AGENDA
JOINT MEETING
SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL/PUBLIC WORKS COMMISSION
CITY OF CROSSLAKE
MONDAY, AUGUST 2, 2021
4:00 P.M. – CITY HALL

CITY COUNCIL

1. City Council Call to Order

PUBLIC WORKS

2. Public Works Commission Call to Order

3. Approve July 6, 2021 Meeting Minutes (Motion)

4. Memo dated July 29, 2021 from Phil Martin Re: Projects Update

5. Memo dated July 29, 2021 from Phil Martin Re: 2022 Road Improvements Feasibility Report Update (Motion)

6. Memo dated July 27, 2021 from Phil Martin Re: CSAH 66 Feasibility Report Update and Mock Assessments (Motion)

7. Memo dated July 29, 2021 from John Graupman Re: Clarifier Project Schedule Update (Motion)

8. Update from Ted Strand on Wastewater Treatment Plant Operations and Public Works Operations

9. Public Works Commission Adjourn

CITY COUNCIL

10. City Council Adjourn

SPECIAL JOINT COUNCIL MEETING
WITH PUBLIC WORKS COMMISSION
CITY OF CROSSLAKE
TUESDAY, JULY 6, 2021
4:00 P.M. – CITY HALL

The Council for the City of Crosslake met in a Special Joint Session with the Public Works Commission on July 6, 2021. The following Council Members were present: Mayor Dave Nevin, John Andrews, Marcia Seibert-Volz and Aaron Herzog. The following Commission Members were present: Doug Vierzba, Gordie Wagner, Tim Berg, Mic Tchida, and Tom Swenson. Also present were Public Works Director Ted Strand, City Clerk Char Nelson, City Administrator Mike Lyonais, Zoning Administrator Jon Kolstad, and City Engineer Phil Martin. There were six audience members.

1. Mayor Nevin called the Special Council Meeting to order at 4:04 P.M. City Attorney Brad Person reported that the Council just adjourned a closed meeting regarding pending litigation on land acquisition on the Perkins Road project. MOTION 07SP2-01-21 WAS MADE BY MARCIA SEIBERT-VOLZ AND SECONDED BY JOHN ANDREWS TO CONFIRM THAT COUNCIL GAVE STAFF DIRECTION ON HOW TO PROCEED WITH MEDIATION REGARDING PENDING LITIGATION. MOTION CARRIED WITH ALL AYES.

2. Public Works Commission Chair Doug Vierzba called the Public Works Commission Meeting to order at 4:05 P.M.

3. A MOTION WAS MADE BY TOM SWENSON AND SECONDED BY MIC TCHIDA TO APPROVE THE SPECIAL JOINT COUNCIL/PUBLIC WORKS COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES OF JUNE 7, 2021. MOTION CARRIED WITH ALL AYES.

4. The Commission reviewed two right-of-way vacation applications. Mic Tchida reported that the Park Commission reviewed the two applications at their meeting and made a motion to table action and to recommend that the City Council form a committee to create guidelines on how the applications should be handled and how to determine which should be vacated. Dave Nevin stated that these applications are already in process and should be acted on. Jon Kolstad stated that there is no State Law regarding the length of time to approve or deny vacation applications and noted that if the applications are tabled, the applicants would not need to reapply later. Dave Nevin state that the Commission should have discussion on both applications.

   Mike and Lisa Rocca are looking to have the 20-foot right-of-way between the two properties that they own vacated. In a letter from the Rocca's, they state that the right-of-way provides no useful purpose to the City or the public and is a public safety hazard due to the bluff. Jon Kolstad stated that a resident in that neighborhood attended the Park Commission meeting and said he used the public right-of-way often.

   Laurie Hoenig of 12219 Shadywood Street stated that the property owners knew that there was a public right-of-way there when they purchased the property and that it is not fair for

the City to give them an extra 20 feet of lakeshore. John Hoenig stated that the Rocca's paved part of the right-of-way for their driveway and that the rights-of-way were meant to be used by the property owners of the inner lots.

Jon Kolstad stated that staff recommends that the Council have all the rights-of-way that terminate at the water surveyed, create in inventory and photograph existing conditions and secure use agreements for accesses with existing encroachments.

Tom Swenson stated that many years ago the Council agreed not to vacate any rights-of way that terminate at the water and when the City Attorney told the Council that they had to accept applications for the vacations of these, it opened the flood gates and everyone is coming to the City to have them vacated. Mr. Swenson stated that the criteria to support the vacation of rights-of-way needs to be strict and that these could be retained by the City for green space. Mr. Swenson stated that the City vacated a right-of-way on Edgewater Lane and during the installation of municipal sewer, needed the land and had to buy it back from the property owner. Mic Tchida agreed with Tom Swenson.

Cindy Gibbs of 11338 Whitefish Ave spoke to the Commission about the Varley vacation that they heard last month and asked why the property owners could not put the staircase back in the right-of-way that Mr. Varley removed.

Chris Neaton of 14095 Norway Trail stated that the Commission had some good points but that each application should be considered case by case. Mr. Neaton stated that the right-of-way next to his property is never used and it is full of thistles.

Mike Rardin of 14089 Norway Trail stated that the Commission should review each application and determine what the City could ever use them for. Gordie Wagner stated that some are not used because people do not know that they are there. Mr. Wagner stated that off lake property owners should be able to access the lake.

Dave Nevin stated that if the rights-of-way are not being used, the City should get rid of them because they are problems. Mic Tchida stated that if you approve one, you should approve them all and thought that establishing criteria would be useful.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY GORDIE WAGNER AND SECONDED BY MIC TCHIDA TO RECOMMEND THAT THE CITY COUNCIL PLACE ALL RIGHT-OF-WAY VACATIONS ON HOLD UNTIL A COMMITTEE IS ESTABLISHED TO CREATE CRITERIA FOR RIGHT-OF-WAY VACATIONS AND IMPROVEMENTS AND HAVE ALL RIGHTS-OF-WAY SURVEYED AND MARKED.

Tom Swenson stated the Public Works Commission should look at each one and determine how it can be used by the City. Mr. Swenson stated that it is a lot of work, but that is what government is here to do. Mr. Swenson added that just because a person owns land on each side is not a reason to vacate and that if the accesses are left wooded, there would be no maintenance. MOTION CARRIED WITH ALL AYES.

5. Included in the packet for review was an email dated June 30, 2021 from Donna Lein of 36868 Brook Street. Ms. Lein is one of four owners of the property and her email stated that the property owner, who received communication from the City on the requirement to hookup to municipal sewer, never shared the information with the other property owners. The assessment of $7,500 was certified to the property taxes and started being collected in 2020. Ms. Lein stated that the estimated cost to abandon the old system, excavation, and running the sewer line from the road to the house is between $10,000-$13,000. After a year and a half of Covid hardships, the owners cannot afford this improvement at this time. Although Ms. Lein stated that their septic system is brand new, City records show that it was installed in 2012.

   Tim Berg stated that the problem is between Ms. Lein and the other owners, not with the City. Tom Swenson stated that people had the same arguments during the installation of Phase 1 of city sewer and everyone was given one year to hookup. The one year for Ms. Lein is 7/1/21. Dave Nevin suggested that the City allow the property owners to wait until the sewer is extended to Norway Trail. Marcia Seibert-Volz stated that the Council is considering allowing property owners along the sewer extension to Moonlite Bay to have 10 years to hook up if their system is brand new. Using that method, the Lein's would have until next year to hook up. Phil Martin stated that the property owners need to take some responsibility because they must have seen the construction and suggested that the City stay consistent with a policy. A MOTION WAS MADE BY TOM SWENSON AND SECONDED BY TIM BERG TO RECOMMEND TO THE CITY COUNCIL THAT BASED ON THE FACT THAT THE SEPTIC AT 36868 BROOK STREET IS 9 YEARS OLD, THE PROPERTY OWNERS HAVE TWO YEARS (11/14/2023) TO HOOK UP TO MUNICIPAL SEWER. THIS ALLOWS THEM TO HAVE TEN YEARS FROM THE INSTALLATION OF THEIR SEPTIC PLUS ONE YEAR TO HOOK UP. THE MONTHLY USAGE FEES WOULD NOT BE BILLED UNTIL THE HOOK UP IS COMPLETE OR 11/14/2023, WHICHEVER COMES FIRST. MOTION CARRIED WITH ALL AYES.

6. Included in the packet were minutes of the December 7, 2020 Public Works Commission meeting where discussion took place regarding the potential assessments for the Moonlite Bay Sewer Extension project. Phil Martin summarized the conversation in a memo dated July 2, 2021. A MOTION WAS MADE BY TOM SWENSON AND SECONDED BY GORDIE WAGNER TO RECOMMEND TO THE CITY COUNCIL THAT THE ASSESSMENT FOR SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL HOMES BE $7,000, THE ASSESSMENT FOR COMMERCIAL PROPERTY BE $0.35 PER SQUARE FOOT, AND ALLOW THE ASSESSMENT PAYMENTS TO BE PAID OVER 20 YEARS. MOTION CARRIED WITH ALL AYES.

   A MOTION WAS MADE BY MIC TCHIDA AND SECONDED BY GORDIE WAGNER TO RECOMMEND TO THE CITY COUNCIL THAT BASED ON A TEN-YEAR SEPTIC SYSTEM AGE, PROPERTY OWNERS WOULD HAVE TO CONNECT BEFORE THEIR SYSTEM IS 11 YEARS OLD AND FOR ANY SYSTEMS OLDER THAN 10 YEARS OLD, PROPERTY OWNERS WOULD HAVE TO CONNECT IN ONE YEAR OF PROJECT COMPLETION. MOTION CARRIED WITH ALL AYES.

A lengthy discussion ensued regarding how to assess large commercial parcels, which include Frasers property and the Log Church. Questions to consider would be whether the current use (such as the church) will remain that use forever and whether the large lots could be subdivided in the future. Doug Vierzba stated that the southerly Fraser parcel has a narrow frontage along County Road 66 with most of the parcel fronting on Ox Lake Landing. Mr. Vierzba suggested that this parcel does not benefit from the proposed sanitary sewer project on County Road 66 because future sanitary sewer extension would be needed to serve the larger buildable portion of this parcel. Phil Martin stated that a lift station would be needed to serve this parcel as the grade falls off from County Road 66, so much that a gravity sewer system would not work. Mr. Vierzba stated that this parcel would be assessed in the future when the system (including lift station) would be extended to serve this parcel. Mr. Vierzba stated that the Log Church site has two parcels. The southerly parcel is currently used for parking and there is vacant church land east of that, a distance of 1000 feet from County Road 66. If and when this property develops in the future, a future sewer extension will be needed to serve the easterly portion of this parcel. This easterly portion of the parcel would pay a share of the cost of the future sewer extension. Mr. Vierzba suggested only assessing the westerly half of this parcel for the County Road 66 project. Mr. Martin stated that he would revisit the numbers and bring a recommendation to the Council next week. Tom Swenson asked if the connection fee payments would be spread out over time. Phil Martin replied that the plan was on making that payable in full at the time connection.

Phil Martin stated that he would like to hold the first improvement hearing for the sewer project in September 2021, bid project in January 2022, and construction during school's 2022 summer break.

Phil Martin gave a brief update on the road projects, stating that the soil borings showed unexpected road conditions on Birch Narrows Road, Harbor Lane, and Whitefish Ave. These roads have little to no aggregate under the blacktop. Rushmoor Blvd is in better shape and could get by with patching and an overlay.

Phil Martin gave a brief update on the Rapid Flashing Rectangular Beacons (RRFB) and stated that the County is in favor of the plan but asked for more information. Marcia Seibert-Volz asked if the County was going to contribute to the cost of the lights. Phil Martin replied that the County had said upfront that if the City made crosswalk improvements before the TAP Grant was awarded, that they would not participate in the cost. Marcia Seibert-Volz asked why. Phil Martin stated that he thinks the County did not want to make plans until the grant is approved and awarded.

7. Ted Strand reported that the wastewater treatment plant is performing outstanding and that the plant treated over 100,000 gallons everyday last week. Mr. Strand reported that is the most the plant has ever done.

8. Gordie Wagner asked the status of the right-of-way vacation application from Leo Varley that the Commission recommended that the Council deny last month. Jon Kolstad stated that the applicant withdrew his application before the Council meeting. Gordie Wagner and Tim Berg stated that Mr. Varley should have to replace the stairs to the lake that he mistakenly removed. Cindy Gibbs stated that when the stairs were on the right-of-way, no one was

worried about slipping or getting hurt and stated that the residents paid for and maintained the stairs. Dave Nevin asked why the City is liable if the stairs were replaced. Ted Strand replied that the City did not know that the stairs existed until now and that because the City now knows, they are liable for the conditions. A MOTION WAS MADE BY GORDIE WAGNER AND SECONDED BY TIM BERG TO RECOMMEND THAT THE CITY COUNCIL TALK ABOUT THE ISSUE WITH THE STAIRS AT HILLCREST BEACH. MOTION CARRIED WITH ALL AYES.

9. There being no further business at 6:20 P.M., MOTION WAS MADE BY TOM SWENSON AND SECONDED BY GORDIE WAGNER TO ADJOURN THE PUBLIC WORKS MEETING. MOTION CARRIED WITH ALL AYES.

10. MOTION 07SP2-02-21 WAS MADE BY DAVE NEVIN AND SECONDED BY MARICA SEIBERT-VOLZ TO ADJOURN THE SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL MEETING AT 6:20 P.M. MOTION CARRIED WITH ALL AYES.

Respectfully submitted by,

Charlene Nelson
City Clerk

BOLTON & MENK

Real People. Real Solutions.

MEMORANDUM

Date: July 29, 2021
To: Ted Strand, Public Works Director
From: Phil Martin, PE
Subject: Projects Update for August 2, 2021, Public Works Meeting

---

CSAH 66 Sanitary Sewer Extension / Storm Water Quality Improvements

We met with private utility providers within the City to identify and discuss potential conflicts and the tentative project timing for construction. Based on that discussion and a follow up discussion with another utility provider that was not at the meeting, we believe the conflict locations will not result in delays or issues and that we will be able to work with the Contractor and the utility providers to address the areas of concern.

We updated the original feasibility report that was prepared in September 2019, modified in October 2019, and presented at the December 2019 Improvement Hearing. The update addresses changes identified since December 2019 and recent Council direction regarding assessments.

2022 Road Improvements

An Information Open House was held at City Hall on July 21, 2021. We had about 25 people attend in addition to City staff, Council, and public works members. We received three written comment cards (attached). We also received a few comments on the INPUTID platform that was created for the improvements and a few via phone call or email from interested individuals.

At the meeting, we identified the following comments from those that attended. This summary is based on our notes and memory following the meeting.

Whitefish Avenue, Hilltop Drive, Woodland Lane, Cool Haven Lane

- "No improvement needed" to "no improvement needed west of Hilltop"
- Making curve area visibility better would be a good solution.
- Runoff down driveways on easterly portion of Whitefish Avenue is an issue.
- Runoff/washout at area near water edge by Forney access lot.
- Petition being circulated against improvement or assessment based on assessment policy change with comments made that "Manhattan Point didn't get assessed".

Harbor Lane

- Talked with property owner that owns land where City does not have easement. They seemed cooperative and interested in softening curve of CSAH 16. It was pointed out that stormwater erodes edges of road in curve area.
- Property owners the first one on the left off of CSAH 16 is cooperative in working with the city for an easement.
- Overall, there was a concern for pedestrians and bikers on the road.
- Bay View Lodge is in full support of walking/bike trail. Also supported by three other property owners along the project.
- Interest in installing speed limit signs and striping on the road to help speeding traffic.
- One resident does not support the project at all. They live on a gravel road off of Harbor lane. They think that any improvement would increase traffic and encourage faster drivers.

- Property owner along land where city has no easement expressed interest in a bike trail and also ditching for storm water conveyance.
- Lack of sight lines throughout the project at corners due to trees encroaching on the road.
- Property owner proposed curb & gutter/ catch basin outfall in the location of the severe washout down to the wetland.
- Disappointed the project did not progress to construction back in 2014
- Coordinate with Ideal Township for the continuation of a trail into the township

Rushmoor Boulevard and Trail

- Need to relocate road into R/W at CSAH 16 and flatten approach
- Get rid of Island intersection and install T-type intersection
- Dip in road on end right leg of Rushmoor Boulevard needs to be addressed.
- Support for patch and overlay approach

Birch Narrows Road

- There is a need for storm water storage at the first sharp turn on the inside of the turn.
- Two property owners on the private gravel road off of the end of Birch Narrows does not want to be assessed and also would like their road to remain private.
- Begin construction after Memorial Day to allow property owners to settle in for the summer ahead of construction.

Wild Wind Ranch

- Relocate culvert location by wetland.

<u>RRFB Installations</u>

Plans were submitted and the City has received approval from the County Highway Engineer to make the improvements. Construction plans were submitted to two concrete companies to provide the City a quote. We understand the City is picking up the signposts and waiting for the RRFBs to arrive.

Please start After memorial DAY

Comment Card

2022 Road Improvements Project

Crosslake, MN

BOLTON & MENK
Real People. Real Solutions.

(Optional Contact Information)

Name: Tom Fuith Telephone: 651 270 3602

Address: 15657 Bird NARROWS Email: tfuith@comcast.net

Comments / Questions: Thank you for listening

I'm hoping the ~~drainage~~ drainage can be directed to the other side of the Street (~~the inside curve~~) ~~because~~ my lot is only 33' wide and is already low. I don't need any more water 😊

Also - As I own (3) Lots on Bird NARROWS I am wondering ~~if~~ if my ~~assessments~~ can be ~~capped~~ at 1X or 2X

Thank you

2022 Road Improvements Project

Wednesday, July 21, 2021

Comment Card

2022 Road Improvements Project
Crosslake, MN

BOLTON & MENK
Real People. Real Solutions.

(Optional Contact Information)

Name: John Forney Telephone: 952-956-4014

Address: 11797 Whitefish Ave. Email: jwforney@gmail.com

Comments / Questions: Roads in the city are used by ALL. The roads should be financed by the entire city, not as an ~~assessment~~ assessment per property owner. On the other hand, Sanitary Sewers serve specific homes or businesses but are not open to all the public. (I can't knock on the door of a house that has Sanitary Sewer and ask to use their bathroom.)

2022 Road Improvements Project
Wednesday, July 21, 2021

Comment Card

2022 Road Improvements Project
Crosslake, MN

BOLTON & MENK
Real People. Real Solutions.

(Optional Contact Information)

Name: Cindy Gibbs Telephone: _____

Address: 11338 Whitefish Ave Email: _____

Comments / Questions:

I do not believe the road should be done other than Chip Seal. It is in good shape. Maybe in about 5 years - and road restrictions should be inforced!

2022 Road Improvements Project
Wednesday, July 21, 2021

PLEASE SIGN IN

Crosslake

2022 Road Improvements Project
Crosslake, MN
Public Information Meeting

BOLTON & MENK
Real People. Real Solutions.

Date: July 21, 2021
Time: 5:00 PM
Location: Crosslake City Hall

Name	Phone	Email
Phil Martin - City of Crosslake	218-824-7265	phillip.martin@bolton-menk.com
Tom + Sue Hedlund Whitefish Ave	612-718-1956	Tboe53@Aol.com
Cynthia Gfrevey	612-701-4617	leveycynthia56@gmail.com
Ed + Doris Butler - Harbor Trail	763-443-8251	edbutler250@yahoo.com
Grace Scarlett Gibbons - Crosslake	218-831-4499	Chargeo@Crosslake Connect.net
Tim Berg - Bay View Lodge	612-968-2422	tim_berg220@msn.com
JOHN FORNEY	952-956-4014	jwforney@gmail.com
Cindy Gibbs	952-250-0094	ninanow@Hotmail.com
DARREN ERICKSON WILDWOOD	218-779-7031	dEALS440@gmail.com
David Wigren	218 831 7757	XLAKEDOC & AOL.com
John Downs	218-692-3333	11951 Whitefish Ave
Jack Lamm	218-692-6916	

* PLEASE SIGN IN *

2022 Road Improvements Project
Crosslake, MN
Public Information Meeting

BOLTON & MENK
Real People. Real Solutions.

Date: July 21, 2021
Time: 5:00 PM
Location: Crosslake City Hall

Name	Phone	Email
Phillip Martin - Bolton & Menk	218-821-7265	phillip.martin@bolton-menk.com
Andy Beadell - Bolton & Menk	218-244-5928	andrew.beadell@bolton-menk.com
Marion & Rhonda Trees	641-590-3787	mariontrees67@gmail.com
Gary Swoverland	612-719-4783	gary.swoverland@gmail.com
David Jensen	952-846-8225	DAVIDAJENSEN13@GMAIL.com
Bob Moen Gen	218-350-5984	RANDTmoen@TDS.NET
Tom Fuith	651 270 3607	tfuith@comcast.net
Jim McLellan	763-221-8014	JAMES.S.MCLELLAN@Q.com
Susan Derus	218-692-3323	sderus09@gmail.com
DAVE FISCHER	218.692.1869	davidrfischer@crosslake.net
Tim Kavanaugh	612 508-0554	sueakavanaugh@msn.com
Doug Haines	218-612-1251	

BOLTON & MENK

Real People. Real Solutions.

MEMORANDUM

Date: July 29, 2021
To: Ted Strand, Public Works Director
From: Phil Martin, PE
Subject: 2022 Road (delayed 2021 Crosslake Street) Improvements Feasibility Report Update

---

In December 2020, Widseth submitted the Feasibility Report for 2021 Crosslake Street Improvements. That report was and presented at a February 2021 public improvement hearing. Later that month, the City chose to delay improvements and consider construction in 2022.

The purpose of this memorandum is to provide updated information to specific sections of the original feasibility report in preparation for the Improvement Hearing scheduled for August 25, 2021, to consider proceeding with final design, public bidding, and construction of the improvements in 2022. To gain a better understanding of issues and to obtain property owner feedback, Bolton & Menk created an INPUTID platform for the project and held an informational open house on July 21, 2021.

Existing Conditions update: A topographic survey was conducted along all proposed improvement segments, excluding the Whitefish Avenue project area. The survey scope was to collect field data to a distance 10 feet beyond the existing edge of pavement. In addition, soil borings were completed, and road material profiles identified in a number of areas on each proposed improvement segment.

Project Area #1 – Wild Wind Ranch Drive
Two sets of soil borings were taken in two locations (4 borings total). The soil borings showed indications of variable aggregate depth (ranging from 0" to 3.5"). Although the soils descriptions were similar, there is evidence that fill material was placed near an adjacent wetland and significant variation in soil compaction between borings in the same set.

Project Area #2 – Rushmoor Boulevard and Rushmoor Trail
Soil borings were taken in three locations. The soil borings showed pavement depth ranging from 2" to 3" aggregate depth ranging from 4" to 6.5". Based on our review of the road alignment at CSAH 16, it appears Rushmoor Boulevard may extend beyond the edge of the easterly right-of-way.

Project Area #3 – Harbor Lane
Soil borings were taken in two locations. The soil borings showed 4.5" to 6" of pavement with no aggregate base.

Project Area #4 – Birch Narrows Road
Soil borings were taken in three locations. The soil borings showed 3" to 5.5" of pavement with no aggregate base. Based on our review of available survey information, it appears the City has right-of-way for the entire project segment but may need to secure some additional right-of-way if the sharp curve section is modified or if drainage improvements are completed in that location.

Project Area #5 – Whitefish Avenue, Hilltop Drive, Woodland Drive, Cool Haven Lane
A soil boring was taken in near the sharp curve on Whitefish Avenue by Hilltop Drive. The soil borings showed 2" of pavement with 3" of aggregate base. Based on input received from Rob Hall at the Crow Wing County Highway Department, we believe Whitefish Avenue was planned for construction to have a 4" aggregate base and 2" of pavement before it was turned back to the City in 2002. The original feasibility report indicates that Whitefish Avenue was overlaid: however, the boring and input from the

County suggest it was new bituminous construction. We have requested record information from the County and City for that turnback event to verify our assumption but have not received information to date.

Proposed Improvements update: Based on soil boring information obtained, field survey work completed, field review of proposed road improvement segments, and input received from staff and property owner interaction, we reviewed the proposed improvements and provided comments.

Project Area #1 – Wild Wind Ranch Drive
The original plan is for a Full Depth Reclamation (FDR) improvement with reconstruction. We believe that approach is appropriate for this road segment. The construction plans that were prepared by Widseth indicate that only the westerly/southerly lane would be subcut, geotextile fabric placed, and a granular fill placed before the aggregate base and bituminous pavement were placed over both lanes. Based on our understanding of the soil conditions, we recommend the subcut reconstruction method be applied to both lanes for the entire project to create similar soils and provide a homogenous road base for construction. This will result in an increase in cost but also provide benefit to the longevity of the road.

Project Area #2 – Rushmoor Boulevard and Rushmoor Trail
The original plan is for an FDR improvement. This road could be a candidate for a bituminous overlay based on pavement condition and existing pavement/aggregate depth. Improvements identified on Rushmoor Boulevard include reconstruction of the approach at CSAH 16, reconstruction of the Rushmoor Boulevard/Trail intersection, and reconstruction of the sunken area near the end of Rushmoor Boulevard. These reconstruction segments impact a significant portion of the existing pavement which in our opinion diminishes the attractiveness of a bituminous overlay especially in lieu of the pavement age. As a result, we recommend the City stay with the original FDR plan for this road improvement area.

Project Area #3 – Harbor Lane
The original plan is for an FDR improvement. We agree that based on the existing lack of aggregate base an FDR approach ultimately makes sense on the north-south segment. The east-west segment will likely require a bituminous overlay. We have confirmed that there is no dedicated right-of-way for the north-south segment of Harbor Lane. The City has decided to delay construction of Harbor Lane until a dedicated right-of-way or easement is in place and issues such as stormwater, alignment, and pedestrian activity along the road segment are addressed in an acceptable plan.

Project Area #4 – Birch Narrows Road
The original plan is for an FDR improvement. We agree that based on the existing lack of aggregate base an FDR approach makes sense.

Project Area #5 – Whitefish Avenue, Hilltop Drive, Woodland Drive, Cool Haven Lane
The original plan is for a bituminous overlay improvement. We note that Cool Haven Lane does not appear to have a dedicated right-of-way/easement. We would recommend that improvement of Cool Haven Lane be delayed until a dedicated right-of-way/easement acceptable to the City is established. At the sharp curve on Whitefish Avenue, we recommend the City secure an easement to grade the slope back to create more visibility around the curve for traffic coming in both directions. We recommend ponding areas be added along the south side where opportunities are identified to reduce erosive stormwater discharges to the adjoining water bodies.

The pavement condition for the most part is good with some obvious distressed areas. Based on the pavement rating system we utilize; the pavement condition is at the point where it could be considered for either an aggregate chip sealcoat or a bituminous overlay depending upon other factors. We understand the road was constructed in 2002. We have conflicting information on what type of improvement was completed. The original feasibility report indicates the area was overlaid meaning bituminous pavement on top of bituminous pavement. Input from the County and the result of the soil boring we completed

suggest the bituminous pavement was placed on aggregate and therefore not an overlaid condition. Based on the fact that the pavement is almost 20 years old, we offer the following recommendations and comments:

- If existing pavement has a 2" pavement thickness, we recommend an approach where distressed areas were cut out and patched and a bituminous overlay placed.
- If the pavement thickness is found to be 3 ½" or more in depth, we would recommend a mill & overlay approach with removal and patching of distressed areas.

Comments:

- The City could do an aggregate chip sealcoat after removing and patching distressed areas and potentially could do another aggregate chip sealcoat in 5 years. This would save costs in the short term but limit what the City could do in the future. If the City chooses to do an aggregate chip sealcoat(s), the City should expect that the subsequent improvement would be a full depth reclamation and that a mill & overlay approach would not be feasible.
- The City could opt to simply remove and replace distressed pavement areas at this time. The City should expect that subsequent improvements would be a bituminous overlay or full depth reclamation because the pavement condition will deteriorate beyond acceptable sealcoating conditions.

Summary of Estimated Project Costs: The estimated total project cost was updated to reflect changes that have been identified or are recommended since the original report was prepared.

ITEM	COST
Wild Wind Ranch Drive	$205,000
Rushmoor Boulevard/Trail	$215,000
Harbor Lane (delayed)	$ 0
Birch Narrows Road	$286,100
Whitefish Avenue, Hilltop Drive, Woodland Drive	$465,700
Total Estimated 2022 Improvements	$1,171,800

Proposed Method of Assessment: Updates are needed to account for no planned construction of Harbor Land and our recommendation to delay improvement of Cool Haven Lane until right-of-way is properly established. For the Whitefish Avenue, Hilltop Drive, Woodland Drive, Cool Haven Lane, the number of assessed parcels identified in the original feasibility report was 160. With Cool Haven Lane removed, the number of assessed parcels would decrease by 9 to a total number of 151 parcels. This would change the total estimated assessment from $160,000 to $151,000.

Recommendation: If the City proceeds with these improvements, the recommended timeframe for proceeding is provided in the table below:

Action Taken/Proposed Project Schedule	Timeframe
Updated Feasibility Report Supplement to City	August 9, 2021
Second Improvement Hearing/Assessment Review	August 25, 2021
Engineering Design/Plan Preparation	September – December 2021
Public Bidding	January/February 2022
Construction	June – August 2022

BOLTON & MENK

Real People. Real Solutions.

MEMORANDUM

Date: July 27, 2021
To: Ted Strand, Public Works Director
From: Phil Martin, PE
Subject: CSAH 66 Feasibility Report Update

In September 2019, Bolton & Menk submitted the Feasibility Report for the CSAH 66 Sanitary Sewer Extension. That report was prepared and included a mock assessment roll based on mid-range benefit to each parcel as identified by Nagell Appraisal. In October 2019 the mock assessment roll was revised per City Council input and presented at the December 2019 public improvement hearing. The mock assessment revisions dealt with low water use commercial parcels and were based on size as follows:

- 2 acres or less was assessed at $0.35/sq ft
- > 2 acres was assessed at $0.20/sq ft

In January 2020 the City chose to proceed with preparation of construction plans but to delay construction. Since that time, the construction plans have been completed and easement negotiations have been initiated. In addition, the plans for stormwater quality improvements have been defined and discussions have evolved with the Crow Wing County Highway Department regarding the scope of replacement of the existing stormwater collection system.

The purpose of this memorandum is to provide updated information to specific sections of the original feasibility report so the City of Crosslake can review and schedule an Improvement Hearing for September 2021 to consider proceeding with public bidding and construction of the improvements in 2022.

Section IV. Proposed Improvements update: Due to the depth of the sanitary sewer replacement, a significant portion of the existing storm sewer will be impacted. In addition, the City of Crosslake secured a grant to provide stormwater treatment of storm sewer discharges into Cross Lake. The combined effect of these impacts led Crow Wing County to agree to replace the entire storm sewer within the project scope and to participate in that associated cost.

Section V. Estimated Project Costs update: The estimated total project cost was updated to reflect the stormwater quality improvement additions and the replacement of the existing stormwater collection system. The costs were also updated from a 2019 basis to a 2021 basis.

ITEM	COST
Construction Total	$1,913,400
Engineering, Legal, Financial, Administrative (20%)	$ 382,680
Easement/Land Acquisition	$ 60,000
Budgetary Total Project Cost	$2,356,080

Section VI. Project Financing: Based on discussions with Crow Wing County and the stormwater quality funding received from BWSR, the total cost responsibility for the proposed improvements breakdown as follows:

- Budgetary Total Project Cost = $2,356,080

- Budgetary Total Project Cost City (Street/Sanitary/Storm) = $1,509,504
- Budgetary Total Project Cost County (Street/Storm) = $392,532
- Budgetary Total Project Cost City/County (Stormwater Quality)* = $454,044

* *BWSR granted awarded for up to $315,000. Expires December 31, 2022.*

Based on discussions with the City Public Works Committee and City Council, the following assessment modifications have been identified and are presented in the updated mock assessment roll.

- Assessment Modifications Single family residential
  - Roadway = $0 per home site (unchanged)
  - Sanitary sewer = $7,000 per home site

- Assessment Modifications Commercial
  - Roadway = $0 per sq ft (unchanged)
  - Sanitary sewer = $0.35/sq ft

- Assessment Terms
  - Connection based on 10-year septic age. Property owners would have to connect before their system is 11 years old.
  - Assessment period of 20 years

The original feasibility report mock assessment as presented amounted to $721,353.10 in assessments. When revised by the City Council for presentation at the December 13, 2019, Improvement Hearing, the assessed amount was $594,681.80. With the recent Council assessment directives noted, the updated mock assessment amount is $594,023.15.

Section VII. Recommendation and Timetable: The recommendation to proceed remains unchanged the timeframe for proceeding is updated in the table below:

Action Taken/Proposed Project Schedule	Timeframe
Preliminary Engineering Report	*Completed August/July 2018*
Field Topographic Survey	*Completed September/October 2018*
Feasibility Study Ordered	*Approved September 9, 2019*
Feasibility Study to City Council	*October 14, 2019*
Improvement Hearing Ordered	*October 14, 2019*
Improvement Hearing/Assessment Review	*Completed December 13, 2019*
Engineering Design/Plan Preparation	*Completed May 2021*
Updated Feasibility Report Supplement to City	August 9, 2021
Second Improvement Hearing Ordered	August 9, 2021
Second Improvement Hearing/Assessment Review	September 2021
Public Bidding	January 2022
Construction	June – August 2022

Mock Assessment Determination

18-Jul-21 *revised*

Nagell Classification	Road Benefit		Sewer Benefit	
SF on lake, direct, $/lot	$ 2,000.00	$ 5,000.00	$ 5,000.00	$ 10,000.00
SF off lake, direct, $/lot	$ 1,500.00	$ 4,000.00	$ 4,000.00	$ 9,000.00
SF off lake, indirect, $/lot	$ 500.00	$ 1,000.00		
Non-res C/I direct, $/SF	$ 0.03	$ 0.15	$ 0.20	$ 0.50
Non-res P direct, $/SF	$ 0.02	$ 0.15	$ 0.05	$ 0.20

Zoning Legend
S - Single Family
LC - Limited Commercial
WC -Waterfront Commercial
P - Public

CSAH 66 SANITARY SEWER EXTENSION

Line No.	Parcel ID No.	Zoned	Road Assessment: Road Basis	Road Assessment: Cost	Sewer Assessment: Sewer Basis	Sewer Assessment: Area	Sewer Assessment: Home Site	Sewer Assessment: Cost	Total Assessed Cost	Connection Charge[1] Basis (2021) Cost/ERU[2]	Total Connection Cost
1	14090680	S	$ 3,500.00	$ -	$ 7,000.00	0.55	1	$ 7,000.00	$ 7,000.00	$ 4,000	TBD
2	14090681	S	$ 3,500.00	$ -	$ 7,000.00	0.47	1	$ 7,000.00	$ 7,000.00	$ 4,000	TBD
3	14090687	S	$ 3,500.00	$ -	$ 7,000.00	1.22	1	$ 7,000.00	$ 7,000.00	$ 4,000	TBD
4	14090682	S	$ 3,500.00	$ -	$ 7,000.00	0.46	1	$ 7,000.00	$ 7,000.00	$ 4,000	TBD
5	14090683	S	$ 3,500.00	$ -	$ 7,000.00	0.47	1	$ 7,000.00	$ 7,000.00	$ 4,000	TBD
6	14090684	S	$ 3,500.00	$ -	$ 7,000.00	0.51	1	$ 7,000.00	$ 7,000.00	$ 4,000	TBD
7	14090685	S	$ 3,500.00	$ -	$ 7,000.00	0.51	1	$ 7,000.00	$ 7,000.00	$ 4,000	TBD
8	14090686	S	$ 3,500.00	$ -	$ 7,000.00	0.48	1	$ 7,000.00	$ 7,000.00	$ 4,000	TBD
9	14090743	S	$ 3,500.00	$ -	$ 7,000.00	0.5	1	$ 7,000.00	$ 7,000.00	$ 4,000	TBD
10	14090744	S	$ 3,500.00	$ -	$ 7,000.00	1.22	1	$ 7,000.00	$ 7,000.00	$ 4,000	TBD
11	14090746	LC	$ 0.09	$ -	$ 0.35	0.91		$ 13,873.86	$ 13,873.86	$ 6,500	TBD
12	14090745	LC	$ 0.09	$ -	$ 0.35	1.78		$ 27,137.88	$ 27,137.88	$ 6,500	TBD
13	14090742	LC	$ 0.09	$ -	$ 0.35	3.12		$ 47,567.52	$ 47,567.52	$ 6,500	TBD
14	14090502	LC	$ 0.09	$ -	$ 0.35	2.34		$ 35,599.41	$ 35,599.41	$ 6,500	TBD
15	14090676	S	$ 3,500.00	$ -	$ 7,000.00	0.53	1	$ 7,000.00	$ 7,000.00	$ 4,000	TBD
16	14090675	LC	$ 0.09	$ -	$ 0.35	0.55		$ 8,385.30	$ 8,385.30	$ 6,500	TBD
17	14090674	S	$ 3,500.00	$ -	$ 7,000.00	0.56	1	$ 7,000.00	$ 7,000.00	$ 4,000	TBD
18	14090673	S	$ 3,500.00	$ -	$ 7,000.00	0.77	1	$ 7,000.00	$ 7,000.00	$ 4,000	TBD
19	14090660	P	$ 0.09	$ -	$ 0.13	0		$ -	$ -	$ 4,000	TBD
20	14080584	S	$ 3,500.00	$ -	$ 0.35	0		$ -	$ -	$ 4,000	TBD
21	14080585	S	$ 3,500.00	$ -	$ 7,000.00	0.35	1	$ 7,000.00	$ 7,000.00	$ 4,000	TBD
22	14080587	S	$ 3,500.00	$ -	$ 7,000.00	0.63	1	$ 7,000.00	$ 7,000.00	$ 4,000	TBD
23	14080588	S	$ 3,500.00	$ -	$ 7,000.00	0.43	1	$ 7,000.00	$ 7,000.00	$ 4,000	TBD
24	14080589	S	$ 3,500.00	$ -	$ 7,000.00	0.63	1	$ 7,000.00	$ 7,000.00	$ 4,000	TBD
25	14080590	S	$ 3,500.00	$ -	$ 7,000.00	0.37	1	$ 7,000.00	$ 7,000.00	$ 4,000	TBD
26	14080591	S	$ 3,500.00	$ -	$ 7,000.00	0.27	1	$ 7,000.00	$ 7,000.00	$ 4,000	TBD
27	14080623	WC	$ 0.09	$ -	$ 0.35	2.6		$ 39,639.60	$ 39,639.60	$ 6,500	TBD
28	14080624	WC	$ 0.09	$ -	$ 0.35	0.81		$ 12,349.26	$ 12,349.26	$ 6,500	TBD
29	14080627	LC	$ 0.09	$ -	$ 0.35	1.74		$ 26,528.04	$ 26,528.04	$ 6,500	TBD
30	14080643	LC	$ 0.09	$ -	$ 0.35	0.57		$ 8,690.22	$ 8,690.22	$ 6,500	TBD
31	14080656	S	$ 3,500.00	$ -	$ 7,000.00	5.4	2	$ 14,000.00	$ 14,000.00	$ 4,000	TBD
32	14080655	S	$ 3,500.00	$ -	$ 7,000.00	5.1	1	$ 7,000.00	$ 7,000.00	$ 4,000	TBD
33	14080634	LC	$ 0.09	$ -	$ 0.35	4.23		$ 64,490.58	$ 64,490.58	$ 6,500	TBD
34	14080633	LC	$ 0.09	$ -	$ 0.35	0		$ -	$ -	$ 6,500	TBD
35	14080620	LC	$ 0.09	$ -	$ 0.35	4.32		$ 65,862.72	$ 65,862.72	$ 6,500	TBD
36	14080632	S	$ 2,750.00	$ -	$ 7,000.00	0.56	1	$ 7,000.00	$ 7,000.00	$ 4,000	TBD
37	14080631	S	$ 2,750.00	$ -	$ 7,000.00	0.51	1	$ 7,000.00	$ 7,000.00	$ 4,000	TBD
38	14080630	S	$ 2,750.00	$ -	$ 7,000.00	0.46	1	$ 7,000.00	$ 7,000.00	$ 4,000	TBD
39	14080629	S	$ 2,750.00	$ -	$ 7,000.00	0.4	1	$ 7,000.00	$ 7,000.00	$ 4,000	TBD
40	14080628	P	$ 0.09	$ -	$ 0.13	0		$ -	$ -	$ 4,000	TBD
41	14080599	LC	$ 0.09	$ -	$ 0.35	1.66		$ 25,308.36	$ 25,308.36	$ 6,500	TBD
42	14080598	LC	$ 0.09	$ -	$ 0.35	0.55		$ 8,385.30	$ 8,385.30	$ 6,500	TBD
43	14080597	LC	$ 0.09	$ -	$ 0.35	0.96		$ 14,636.16	$ 14,636.16	$ 6,500	TBD
44	14090503	LC	$ 0.09	$ -	$ 0.35	0.89		$ 13,568.94	$ 13,568.94	$ 6,500	TBD
45											
46								**Total Assessed Amount**	**$ 594,023.15**		$ -

[1]Connection Charge is a direct charge that is applied at the time of connection when the property owner makes connection to the City sanitary sewer system.

[2]ERU or Equivalent Residential Unit means a term used for the purpose of calculating the total connection charge for a property.

BOLTON & MENK
Real People. Real Solutions.

1960 Premier Drive
Mankato, MN 56001-5900

Ph: (507) 625-4171
Fax: (507) 625-4177
Bolton-Menk.com

MEMORANDUM

Date: July 29, 2021

To: Ted Strand, City of Crosslake

From: John Graupman, P.E.

Subject: Clarifier Project Schedule Update
City of Crosslake, Minnesota
Project No.: M25.119925

The bidding documents for the clarifier rehabilitation project are nearly complete. We are approaching the next phase of bidding. The proposed schedule we discussed is as follows:

- Advertise in local paper week of August 9 (submit advertisement week of August 2)
- Hold pre-bid meeting onsite for interested contractors August 26 (one clarifier would be drained to allow full visual inspection)
- Bid project September 9

The project bidding is proposed to be done through the online program QuestCDN. This is a website used in the construction industry for plan distribution and bidding. It has gained acceptance in the last 18 months for all parties. Contractors particularly prefer the online option and all that would be expected to bid this project are experienced in the process. We would recommend this option if the city concurs, but can hold this in person with paper if preferred.

We envision most of the work can be done through the winter. Equipment lead time has been very fluid and unpredictable, so we would recommend a longer contract length of 365 days, but limit down time of either clarifier to limit impacts to operations and treatment. We would also include time periods that both clarifiers must be online for (St. Patrick's Day, holiday weekends, etc.). Please call me at 507-380-0433 with any questions.