) inquired whether the project would be put to a vote or if the Council made the decision. He stated he would like to see it put to a vote.

Chairman Swanson stated that the Committee has spoken with Senator Samuelson and Representative Hasskamp to enlist their support and encouraged residents to do the same. The Committee feels the City needs some help from the State since the area is used by visitors and tourists who don't pay taxes to the City. He stated that the City is changing fast and needs to prepare for this changing growth.

Randall Godeke inquired as to the size of the plant and the anticipated flow rate. He stated that once the flow goes over 100,000 gallons, two of everything is needed.

Ron Hughes asked if C&C Consultants was still involved in trying to obtain grants. He asked if the discharge rate into Pine River included the discharge already being dumped by the Corps of Engineers. Mark Hallan responded that the study included discharge into Pine River by the Corps of Engineers Treatment Facility. George Orning stated that the Department of Natural Resources was heavily involved in the decision made by the MPCA and that the proposed plant is what the DNR would allow. Ron Hughes asked what would happen to Pine Lake. Mark Hallan stated that the major issue is phosphorus levels in that only one part per million of phosphorus is allowed in order to not damage the water downstream. Ron Hughes asked if there would be enough pipe to hold the discharge should the plant malfunction. Mark Hallan stated that the MPCA would not allow any bypass into the river. Ron Hughes asked if the City would carry any kind of insurance for waste backup. City Administrator Swenson stated that he has been in other cities' where the City has been sued for backup problems. Ron Hughes asked about farm run off into the lakes and Mark Hallan stated that WSN has not addressed agriculture issues in the City. George Orning stated that there is not a lot of agriculture in the watershed district, however, the Pine River Protection Watershed is looking into agricultural runoff. Jack Wallschlaeger, President of WAPOA, stated that WAPOA does stream monitoring for phosphorus on the Whitefish Chain and statistics are available. He stated that lawn fertilizer, however, is the major contributor to lake pollution. Ron Hughes commented on the septic inspections being conducted in the City and the amount of time spent conducting the inspections.

Ms. Rohde asked if summer residents would be able to vote if the issue was brought to a referendum. Chairman Swanson stated that the Council was aware of the issue where seasonal residents are not allowed to vote but share in the costs. He encouraged seasonal residents to provide input to the Council regarding their position on the issue. Ms. Rohde asked if residents would be required to pay the monthly charge for twelve months or only on a seasonal basis and Mark Hallan stated that this issue has been looked at, and due to the costs associated with the project, would require a constant revenue flow to absorb the

cost of the project which means the monthly sewer charge would very likely be year round.

Ben Boldt asked why the usage charge is projected to be higher than the charges in surrounding communities and Mark Hallan stated that other communities have annual fees in addition to the usage fees which, if totaled, would be comparable to what is being proposed in Crosslake.

Jeff Cripps (Name not on sign in sheet) asked if the City is proposing a system that would handle Phase 2 and Phase 3. Mark Hallan stated that the current system would only handle Phase 1. The wastewater plant would be constructed to allow for expansion in the future when needed.

Roger Roy commented that killing off the lake with effluents would be detrimental to the economy in the area. He stated that people wouldn't come to the lake area if they were polluted which would affect both residential and commercial property. He inquired about the water quality in the area and Dave Reese stated that in 1996, water sampling was performed and, in general, the ground water did not appear to be unsafe even with the levels of manganese and iron. He did state, however, that eventually regulatory agencies may mandate that iron and manganese be dealt with. Roger Roy asked how many property owners would be serviced in Phase 1 and Mark Hallan stated they have identified 190 properties in Phase 1.

Carl Taubert commented that he was supportive of the Committee's work on the sewer issue. He stated that in the future the cost will be even more than it is now. He was in favor of a sales tax increase in the City and suggested that the City be aggressive in seeking public funds in St. Paul and Washington.

Ron Hughes commented that property owners are faced with increasing taxes due to several issues within the various governmental units. He stated that water and sewer would run approximately \$7M - \$8M, the library would cost the taxpayers money and the Pine River School District is proposing a \$12.5M dollar referendum.

Being no further input from the public, the hearing was adjourned at 10:35 A.M.

Respectfully submitted,



Darlene J. Roach  
Deputy Clerk

October 30, 1999

Municipal Sewer System			
Public Hearing			
Sign-In Sheet			
	Name	Address	Phone Number
1	Dain Deane	WSN	
2	Kevin T. Larson	Crosslake Communications	
3	Tom Swenson	CITY OF CROSSLAKE	
4	Pat Hoag	City of Crosslake	
5	MARK HALLAN	WSN	
6	George Orning	WSN	
7	Danell Symonson	CITY OF CROSSLAKE	
8	Dean L. Swanson	" "	
9	Bert Abbott	" "	
10	Richard Lyden	Crosslake	
11	Charles Almqvist	"	
12	Jimmy Brune	PO Box 700 X LK	
13	Rosella Nemes	PO Box 769 - Cullb	
14	Helen Franer	13053 Anchor Point C/L	
15	Franey Franer	" "	
16	Virgil Anderson	P.O. Box 102 C/L	
17	Shelley Anderson	" " "	
18	Charles Walker	13941 MARY LANE	
19	Kogel Roy	36477 Rt #66	
20	WAYNE BRANDT	13737 SANDY SHORES LANE	
21	GUY SCHWIETERS	14986 WOLF TRAIL	
22	C. D. TAUBERT	14846 " "	
23	Ron Hughes	P.O. Box 256	
24	Larry Rome	12910 Rushmoor Blvd	
25	MICHAEL STONE	35878 CO. RD. 3	
26	Frank Rohde	Cross Lake <del>#66</del>	
27	TERRY CURTIS	35483 CIV RD. 37	182-1150
28	J.O. Wallschlaeger	P.O. Box 137 Regret	
29		Page 1 of 7.	

64	John James	Po Box 769	
65	A. Kewko	37931 Dream Island Rd.	
66	Marge & Vern Clark	13881 Edgewater St.	
67	DAVE & MARY KOLESAR	12058 Manhattan Pt. Blvd	
68	Kelly & D. to Mirtusick	1185 Whitefish Ln	
69	John W Huber	34402 Blue Acres Ln	
70	Ben Boldt	12105 Whitefish	C.H.
71	Don Anderson	Daggett Bay Townhomes	
72	Al Thorpe	25 Edgewater Fr.	
73	Betty J Thorpe	" " " "	
74			
75	Shonna Walker	12359 - Perkins Rd	C.L.
76	Dave Holka	"	"
77	Randall Sodek	Crosslake	
78	Teel Silva	36246 County Rd 66, Crosslake, MN	
79	Barb Brandt	HCL Box 60 C Garrison MN	
80	Dick Stebbins	HCL Box 74B GARRISON MN <sup>320-692-</sup> 4373	
81	Jim Orput	RR-1 Box 240 Regent Mn	
82	Sere Miller	Bonnie Farm Rd	
83	Melene Roach		
84	David & Nancy Brown	Crosslake	
85			
86			
87			
88			
89			
90			
91			
92			
93			
94			
95			
96			
97			

# *City of Crosslake*

## **Public Hearing for Proposed Municipal Improvements**

**October 30, 1999**

**9 a.m. @ Crosslake Community Center**

**Paid for in part by the Initiative Foundation**



# *Crosslake Comprehensive Plan & Land Use Map*

## • **Comprehensive Plan Goals**

### ■ **Surface & Ground Water Resources**

- The City shall develop and implement policies to protect the quality and quantity/elevation of the surface and ground water resources of Crosslake

### ■ **Utilities**

- It is the policy of the City to plan for provision of utilities to all City residents and businesses at the lowest possible cost with high quality services
- This can include providing central water and sewer, as well as designing rules and settlement patterns to encourage sustainable individual and neighborhood systems



- **Sustainable Lakes Project**
  - Found maintenance of water quality was most mentioned issue
- **Zoning Ordinance Update**
  - Includes development density standards
- **Stable Commercial Zones**

---

*The City is an integrated community  
built around a major lake resource*

---



- **Sewer Feasibility Studies/Facility Plans**

- **1996 - comprehensive city-wide study**

- Phase 1 - \$8.3 million

- **1998 - reduced Phase 1 area - Facility Plan submitted**

- Phase 1 - \$4.3 million

- **1999 - revised Phase 1 area - Facility Plan resubmitted**

- Phase 1 - \$3 million
- Paid for in part by the Initiative Foundation



## • Preliminary Costs

■ Collection system	\$1,280,000
■ Lift stations	\$325,000
■ Wastewater Treatment Facility	\$675,000
■ Contingency	<u>\$280,000</u>
<b>TOTAL for construction costs</b>	<b>\$2,560,000</b>
■ Administrative/Legal	\$100,000
■ Engineering	\$180,000
■ Construction observation	\$160,000
<b>TOTAL project budget</b>	<b><u><u>\$3,000,000</u></u></b>

Costs that the City has already incurred for the engineering study, facility plan and purchase of the 14-acre parcel of property are not included in these costs.

City to install service pipe to lot line.

Owner to install service pipe on private property.



# • **Project Cost Implementation**

## ■ **Sewer plant & lift station: city-wide tax levy**

- \$35 per \$100,000 residential evaluation

## ■ **Service connection fees**

- hookup fee \$2,000

## ■ **Monthly user charge (equivalent residential unit)**

- \$24 to \$26 per month per ERU

## ■ **Offsetting costs**

- Depreciation of present sewer system
- Increased property value



• **Typical On-site Sewer Costs** (average life of system is 15 years)

■ Initial installation cost **\$4,000**

■ Pumping cost (\$120 every 3 yrs) **\$600**

**TOTAL** **\$4,600**

■ Equivalent cost per month

$\$4,600 \div (15 \text{ years} \times 12 \text{ months}) = \$25.55$



- **Potential Cost Saving Measures**

- **Low interest loans**
- **Grants**
- **Special legislation**
- **General legislation**
- **Building a water system**

