

**SAUK CENTRE CITY COUNCIL
SPECIAL MEETING
WEDNESDAY, MARCH 17, 2010**

1. CALL TO ORDER/ ROLL CALL/ PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Sauk Centre City Council met in a Special Meeting on Wednesday, March 17, 2010 at 5:00 p.m. in the City Hall Council Chambers pursuant to due notice being given thereof. Present were Mayor Brad Kirckof, Council Members David Thomas, Keith Johnson, Warren Stone and Al Coenen. Also present were City Administrator Vicki Willer, City Planner Sarah Morton, Public Works Director Wessel, City Engineer Yapp and Administrative Assistant Nicki Vogt. Mayor Kirckof presided thereat.

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

A motion was made Council Member Johnson and was seconded by Council Member Thomas to approve the agenda as presented. A vote being recorded as follows: For: Council Members Johnson, Thomas, Stone, Coenen and Mayor Kirckof. Against: None. The motion passed.

3. WORKSHOP – 4TH STREET STORM WATER PROJECT

City Engineer Yapp presented the Storm Water Project stating that the problem areas are Walnut & 4th Street and Grove Lake Street and surrounding streets. The existing storm sewer conditions are:

- Existing pipes analyzed using the Rational Method using a 5 year storm event (3.5” in 24 hours).
- All of the pipes within the system are undersized.
- Problem areas:
 - Both flood prone areas have undersized pipes with low pipe slope.
 - Elm and 4th Street – 2 parallel pipes flow to Sauk Lake and both pipes are undersized.
 - Junction structure near the lake is inadequate to handle large flows.
- It was noted that commercial areas generate more water than residential areas because they contain more impervious coverage.

The Council was presented with the following solutions/options:

Solution: Option 1:

- Pipes upsized from Walnut and 4th Street. This addresses the flooding at the intersection.
- Pipes upsized in the Grove Street area to address the flooding there.
- At Elm and 4th the two parallel pipes to Sauk Lake are replaced by one pipe.
- New splitter structure required to split 48” pipe into two 36” pipes. 36” pipe is the maximum size that will fit under Park Road.
- Storm water will outlet into Sauk Lake in the same location as the existing system.
- Pipe replacement addressed the area within the original drainage basin.

Solution: Option 2:

- Flooding in the Walnut and 4th Street area as well as the Grove Street area which is addressed in a similar manner as Option 1.
- Flow from these two areas is directed through a new trunk storm sewer to the east.
- The outlet will discharge into a wetland adjacent to the Sauk River.
- Portions of the existing storm sewer will remain in place as part of the new system.
- The new trunk main under 4th Street will benefit a larger land area.

The cost estimates for both options are as follows:

| | | | |
|-------------------------|------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|
| Option 1: | | Option 2: | |
| Est. Construction Costs | \$600,000 | Est. Construction Costs | \$912,700 |
| Est. Contingency | \$90,000 | Est. Contingency | \$136,900 |
| Est. Eng./Construction | <u>\$108,000</u> | Est. Eng./Construction | <u>\$164,300</u> |
| Est. Total Project Cost | \$798,000 | Est. Total Project Cost | \$1,213,900 |

Estimated Assessment (96.32AC)
\$0.1902/Square Foot

Estimated Assessment (149.44 AC)
\$0.1865/Square Foot

Analyses of Option 1:

- Addresses the current problem areas.
- Shallow sewer created less disturbance and facilitates easier installation
- Discharge water is not treated, flows directly into Sauk Lake.

Analyses of Option 2:

- Addresses the current flooding problems and serves an additional drainage basin.
- Deep sewer created more disturbance. Pipes must cross Main Street, casing pipe required.
- Water discharged into wetland which can improve water quality before entering into the Sauk River.

The cost estimates for option 2 with minimal vs. full street disturbance is as follows:

| | | | |
|-----------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|
| Minimal Street Disturbance: | | Full Street Disturbance: | |
| Est. Construction Costs | \$912,700 | Est. Construction Costs | \$1,086,600 |
| Est. Contingency | \$136,900 | Est. Contingency | \$163,000 |
| Est. Eng./Construction | <u>\$164,300</u> | Est. Eng./Construction | <u>\$195,600</u> |
| Est. Total Project Cost | \$1,213,900 | Est. Total Project Cost | \$1,445,200 |

Estimated Assessment (149.44 AC)
\$0.1865/Square Foot

\$231,300 additional street assessments

The cost estimates for option 2a with minimal vs. full street disturbance is as follows:

| | | | |
|-----------------------------|-------------|--------------------------|-------------|
| Minimal Street Disturbance: | | Full Street Disturbance: | |
| Est. Construction Costs | \$1,058,600 | Est. Construction Costs | \$1,247,400 |

| | |
|-------------------------|--------------------|
| Est. Contingency | \$158,800 |
| Est. Eng./Construction | <u>\$190,600</u> |
| Est. Total Project Cost | \$1,408,000 |

| | |
|-------------------------|--------------------|
| Est. Contingency | \$187,100 |
| Est. Eng./Construction | <u>\$224,500</u> |
| Est. Total Project Cost | \$1,659,000 |

Estimated Assessment (177.27 AC)
\$0.1823/Square Foot

\$251,000 additional street assessments

The cost estimates for option 2ab with minimal vs. full street disturbance is as follows:

Minimal Street Disturbance:

| | |
|-------------------------|--------------------|
| Est. Construction Costs | \$1,204,800 |
| Est. Contingency | \$180,700 |
| Est. Eng./Construction | <u>\$216,900</u> |
| Est. Total Project Cost | \$1,602,400 |

Full Street Disturbance:

| | |
|-------------------------|--------------------|
| Est. Construction Costs | \$1,393,600 |
| Est. Contingency | \$209,000 |
| Est. Eng./Construction | <u>\$250,800</u> |
| Est. Total Project Cost | \$1,853,400 |

Estimated Assessment (198.03 AC)
\$0.1858/Square Foot

\$251,000 additional street assessments

City Engineer Yapp stated that from a cost perspective, he recommends Option 2ab because it allows for more grant opportunities.

It was the general consent of the Council to move forward with a Feasibility Study for Option 2ab.

12. ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Council Member Stone and was seconded by Council Member Stone to adjourn the meeting. A vote being recorded as follows: For: Council Members Stone, Thomas, Johnson, Coenen and Mayor Kirckof. Against: None. The motion passed.

With no further business to come before the Council, Mayor Kirckof adjourned the meeting at 6:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mayor Brad A. Kirckof

City Administrator Vicki M. Willer