



AGENDA
BIG LAKE CITY COUNCIL WORKSHOP
COUNCIL CHAMBERS

SEPTEMBER 13, 2023

5:00 p.m.

- 1) CALL TO ORDER**
- 2) ROLL CALL**
- 3) PROPOSED AGENDA**
- 4) BUSINESS**
 - 4A. Discuss Well No. 2 Improvements
 - 4B. Discuss Parking Kiosk Payment Box
- 5) OTHER**
- 6) ADJOURN**

Disclaimer: This agenda has been prepared to provide information regarding an upcoming work session of the Big Lake City Council. This document does not claim to be complete and is subject to change.



WORKSHOP ITEM

Big Lake City Council

Prepared By: Dan Childs, Water/Wastewater Superintendent	Meeting Date: 9/13/2023	Item No. 4A
Item Description: Well No. 2 Rehabilitation	Reviewed By: Hanna Klimmek, City Administrator Reviewed By: Deb Wegeleben, Finance Director	

COUNCIL DIRECTION REQUESTED

Staff is looking for direction on the City of Big Lake’s Well No.2 rehabilitation.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

The City redeveloped Well No. 2 and discovered a hole in the well casing. Minnesota Department of Health (MDH) approved a variance allowing non-code compliant repairs and the City to continue using the well until the end of 2023. The City hired SEH to design a new replacement well and associated piping. A future project would modify the Well No. 2 site to be similar to the Well No. 1 site, with the replacement of the existing well house with two manholes and electrical components. The start-up of Well No. 1 last week brought online a completely reconstructed well and site facilities, which led Staff to question the urgency of replacing Well No. 2. Below are the options explored by SEH:

Option 1: Drill a brand-new replacement well a short distance north of the existing well house and temporarily connect to the existing raw water piping inside the well house. This would replace the well but delay the urgency of a project to replace the existing well house and electrical components with manholes and other site improvements to a time in the near future.

<i>Pros</i>	<i>Cons</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Brand new well will be in compliance with MDH, and active by peak season in 2024. - Splits construction costs into two projects to facilitate funding. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Existing Well No. 2 is a high producing well and will need to be abandoned. - Risk of new well not producing as much water as existing Well No. 2. - Will require a future project to replace well house.

Cost: Estimated total Project cost - **\$930,000**

- Well replacement project cost - \$380,000
- Well house demolition and site improvement project cost - \$550,000

Option 2: Demolish well house, overshoot existing Well No. 2, and re-design the well site to be similar to Well No. 1 site all at once.

<i>Pros</i>	<i>Cons</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep using the high producing borehole portion of Well No. 2. - Get the whole project done at once. - Minimize re-work to prepare two construction projects. - Well No. 1 can supply enough water to compensate Well No. 2 inactivity. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Higher upfront costs. - Construction will take longer and will not be completed prior to peak season in 2024. - Demolition work might conflict with Spud Fest.

Cost: Estimated total project cost: **\$900,000.**

Staff feels Option 1 is not a viable option due to concerns the new well will not operate as efficiently as it does in its current location. While this is an unknown, there are significant concerns with Option 1. The biggest concern of sealing Well No. 2, is that it is impossible to know for certain what a new well could supply until it is drilled and a pump is installed. Staff feels the best option is for the City to replace the casing in the existing well (Option 2).

FINANCIAL IMPACT

- Replacing the casing similar to the process at well no. 1 will be approximately \$900,000
- Sealing and replacing with a new well will be approximately \$930,000
- Funding would be from Water CIP Fund 399
 - This would require postponement of the rehabilitation of Water Tower No. 3 until 2025

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends replacing the casing in Well No. 2 (Option 2).

ATTACHMENTS

None



WORKSHOP ITEM

Big Lake City Council

Prepared By: <i>Deb Wegeleben, Finance Director</i>	Meeting Date: <i>9/13/2023</i>	Item No. 4B
Item Description: <i>Lakeside Park Parking Box Information</i>	Reviewed By: <i>Hanna Klimmek, City Administrator</i> Reviewed By: <i>Norm Michels, Streets/Fleet/Parks Superintendent</i>	

COUNCIL DIRECTION REQUESTED

Direction regarding the parking box at Lakeside Park; any changes the Council would like to see.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

As discussed at the July 28, 2023 workshop, staff was directed to bring back information on the parking box at Lakeside Park. Following is the history of the parking box:

- In February 2020, staff looked at alternatives for daily parking at Lakeside Park. Staff looked at getting a gate to control the entrance into the park as well as a parking box for payment. Quotes were obtained for both a gate as well as just the stand-alone payment system. Both options would require a direct connection to power as well as fiber for internet.
 - The gate with kiosk quote was \$20,652
 - The stand-alone kiosk quote was \$6,800
- At the April 22, 2020 workshop, staff brought forward the Lakeside Park Parking Policy due to COVID-19, which was to reduce staff and to move towards a cashless collection for safety purposes. Council also directed staff to move forward with the meter system with the Smart Parking Meter System Kiosk that had been researched.
- After much discussion among staff (Public Works Superintendent, City Engineer, City Administrator, Police Chief and City Finance Director), the direction was determined to go with the walk-up payment system instead of a gate entrance. The committee felt that the gate entrance could cause traffic delays on Highway 10. The kiosk allowed the police the ability to monitor the parking lot (via web access) to determine which spots had been paid for. Those not showing paid would be issued a ticket unless the vehicle displayed the seasonal parking pass. The parking box was ordered and installed in May of 2020, for a total cost of \$10,216.50. The City was able to purchase the parking box with Covid funds.
- Each year, staff refunds 30-50 customers for double charges as the machine is not a chip reader and the customer does not understand that they have to remove their card before the card is processed. Also, no receipt is needed, which at times leads to confusion and the customer will insert their card multiple times to get a receipt. Staff has placed instructions on the parking box to help customers with using the parking box.
- Each year staff budgets revenue from parking at Lakeside Park as follows:
 - Daily parking box - \$50,000
 - Parking Pass – Residents - \$15,000
 - Parking Pass – Non-residents - \$10,000

The revenue covers the wages of the seasonal staff at Lakeside Park and the seasonal lawn care staff.

- Following is the revenue generated from the parking box since it was implemented in 2020.
 - 2020 - \$73,521

- 2021 -\$64,684
- 2022 - \$54,517
- 2023 through 8/31/2023 - \$55,652

Included with this memo, is a breakdown of revenue generated from parking at Lakeside Park as well as expenditures from 2014 through 2023.

Options pertaining to Lakeside Park:

1. Keep as is,
 - For 2024 staff will do some additional training with seasonal staff members so they are aware of how the parking box works.
2. Upgrade the parking box to the new enhanced model, which allows staff to enter a more detail script on the screen; cost is approximately \$7,000.
3. Only sell seasonal parking passes. Staff will have to make adjustments to future budgets to reflect the loss of the \$50,000 budgeted revenues from daily parking pass.
4. Eliminate the fee for parking. Future budgets would have to be adjusted to reflect the loss of \$75,000 in revenues. For 2024, there would have to be a reduction in the transfer to the CIP funds to accommodate this option.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

The revenue generated from parking at Lakeside Park lowers the total levy amount each year.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

N/A

ATTACHMENTS

- Lakeside Park revenue and expenditure breakdown 2014-2023
- April 22, 2020 meeting minutes
- Card processing instructions

LAKE SIDE PARK

Monthly Internet cost - 115/month has been there prior to the parking box- guest can use

	8/31/2023											
	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	TOTAL ACTUALS	
REVENUES												
PARK DAILY	38,574.98	33,403.93	40,840.06	36,168.89	46,396.46	45,487.31	73,521.46	64,684.24	54,516.78	55,652.47	489,246.58	
SEASONAL RESIDENT	10,108.82	9,128.38	9,740.16	9,748.63	9,725.32	10,579.35	11,380.00	13,923.15	12,498.29	13,236.58	110,068.68	
SEASONAL NON-RESIDENTAL	7,152.06	8,121.23	7,715.89	9,440.68	10,039.34	10,625.76	13,917.29	13,917.29	11,036.08	11,502.33	103,467.95	
TOTAL	55,835.86	50,653.54	58,296.11	55,358.20	66,161.12	66,692.42	98,818.75	92,524.68	78,051.15	80,391.38	702,783.21	
EXPENDITURES FOR SEASONAL STAFF ONLY - NOT INCLUDED LAWN CARE WHICH REVENUE HELPS COVER												
WAGES	22,203.71	26,228.13	27,294.64	23,650.76	29,265.47	21,513.81	2,159.94	1,612.50	7,073.98	5,112.50	166,115.44	
FRINGE - 7.65%	1,698.58	2,006.45	2,088.04	1,809.28	2,238.81	1,645.81	165.24	123.36	541.16	391.11	12,707.83	
	23,902.29	28,234.58	29,382.68	25,460.04	31,504.28	23,159.62	2,325.18	1,735.86	7,615.14	5,503.61	178,823.27	
REST OF SEASONAL STAFF - LAWN CARE												
WAGES	4,021.60	7,851.45	12,756.44	18,688.50	17,580.10	38,286.42	37,117.00	26,554.50	25,372.25	23,439.00	211,667.26	
FRINGE - 7.65%	307.65	600.64	975.87	1,429.67	1,344.88	2,928.91	2,839.45	2,031.42	1,940.98	1,793.08	16,192.55	
PERA - 7.50%	-	588.86	956.73	1,401.64	1,318.51	2,871.48	2,783.78	1,991.59	1,902.92	1,757.93	15,573.42	
	4,329.25	9,040.94	14,689.04	21,519.81	20,243.49	44,086.81	42,740.23	30,577.51	29,216.15	26,990.01	243,433.23	
COST OF PARKING BOX	-	-	-	-	-	-	6,960.00				6,960.00	
COST OF ARVIG - INTERNET CONNECTION							3,256.50				3,256.50	
MONTHLY WARRANTY							2,880.00	480.00	480.00	480.00	4,320.00	
EXCESS/(LOSS)	27,604.31	13,378.01	14,224.39	8,378.35	14,413.36	(554.01)	40,656.85	59,731.32	40,739.86	47,417.77	265,990.21	265,990.21

PARKS BUDGET - INCLUDES LAKE MAINTENANCE											
	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	**started the \$100K to Parks CIP in 2023
BUDGET											
EXPENDITURES	373,853.00	408,422.00	404,491.00	513,931.00	565,785.00	543,931.00	614,739.00	538,385.00	560,757.00	734,865.00	
REVENUES(INCLUDES PARKING)	51,200.00	68,300.00	60,450.00	55,875.00	55,305.00	59,880.00	72,362.00	78,000.00	79,060.00	79,060.00	
EXCESS/(LOSS)	(322,653.00)	(340,122.00)	(344,041.00)	(458,056.00)	(510,480.00)	(484,051.00)	(542,377.00)	(460,385.00)	(481,697.00)	(655,805.00)	
**PROPERTY TAX COVERS REST OF EXPENDITURES											

AS OF AUGUST											
	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	**started the \$100K to Parks CIP in 2022
ACTUAL REVENUES											
EXPENDITURES	331,525.00	374,643.00	438,247.00	472,846.00	540,009.00	565,256.00	637,543.00	550,749.00	621,438.00	533,628.00	
REVENUES(INCLUDES PARKING)	86,481.00	88,623.00	146,668.00	77,067.00	115,296.00	98,078.00	126,975.00	100,284.00	80,771.00	88,987.00	
EXCESS/(LOSS)	(245,044.00)	(286,020.00)	(291,579.00)	(395,779.00)	(424,713.00)	(467,178.00)	(510,568.00)	(450,465.00)	(540,667.00)	(444,641.00)	
**PROPERTY TAX COVERS REST OF EXPENDITURES											

BUDGETED REVENUES - LAKESIDE				
	2021	2022	2023	2024
PARKING PASSES - RESIDENTS	11,000.00	15,000.00	15,000.00	15,000.00
PARKING PASSES - NON RESIDENTS	11,000.00	10,000.00	10,000.00	10,000.00
PARKING PASSES - DAILY	53,000.00	50,000.00	50,000.00	50,000.00
	75,000.00	75,000.00	75,000.00	75,000.00
BUDGETED SEASONAL				
SEASONAL GATE (4 STAFF)	15,677.20	26,696.29	31,920.00	37,758.00
SEASONAL LAWN (3 STAFF)	41,107.50	42,630.00	52,780.00	56,112.58
FRINGE PAY FOR SEASONAL LAWN	6,227.79	6,458.45	7,996.17	8,697.45
FRINGE PAY FOR SEASONAL	1,199.31	2,042.27	2,441.88	3,020.64
	64,211.80	77,827.01	95,138.05	105,588.67
+/- TO REVENUE	10,788.20	(2,827.01)	(20,138.05)	(30,588.67)
+/- ONLY SEASONAL GATE	58,123.49	46,261.44	40,638.12	34,221.36



AGENDA ITEM

Big Lake City Council

Prepared By: Gina Wolbeck, City Clerk	Meeting Date: 5/13/2020	<input type="checkbox"/> Regular Agenda Item <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consent Agenda Item	Item No. 6B
Item Description: April 22, 2020 City Council Workshop Minutes		Reviewed By: Clay Wilfahrt, City Administrator	
		Reviewed By: N/A	

ACTION REQUESTED

By approving this item on the Consent Agenda, Council would be approving the April 22, 2020 City Council Workshop Minutes as presented.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

The April 22, 2020 City Council Workshop Minutes are attached for Council's review

FINANCIAL IMPACT

N/A

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

N/A

ATTACHMENTS

Workshop Minutes

**BIG LAKE CITY COUNCIL
WORKSHOP MINUTES**

APRIL 22, 2020

1. CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Wallen called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL

Council Members present: Seth Hansen, Rose Johnson, Paul Knier, Mike Wallen, and Scott Zettervall. Also present: City Administrator Clay Wilfahrt, Finance Director Deb Wegeleben, Community Development Director Hanna Klimmek, City Engineer Layne Otteson, Police Chief Joel Scharf, City Clerk Gina Wolbeck, City Planner Amy Barthel, Streets/Parks Superintendent Nick Abel, and Liquor Store Manager Greg Zurbey.

3. PROPOSED AGENDA

Council Member Knier motioned to adopt the proposed Agenda as presented. Seconded by Council Member Zettervall, unanimous ayes, Agenda adopted.

4. BUSINESS

4A. Lakeside Park Parking Policy for 2020 Discussion

Layne Otteson discussed concerns that have been raised regarding a potential influx of Lakeside Park users due to park and boat launch closures in other communities relating to COVID-19. A significant increase by non-resident users would likely have an adverse impact to resident parking and access to Lakeside Park. In the event that these issues occur, Staff would like to be able to respond immediately if residents and seasonal pass holders are not being able to use the parking lot at Lakeside Park. Currently, there is no policy in place to guide Staff on this type of circumstance. Otteson clarified that a change in operations utilizing an approved option would only happen if needed. Otteson reviewed four options to address these concerns and presented pros and cons for each option; 1) Designate parking areas, 2) Seasonal pass access for residents and non-residents (no day pass), 3) Seasonal pass only for residents (no day pass), and 4) Adjust current price schedule. Each option is expected to result in a reduction of fees collected. The losses in revenue could likely range between 10% to 50% depending on use from residents and non-residents. Staffing reductions would correspond to tracked revenue loss. Otteson expressed that parking lot and boat launch use this summer is unknown and the COVID-19 situation is very fluid. City Staff will monitor parking lot use and capacity closely. Of the four options, Staff finds Option 1 to be the best response to address parking lot use increases due to non-residents. If the situation continues to escalate, Staff would return with an

amendment further restricting parking access. Clay Wilfahrt stressed that it is not the City's intention to start this right away, only on an as needed basis.

Council Member Knier stated that he hopes overcrowding at Lakeside Park doesn't become a problem, but if it does he likes option 1. Knier also stated that he doesn't want to inhibit people from coming to town as it benefits local businesses.

Council Member Johnson discussed that she is a big proponent to give residents some kind of benefit. Johnson noted that she likes option 1 for the near term, but wants to look at a broad scale way to address the access issues that we currently have. Johnson also stressed that we need to give preferential access to City of Big Lake residents.

Council Member Zettervall asked why we don't close the parking lot when the lot is full. Council Member Johnson stressed that she feels it will be a problem when local residents can't park at the City Park. Zettervall stated that he supports option 1, noting that we should give preference to City residents, possibly by only issuing season passes to City residents.

Council Member Hansen stated that he likes option 1.

Mayor Wallen stated that he likes option 1, and would like to see us get to the point that City residents don't have to pay to park.

Council directed Staff to move forward with drafting Option 1 to be implemented into a Lakeside Park Parking Policy and to bring back to Council for final consideration.

Wilfahrt also reviewed Staff's evaluation of potential cost saving measures to control the gate access at Lakeside Park. Wilfahrt noted that a Smart Parking Meter System Kiosk could be a possibility instead of issuing annual passes and staffing the gazebo. Staff is working on verifying that logistically the system will work, and how annual pass holders would have access.

Council Member Zettervall discussed that he would like an access card that would be compatible for numerous uses such as the Park as well as the compost site.

Council Member Knier stated that he is in favor of this type of meter system, and he likes the savings projections.

Council Member Hansen stated that we would need to figure out how annual pass holders will still be able to access.

Council Member Johnson stated that she likes the meter system idea, and would like to move forward with giving free access to residents and increasing the entry fee to non-residents. Johnson also discussed the concept of implementing dynamic pricing.

Mayor Wallen stated that he likes the meter system concept and thanked staff for coming up with new ideas to improve the Park.

4B. 2020 Street and Utility Improvement Project No. ST2020-1 Discussion

Layne Otteson provided an update on the 2020 Street and Utility Improvement Project that was bid in early April. The bids ranged from \$3M to \$3.9M with 5 bidders submitting. Otteson reviewed proposed project costs totaling \$3,371,068.11. In December 2019, the project was estimated to cost \$3.73M including construction and engineering/testing. Otteson also reviewed project funding which would be funded in part through assessments amounting to \$1,446,728.80 and the City paying \$1,924,339.31. In December, the funding identified was projected to be approximately \$1.74M in special assessments and \$1.99M by the City. Otteson reviewed options available for the project which included 1) reject the bids, 2) accept the low bid, or 3) wait until the next Council Meeting. Otteson reviewed the pros and cons of each option, and laid out the financial impact of moving forward with the project. Otteson also discussed the option to redesign at a lower cost, noting that we do need to complete insulation services, ADA upgrades, and repair the County Road 81 water main break issue. Otteson reviewed the potential costs of a reduced project and a potential schedule for the improvements.

Council Member Knier discussed the uncertain times we are experiencing, noting that a redesign would still produce good solid roads in these areas. Knier also stated that he wouldn't be opposed to pushing the street project out to 2021. Knier also discussed whether it would be beneficial to rebid now that oil prices are so low.

Council Member Johnson stressed that if we decide to scale back the project, she doesn't want to jeopardize the quality of the lake. Johnson stressed that a redesign could cause long term harm if not done properly, so we need to continue to be considerate of lake quality.

Council Member Zetervall discussed the need to be ready to be aggressive, and to be prepared to jump on opportunities.

Mayor Wallen discussed the need to continue to be fiscally prudent and preserve our cash standings. Given some of the uncertainties that the State is experiencing, Wallen stated that he would like to scale the project back, and only do the required upgrades in 2020 and then revisit the larger road project portion in 2021. Deb Wegeleben discussed the state of the Bond market, noting that we could potentially have to wait to sell the Bonds depending on the market. If we wait to sell Bonds, the City would have to cash flow the project costs.

Council discussed that the City has up to 60 days to approve or deny the bid award which would allow us until the second meeting in May to make a decision on what capacity to move forward with the project. The Consensus of the Council was to wait until we have a clearer picture of how the economy will look and directed Staff to come back to the next meeting with an update. Otteson noted that he will start a new Preliminary Engineering report in preparation for the May 13th Council Meeting.

4C. New Ideas Discussion

Council Member Knier informed Council that the Big Lake Beyond the Yellow Ribbon and the Big Lake American Legion have jointly funded the purchase and installation of benches at the Veteran's Memorial site. Council directed the Organizations to work with the Parks Department Staff to coordinate the install of the benches.

5. **OTHER** – No other.

6. **ADJOURN**

Council Member Knier motioned to adjourn at 5:52 p.m. Seconded by Council Member Johnson, unanimous ayes, motion carried.

City Clerk

Date Approved By Council

Card processing

- Enter Space Number
- Insert card all the way and then remove it
 - Please make sure the card has been fully inserted and then remove card. Do not leave card in for processing.
- Card will then process
- **Receipt is not needed**, however if you want a receipt you must **Press 1 for a receipt**.

If you receive this message, **just remove your card** and wait for the next screen that will show card is processing. System is set up to process card once card is removed. This notice indicates that card is still in machine.

