

**CITY OF RUSHFORD VILLAGE MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 19, 2024**  
**REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING**  
**43038 State Hwy 30, Rushford Village, Minnesota 55971-5167**

Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag

The November 19, 2024 Council Meeting was called to order by Acting Mayor Micheal Ebner at 7:00 p.m. in the Rushford Village Office. Council Members present: Travis Link, Robert Hart and Rick Ruberg; Public Works/Maintenance Supervisor Trenten Chiglo, Planning/Zoning Administrator Jon Pettit, City Attorney Joseph O’Koren, Treasurer Judy Graham and Clerk Mary Miner  
Absent: Mayor Dennis Overland

**AGENDA** was approved as presented

Motion by Hart, 2<sup>nd</sup> by Link, Carried.

**MINUTES** from the October 15, 2024 Regular Council Meeting were approved as presented

Motion by Hart, 2<sup>nd</sup> by Link, Carried.

**CITIZENS/OTHERS PRESENT:** Derek Olinger-Bolton & Menk, Kirsten Zoellner-Fillmore County Journal/Joining remotely for SRTS presentation Mitchell Kiecker-MN DOT, Rebecca Charles-CEDA

• **Mitchell Kiecker-MN DOT Senior Engineer-Final Safe Routes to School Project Report via remote Microsoft Teams:**

- The proposed project would be from the bridge over the Root River to Main Street/Highway 43 in South Rushford
- Kiecker stated this is not a promise from MN DOT or MN DOT is not expecting CRV to commit to the project right now. The purpose of this report was to dig into the information to see what the estimated cost of the connection to build and other key things to consider. This does not mean the project is going to 100% happen and CRV is on the hook to pay for it. This report is to help CRV stay informed on what CRV wants to do for the next steps
- It was determined the path could not go on the east side of the Highway because the bridges already have the sidewalk on the west side and anything to change the bridge to accommodate a path on the east side would be very costly. West side bridge options would be to use the existing sidewalks which would mean the path would narrow down to 5 feet wide at the sidewalks and widen back out between the bridges, increase the width of the sidewalks by adding concrete or shave the concrete down so it would be a flat surface. Any option to change the sidewalks on the bridge will require further work with MN DOT District 6
- The pedestrian crossing at Highway 16 is needed because the path was moved to the east side of Highway 43 because of potential standing water issues on the west side. It also makes the path easily accessible from Main Street. It is believed this crossing will give drivers better visibility when coming around the curve
- Project A1 is a shared bike path that would include a 10-foot-wide shared use path along Highway 43 and would include curb and gutter, potential removal of sidewalk slabs on the bridges and enhanced pedestrian crossing at Highway 16. Cost estimate \$725,000.00
- Project A2 is a pedestrian/ bike shoulder that would include a 10-foot-wide shoulder along Highway 43 and would include rumble strips or raised curb, potential removal of sidewalk slabs on the bridge and enhance pedestrian crossing at Highway 16. Cost estimate \$870,000.00. This project also shows in the pictures a barrier/guardrail from the first bridge to the bridge over the Root River to better protect those using the path, this is optional and MN DOT suggests the barriers would be low clearance so anyone with a piece of equipment that has wheels that are not that wide but up above has parts that are folded in or sticking out they won’t end up hitting the guard rails
- CRV has the final design report, the next step is the infrastructure grant opportunity which is open until January 17, 2025 for up to 1 million dollars in construction funding. This infrastructure grant would cover all construction costs including asphalt, concrete, earth moving, bridge adjustments, signs, lighting, etc.
- To apply CRV would have to have Fillmore County as the sponsor the County has the financial set up to receive and move funding more easily
- Because of the amount of money for the project a Council resolution will need to be passed and attached to the permit application
- CRV would be responsible for winter maintenance but it might be possible to have an arrangement with MN DOT to plow the path or to work with Rushford
- During the discussion it was determined there will be costs for engineering that are not covered by the grant and would be the responsibility of CRV to cover. This would be for the final engineering design and plans for construction for the project. It is not known at this time what those costs will be.

- Olinger estimates the engineering part could be 10% to 15% but it can vary depending on the design. The design itself is the less than 10%-15%, the expensive piece is the coordination regarding plan reviews with Fillmore County and MN DOT
- Snowmobiles use the bridge over the Root River but use the fields to bypass the South Rushford bridges
- The whole project will all be within the MN DOT right-of-way so there would not be a need for easements but a legal cooperative agreement in which MN DOT acknowledges it is within their space but CRV built, owns and operates the path. MN DOT will not charge CRV for building it over the highway
- This is a competitive grant, there is no guarantee CRV would receive the grant if applied for. There are 2 buckets of money, Safe Routes to School Program and State Wide Active Transportation Program, that are available. If CRV were to be awarded the grant CRV would have until April 2025 to decline the grant. Olinger stated CRV would have the option to back out whenever we wanted to and that MN DOT does not like to get money back once it has been awarded so MN DOT would prefer a decision is made before the application is submitted. If CRV were to decline the grant it would be 2 years before another application could be made. Charles stated it might be possible to get a different grant to cover the engineering cost of the grant
- Olinger stated submitting the application is not free because normally they would put together the information needed for the application and submit it.
- Olinger stated there will be a cost to CRV for the project and that cost should be known before an application is submitted
- O'Koren stated he reviewed the resolution and his concern is the section that states CRV would be responsible for all costs associated with the project beyond the infrastructure grant amount
- Olinger stated when he runs the estimates he needs to know the total cost of the project, eligible and ineligible. MN DOT did nothing wrong with the way they did the estimates but they do not show the full picture. He knows CEDA can put together the cost estimates but he feels this is a problem that requires an engineering design and it would not be smart to not have an engineer look at it and he would be uncomfortable with just CEDA doing that, he would like to look at it. Olinger stated if CRV is applying for the grant CRV should be seriously considering and wanting the project and if that is not the case think about it for a year and apply next year
- Charles stated there is no additional cost to submit the application as the application would be completed and submitted by Charles through the CEDA contract. Kiecker told Charles because the project is in the MN DOT right-of-way so typically the engineering is not more than 5%-7%. Charles is aware Rushford was not approved for their previous projects but none of those projects went through the three different phases that CRV did and she has been assured that is something they take into consideration before awards. This would give CRV \$870,000.00 free dollars to put towards projects that it was identified through community outreach was something they would like to see. CRV could decline the grant if it was not figured out how to cover the rest of the cost but if it is decided to not move forward with it the grant is usually available every other year so CRV would have to wait 2 years to apply again. CRV would have until April to figure out where the rest of the engineering money would come from. City and County resolutions are needed for the grant application
- Charles stated she will contact Fillmore County to let them know the CRV resolution will not be approved during this meeting
- Charles will hold off on working on the rest of the application so she is not putting hours there until the Council decides what is wants to do
- Council is concerned about what the engineering costs will be and are not comfortable moving forward with the resolution or grant application until that cost is known

**FINANCIALS:** October Receipts \$29,940.64, October Expenses \$35,806.60

Outstanding Checks as of 10/31/2024 \$16,909.88, Bank Balance as of 10/31/2024 \$314,407.45

Receipts as of November 15, 2024 \$4,315.48, Expenses as of November 15, 2024 \$25,330.65

Estimated November Receipts \$10,500.00/Estimated November Expenses \$49,000.00

CD's renewing at current advertised rates

**Motion** made to approve the Financials as presented

**Motion** by Hart, 2nd by Ruberg. Carried.

• **Judy Graham-December CD's**

- Graham provided a list with the amounts that were put into various CD's in the past. Grader \$25,000, Road & Mowing Equipment \$12,000, Trucks \$16,000, Bridges \$25,000, Office Tech & Equipment \$20,000, Parks \$2,000
- Other than \$2,000 for parks none of the other CD's have been purchased for a number of years
- Graham stated she felt the grader should remain at \$25,000 but because we are in good shape regarding road and mowing equipment that could be reduced to \$6,000, \$16,000 for a truck could be eliminated if we have a truck coming next year, bridges seem to be ok and there does not appear to be any that will need to be worked on so reduce this to \$12,000, the computers have been replace so the office tech & equipment reduced to \$5,000 and leave the \$2,000.00 for parks. There is already money in the budget for road maintenance
- Graham asked the Council to think about these CD's so they can decide in December what they want to do

## **PLANNING / ZONING–Pettit: New Permits /Inquiries/Updates;**

### **New Permits:**

- #1691-Robert Hart-8'x16' Deck-Pine Lane
- #1692-Mark Rasmussen-16'x18' Garden Shed-Rush Creek Roe Rd
- #1693-Randy Baker-Replace & Attaching building to existing building-Ridgeview Rd
- #1694-Jen Kleist-Replacing patio door- State Highway 16
- #1695-James & Tara Scaife-Replacing 1 window-Aspen Rd
- #1696-Philip Austin-12'x20' Shed/Garage & Demolish old Shed/Garage-Main St
- #1697-Dave & Lori Clobes-8'x12' Deck-Tower Ridge Road

### **Permit Status/Projects in Process/Inquiries/Updates:**

- **Ladewig Subdivision:**
  - Pettit reported the Les Ladewig subdivision permit application was denied because it was incomplete.
  - This does not mean the subdivision is denied, it means there is more information needed to make a complete permit application for the subdivision

## **ROADS/WATER/SEWER:**

- **Roads/Utilities Update:** Chiglo reported
  - The maintenance shed north side overhead doors will be installed Wednesday, November 20th. Chiglo has been in contact with Baker Construction, Norman's will be contacted
  - The rock shed has been filled
  - He will be getting the trucks ready for winter
  - He has gotten a lot of grading done the last couple of weeks
  - Chiglo was congratulated on passing his wastewater exam
- **Chiglo Wastewater Exam/Scheck Letter:**
  - Chiglo passed his wastewater exam on October 3, 2024
  - Travis Scheck was sent a letter stating Chiglo passed his wastewater exam and Scheck's Water and Wastewater Reports and On Call Services Agreement will no longer be needed. November 30, 2024 is the last day the agreement will be in effect. Scheck was thanked for the service he provided to CRV
- **Village Road Chip Seal Update-Derek Olinger, Bolton & Menk:**
  - Olinger provided an estimate of \$124,250.00 to double chip seal Village Road. To do a total repaving of the road Olinger estimated the cost would cost an additional \$75,000.00-\$100,000.00
  - The chip seal part of the project is about \$25,000.00-\$30,000.00, the road bed prep is where the cost is
  - Chiglo questioned if it would work to haul in 8 inches of rock and then chip seal over that. Olinger is not sure if it would last and it might be too high to be tied into the road
  - Olinger stated it would be good to investigate the thickness of the pavement by digging up a 5'x5' section of the road to help determine what can be done. An option may be to have the road ground up one year the chip sealed the next. Chiglo and Olinger will work together on the investigation this year
  - It was suggested the section of road from the bridge to the Yucatan line get ground up and left that way instead of chip sealing it. The ground up material will pack which would help with the dust. Yucatan does not intend to replace any of the blacktop on their portion and eventually it will become a gravel road.
  - Chiglo state there is about 200 feet of pavement that goes up Aspen Road that is in bad shape so he has put gravel over the top of it. Chiglo stated it might be better to leave it as gravel so he can shape it so the water runs off the road. Olinger stated to replace this section would increase the cost
- **2024 Lift Station Inspection Report:**
  - Council reviewed the MN Pump Works lift station inspection report
  - Chiglo stated everything looks good. The propellers are showing wear but that is to be expected

**Motion** to approve the MN Pump Works lift station report

**Motion** by Hart, 2<sup>nd</sup> by Ruberg, Carried.

## **OTHER:**

- **2024 CRV Election Results:**
  - Miner reported there were 583 registered CRV voters at 7:00 am on November 5, 2024. There were 31 new registrations on election day and 57 accepted regular, military, and overseas absentee ballot and mail ballots accepted at Fillmore County. The total number of CRV voters on November 5, 2024 was 527
  - Mayor Seat: Dennis Overland received 477 votes with 7 write-in votes
  - Council Member at Large Seats-Elect 2: Rick Ruberg received 419, Mike Ebner 420 with 4 write-in votes
  - Miner reported it was a very busy day and things went well
  - Ebner thanked Graham and Miner for their time

**Motion** made to accept the 2024 General Election CRV results as presented

**Motion** by Hart, 2<sup>nd</sup> by Link, Carried.

- **SMIF-Taylor Rural Improvement Grant ADA Merry-Go-Round \$1,200.00 Additional:**

- Miner reported CRV received an additional \$1,200.00 to go towards the ADA compliant merry-go-round at the hall park
- Pee Rock is no longer considered ADA compliant so the additional funds can be used to purchase mulch which is ADA compliant
- The old merry-go-round did not have a concrete pad under it so one will need to be installed
- Charles will be at the December 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting to provide more information

**Motion** made to accept the additional \$1,200.00 SMIF-Taylor Rural Improvement Grant

Motion by Ruberg, 2<sup>nd</sup> by Link, Carried.

- **PEIP Health Insurance-New employee waiting period:**

- Council was provided with the MN PEIP health insurance proposal for review
- Miner stated the Council needs to formally accept CRV is going through the MN PEIP for health insurance and to decide what the new hires health insurance waiting period will be
- Ebner reported he spoke with Overland about the waiting period for new hires, Overland suggested a 30-day waiting period for new hires

**Motion** made for CRV to get their health insurance through MN PEIP

Motion by Link, 2<sup>nd</sup> by Hart, Carried.

**Motion** made to have a 30-day health insurance waiting period for new hires

Motion by Link, 2<sup>nd</sup> by Hart, Carried.

- **SEMLM Meeting-Wednesday, December 4th-5 pm Social/6 pm Dinner @ Chatfield:**

- Ebner, Overland, Miner and Graham will attend

- **Resolution 2024-11-19-Support of Safe Routes To School Infrastructure Grant Application:**

- It was determined during the remote SRTS presentation the engineering costs would not be covered by the infrastructure grant being applied for
- It is not known what the engineering costs will be, Olinger will look at the total cost of the project and get an estimate for the engineering costs
- Council is not comfortable with signing the resolution and moving forward with the project until the engineering costs are known

**Motion** made to table discussion to the December 3, 2024 meeting

Motion by Hart, 2<sup>nd</sup> by Link, Carried.

- **Rebecca Charles-CEDA Monthly Report:**

- Report was reviewed. Rebecca plans to attend the December 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting to discuss items on the report

- **Budget:**

- Miner reported she removed from the 2025 proposed \$24,000.00 for the maintenance shed remodel because that work is being done now
- \$7,000.00 was left in the maintenance shed remodel 2025 proposed budget to cover the cost of installing heat. This is just an estimate, an updated quote will be needed
- The 2025 proposed budget now shows receipts of \$739,679.00 and disbursements of \$723,943.00
- Miner reminded the Council a decision will need to be made regarding employee 2025 salaries. The proposed budgeted amount for 2025 is a 3% COLA increase and a step for all employees

**OTHER UPDATES / MEETINGS:**

- December 3, 2024, Tuesday-Truth in Taxation (TNT) Meeting, 6:45 pm @ CRV Office
- December 4, 2024, Wednesday-SEMLM Meeting-5:00 pm Social/6:00 pm Dinner @ Chatfield

**Next Meetings: Council:** December 3, 2024 TNT Meeting @ 6:45 pm, Council Meeting @ 7:00 pm and December 17, 2024 @ 7:00 pm at CRV Hall Office

**Zoning:** December 17, 2024 @ 5:30 pm at CRV Hall Office

**Motion made to Adjourn** Regular Council Meeting at 8:20 pm by Hart, 2<sup>nd</sup> by Ruberg. Carried