Dexter City Council Meeting
November 8, 2021

Additional Staff Updates

8140 Main St. Hazard Survey. As previously reported, staff will be participating in the MIOSHA hazard survey for 8140 Main St. that was requested on Wednesday, November 10th at 9:30am.

Utility Operator Posting. Staff has posted an opening for a Public Utility Operator. The purpose of the position is to maintain staffing in the water/sewer utilities department when the Public Services Superintendent leaves.

Responses to Council Questions

Department of Public Services Report
p9: Should we be concerned that the pedestrian crossing sign near Dairy Queen was run over? Do you know what happened?

> We do not have details on who hit the sign or why. However, these signs are typically placed in or near the road (for Main St. and the Dairy Queen, they are in the road), and there is always the possibility that they will be hit by a vehicle. This is even more likely due to the movement of trucks and turning radii from those making the left into the Dairy Queen parking lot or making a left off of Central St.

p9: Can you please remind me what the backwash gallons refers to/indicates? It looks like there was a relatively large increase (up 8,000 gallons from 28,000 to 36,000) between the two weeks reported.

> The amount of water needed to remove the iron from the filter via the backwashing process depends on how long it takes for the water being backwashed to present as clear.

p10: Should we be concerned about the high phosphorus loading at the WWTP? Any additional updates?

> In late-September, the Wastewater Treatment Plan experienced high spikes of phosphorus in the influent on the weekends. Dexter staff performed quality control checks to make sure the lab was working properly. Then Dexter staff used its portable automated sampler in the wastewater system in an attempt to locate the spikes. Staff was not able to definitively locate the source of the spikes, but the high phosphorus levels on the weekends have stopped.

Community Development Manager/City Planner Report
p12: Regarding the excerpt below, what is the actual tax revenue from the industrial park, both in dollars and as a share of all tax revenue? How are those funds divided between the City and the DDA, if at all?

1. The Planning Commission voiced concern about allowing a use in the RD District that would not be a job generator, citing a key point of having the industrial park was to provide a strong tax base for the city, along with good paying jobs.

Industrial Park Ad Valorem (real and personal):
Operating: $247,473.10
Streets: $100,079.48

IFT (real and personal):

Operating: $42,925.72
Streets: $17,359.37

Total:
Operating: $290,398.82
Streets: $117,438.85

Percentage of total collections: 9.85%

The DDA does not capture taxes from properties located within the industrial park.

p17: Regarding the rental inspection ordinance, it seems like this could be its own agenda item, yes? Perhaps it was received too late (memo is dated 11/4) to be added as such? It looks like Mike's last meeting will be the 22nd, is that right? Perhaps this is worth discussing on Monday night so we can avail ourselves of his knowledge of the topic. Council could make a motion to amend the agenda.

There are a number of ways that this could be handled: 1) City Council could amend the agenda to make this a discussion item; 2) it could be included as an item on the November 22, 2021 meeting agenda; or 3) if there are specific questions, they could be asked during the Community Development Report section of the agenda and then also included as a discussion item on a future agenda. Due to the number of items already on the agenda, staff wanted to include it as an update first, gauge City Council's interest in the item, and then bring it back for additional discussion/consideration for a future agenda. While Mike will be leaving the City of Dexter, Michelle can be prepared to carry this item forward.

City Manager Report
p23: Why is it that staff is not allowed to move into the new City Hall yet? Perhaps it has something to do with the inability to secure the offices from the public meeting space? A resident reached out to me and I wasn't sure.

The 3515 Broad St. User Group is still working with Partners in Architecture to define the interior remodel and exterior improvements project for 3515 Broad St. The group is working to make sure that what is proposed makes sense with the budget that the City has available. We are hoping to have a presentation from Partners in Architecture included on the November 22nd agenda about the proposed project. The issue with moving-in right now is the proposed construction that would take place in the offices section of the building. What is likely to be proposed includes the installation of an

elevator, removal and relocation of the stairs, and defining the lobby area. If City staff were to occupy the building immediately, the proposed construction would be highly disruptive to the function of the office.

p27: Discussion of: Utility Account Seasonal Estimating: It seems like this should be a discussion item at some point, right? Or are you anticipating some discussion of this topic during your staff update?

If there is interest, this could also be amended to be a discussion item on the agenda or brought-back for discussion on a future agenda. Due to the number of items already on the agenda, staff wanted to provide the information to City Council, gauge City Council's interest in having additional discussion on this item, and then bring it back for additional discussion/consideration for a future agenda.

As an update on this topic, staff shared the memo included in the agenda packet with Mr. Sherrill. Mr. Sherrill responded that he appreciated the additional information and that he provided the following in an e-mail:

"Justin,

Thanks for the update on water and sewer billing along with the Utilities Department recommendation. I did not know that so many residences had established a two meter system at their service location, one for water only billing and one for water and sewage billing. Given that so many residences have done this to provide accurate billing information, I do not think that policy should change, and I agree with the recommendation presented in the memorandum.

I also agree that my proposed methodology would present inaccurate estimates for snowbirds sewage use. It is my understanding that the City has quite a few snowbirds.

Given the above, I would like to move forward and consider the installation of a water only meter at my residence."

CDBG ADA Ramps

p67: How were these locations determined/prioritized? If the City maintains a list of future replacements, how many ramps are on that list?

The DPW maintains a list of locations where this work is needed. With Kurt Augustine, the DPW Foreman, on vacation, the exact number was not available on Monday. However, we have tried to address the most "awkward" crossings (i.e. ramps that lead out to the street) and those areas where one side of the street received an accessibility treatment, but the opposite side remains to be completed. The final locations were determined based on the amount of work to be done and what would fit within the grant dollars available, based on the engineer's estimate.

Variety Die & Stamping
p85: The Planning Commission has proposed approval with a number of conditions. My sense is that many projects undergo a combined preliminary and final site plan review. Why not separate more of these so that the final site plan is much closer to what we want to be approved, with many fewer (ideally no) conditions? This would give the PC two opportunities to review the plan. Do certain plans automatically qualify for a combined review?

> The Zoning Ordinance allows an applicant to submit for a combined preliminary and final site plan. The site plan did have conditions, however the conditions are minor and do not warrant an administrative requirement for a separate preliminary and final site plan review.

Urban Wireless
p125: So will the total compensation for all services received between the beginning of any agreement and the end of this amended agreement be $5,000?

> Yes. It's the same amount remaining on the initial agreement.