

Carver County Board of Commissioners
 Regular Session
 August 12, 2008
 County Board Room
 Carver County Government Center
 Human Services Building
 Chaska, Minnesota

PAGE

9:15 a.m.	1.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) CONVENE b) <i>Pledge of Allegiance</i> c) <i>Public participation (comments limited to five minutes)</i> d) <i>Introduction of New Employees</i> 	
	2.	Agenda review and adoption	
	3.	Approve minutes of August 5, 2008 Regular Session.....	1-2
	4.	Community announcements	
9:15 a.m.	5.	CONSENT AGENDA	
	5.1	Payment of emergency claim	3
	5.2	Contract with Solid Waste Management Coordinating Board for the MN Paint Project	4
	5.3	Feedlot program annual report	5-17
	5.4	Application for Carver County Transit 2009 funding Agreement with Mn/DOT	18-19
	5.5	Approval of Sheriff's Office donation seven mobile computer stands to the City of Carver	20
	5.6	Sheriff's Office – Joint Powers Agreement with Minnesota DOC Oak Park Heights	21
	5.7	Abatements/additions.....	22-23
	5.8	Carver County Intersection Street Lighting Project-Mn/DOT	24-26
	5.9	Award of bid for SAP 10-599-16 bridge 10J14 (Hollywood Township Bridge)	27-28
	5.10	Community Social Services' warrants	NO ATT
	5.11	Commissioners' warrants.....	SEE ATT
9:20 a.m.	6.	ADMINISTRATION	
	6.1	MICA Annual end of session report.....	29
9:45 a.m.	7.	PUBLIC WORKS	
	7.1	Counties Transit Improvement Board Carver County ex-officio member	30

10:00 a.m.

8. ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES

8.1 Partial approval of bid awards for Bid Package 3:

Justice Center interior build out 31-38

10:30 a.m.

ADJOURN REGULAR SESSION

10:30 a.m.

1. Chair

2. Board Members

3. Administrator

11:00 a.m.

4. Adjourn

David Hemze
County Administrator

REGULAR SESSION
August 5, 2008

A Regular Session of the Carver County Board of Commissioners was held in the County Government Center, Chaska, on August 5, 2008. Chair James Ische convened the session at 9:16 a.m.

Members present: James Ische, Chair, Tim Lynch, Vice Chair, Gayle Degler, Randy Maluchnik and Tom Workman.

Members absent: None.

Lynch moved, Maluchnik seconded, to approve the agenda. Motion carried unanimously.

Degler moved, Workman seconded, to approve the minutes of the July 22, 2008, Regular Session Motion carried unanimously.

Community announcements were made by the Board.

Degler moved, Lynch seconded, to approve the following consent agenda items:

Payment of emergency claims in the amounts of \$670, \$795, \$1,185, \$100, \$23,409.77 and \$1,561.64.

Authorized the Sheriff's Office acceptance of \$50 donation and food, beverage and utensil donation.

Appointed Dr. Sam Desweese to the Mental Health Advisory Committee.

Adopted the Findings of Fact and Order #PZ20080024 fore the issuance of Conditional Use Permit #PZ20080024, June Rosckes, Waconia Township.

Adopted the Findings of Fact and Order #PZ20080022 for the issuance of Conditional Use Permit #PZ20080022, Terry Kaiser, Benton Township.

Authorized the Sheriff's Office to donate three radio cabinets and miscellaneous equipment to the Southwest Metro Amateur Radio Transmitting Society.

Authorized the Employee Club's acceptance of Valleyfair, Renaissance Festival and Nickelodeon Universe ticket/wristband donations.

Community Social Services' actions.

Approved payment of the following Commissioners' warrants:

INSERT

Motion carried unanimously.

Lynch moved, Degler seconded, to adjourn the Regular Session at 9:29 a.m. Motion carried unanimously.

David Hemze
County Administrator

(These proceedings contain summaries of resolutions. The full text of the resolutions are available for public inspection in the office of the county administrator.)



Office of Finance Director
Carver County Government Center
Administration Building
600 East Fourth Street
Chaska, MN 55318-1202
Phone: 952 361-1509
Fax: 952 361-1308

283883

AUTHORIZATION

PAYMENT OF EMERGENCY CLAIM

Motion passed by the Board of County Commissioners at their February 24, 1987 meeting has authorized the issuance of a check upon the consensus of the Chairman of the Board, County Administrator and the County Attorney (with a minimum of two).

VENDOR: JANE Mc Naught

ACCOUNT: 11-423-710-3550-6040

AMOUNT: \$5,000

REASON: a retainer for a Court Ordered Assessment, appointment can not be scheduled until retainer is received.

Department Head Signature: Mary Bann

Chairman of County Board

James Ische
James Ische

County Administrator
Finance Director

David Henze
David Henze

County Attorney

James W. Keeler, Jr.
James W. Keeler, Jr.

Date: 7/26/08



REQUEST FOR BOARD ACTION

AGENDA ITEM: Contract With Solid Waste Management Coordinating Board For The MN Paint Project

Originating Division: Land and Water

Meeting Date: August 12, 2008

Amount of Time Requested: NA

Attachments for packet: No

Item Type: Consent Regular Session Closed Session Work Session Ditch/Rail Authority

BACKGROUND/EXPLANATION OF AGENDA ITEM: In August of 2007, Carver County contracted with the Solid Waste Management Coordinating Board for the designation of Leslie Wilson, Environmentalist III, as Coordinator of the MN Paint Project. The project is a joint effort of the paint industry, the MN Pollution Control Agency, and the Solid Waste Management Coordinating Board [SWMCB]. It will develop a system in Minnesota that includes participation by paint manufacturers in the management of waste paint. The project was anticipated to run to the end of 2008. However, legislation to enable the start of the project implementation activities was vetoed by Governor Pawlenty. The project has been extended into 2009 to allow project cooperators to address concerns voiced by the Governor and to further refine implementation details. The amendment to the contract with the SWMCB will extend the role of Ms. Wilson as Coordinator until March 31, 2009 but reduce the position from 0.75 FTE to 0.50 FTE.

ACTION REQUESTED: Motion to approve the First Amendment to the MN Paint Demonstration Project Coordinator Contract with the Solid Waste Management Coordinating Board.

FUNDING

County Dollars = \$42,000

Other Sources & Amounts = \$

= \$

TOTAL = \$42,000**FISCAL IMPACT**

None

Included in current budget X

Budget amendment requested

Other:

Related Financial Comments: The funding received from the project reimburses Carver County for Ms. Wilson's salary and benefits. It is partially used to retain part time and temporary staff to assist with Environmental Services in implementing other solid waste projects that she is not available for.

 Reviewed by Division Director

Date: 1 Aug 08



REQUEST FOR BOARD ACTION

AGENDA ITEM: Feedlot Program Annual Report

Originating Division: Land and Water

Meeting Date: August 12, 2008

Amount of Time Requested: NA

Attachments for packet: Yes

Item Type: Consent Regular Session Closed Session Work Session Ditch/Rail Authority

BACKGROUND/EXPLANATION OF AGENDA ITEM: Carver County has been delegated to operate the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's Animal Feedlot Regulatory Program since 1980. The County currently receives a grant of about \$30,000 per year to operate the program in coordination with the MPCA. County staff perform feedlot inspections, provide education to feedlot owners, and assist owners with the permitting process. Attached is the Annual Report for the period of the 2008 Fiscal Year. It has been reviewed and approved by MPCA staff. The report spells out the actions Carver County took to meet the requirements of the delegated program. The final report requires signature by the County Board Chair.

ACTION REQUESTED: Motion to 2008 Annual Feedlot Officer and Performance Credit Report.

FUNDING

County Dollars =	\$30,000 [matching funds]
Other Sources & Amounts =	\$
State Grant =	\$30,000
TOTAL	= \$60,000

FISCAL IMPACT

None
 Included in current budget
 Budget amendment requested
 Other:

Related Financial Comments: The actual grant amount is dependant on the number of feedlots within the County and specific performance criteria such as the number of inspections completed, educational opportunities provided, and permits issued.

Reviewed by Division Director

Date: 1/12/08



18-Month 2009 County Feedlot Program Delegation Agreement and Work Plan (July 1, 2008 – December 31, 2009)

County: Carver

County Feedlot Officer(s): Lori Brinkman, Michael Lein

Primary Contact Person: Michael Lein

Telephone Number: 952-361-1802

E-mail Address: mlein@co.carver.mn.us

The revised rules adopted on October 23, 2000, require a Delegated County to prepare a Delegation Agreement that describes the county's plans/strategies and goals for administration and implementation of the feedlot program. The attached Work Plan satisfies the Minnesota Rules 7020 requirement that the Delegation Agreement must be reviewed and approved by the Delegated County and the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) annually.

Minnesota legislative appropriation language (Session Laws 2007, Chapter 57, Article 1, Section 2.) contains provisions for reducing grants to Delegated Counties if they do not meet Minimum Program Requirements (MPRs) as set forth in this document. Counties that fail to meet the 7% inspection rate MPR and/or 90% of non-inspection MPRs are subject to having base grant reductions and/or loss of eligibility for a performance award.

For any feedlot in which a county employee or a member of the county employee's immediate family has an ownership interest, the county employee will not:

- (a) Be involved in making preliminary or final decisions to issue a permit, authorization, zoning approval, or any other governmental approval for the feedlot;
- (b) Conduct or review compliance inspections for the feedlot; or
- (c) Conduct complaint inspections for the feedlot.

This County Feedlot Program Delegation Agreement and Work Plan has been prepared by the county for the 18 month period of July 1, 2008 – December 31, 2009. The county agrees with the terms and conditions established in this delegation agreement and will use feedlot grant funds in conjunction with required local match of dollars and in-kind contributions to carry out the goals and plans described herein.	
Signature of Chair of Board of County Commissioners	Date

Work Plan Preparation Instructions

This work plan is designed to cover an 18-month period beginning July 1, 2008 and ending December 31, 2009. Except where noted, the plans, goals and agreements entered into this work plan will be applicable for the full 18-month period.

This extended work plan period of 18 months is intended to be a one-time arrangement. It was caused by terms and conditions in the legislative appropriation that funds the county feedlot program, whereby funds must be expended by the end of the biennium. County grant award amounts and distribution of awards will not be affected by this work plan modification.

Importantly, County-MPCA work plan review and grant approval sessions will be conducted twice during the 18-month work plan period.

- A. July 1 - December 31, 2008. The first term of the work plan agreement will be six months in length and will end December 31, 2008. County-MPCA review sessions for this period will follow in January and February of 2009. As part of the review, the MPCA will:
- Determine county performance awards, based on the six month period ending December 31, 2008.
 - Approve 2010 fiscal year (July 1, 2009 – June 30, 2010) base grant award amounts.
 - Determine if any modifications to the work plan are appropriate for the second term (January 1 – December 31, 2009) of the agreement.
- B. January 1 – December 31, 2009. The second term of the work plan agreement will be 12 months in length ending December 31, 2009. As part of the review, the MPCA will:
- Determine county performance awards, based on the 12-month period ending December 31, 2009.
 - Approve 2011 fiscal year (July 1, 2010 – June 30, 2011) base grant award amounts.
 - Note: A mid-point review will be conducted at the six month mark of the second work plan term.

The body of the work plan is divided into two parts: Strategies and Minimum Program Requirements (MPRs). Your task under the Strategies part is to state the plans and goals that you intend to accomplish in the 18-month work plan period. Your task under the MPRs portion is to confirm your agreement to comply with Minnesota Rules Chapter 7020 procedures and practices.

Alternative Procedures: CFOs who propose to use alternate practices for meeting individual MPR terms and conditions must state their proposed alternative under Item C. of the Work Plan Review Session Summary page. Agency approval of the work plan indicates approval of the alternative procedure.

Agency-Approved Forms: Feedlot program forms used by the county and that deviate from MPCA standardized forms are considered to be “agency-approved” provided that they are identified under Item C. of the Work Plan Review Summary page and the work plan has received agency approval.

A. Work Plan Initiative Strategies:

The strategies component of the work plan fulfills delegated county rule requirements (MN Rules Chapter 7020.1600, Subp. 3a.) that state the county must develop annual plans and goals in accordance with registration, inspection, scheduled compliance and owner assistance responsibilities.

Registration Strategy: Please address the following registration strategy criteria.

1. Indicate the method(s) the county will use to fulfill the owner registration receipt requirement.
 - a. Registration receipt letter
 - b. Inspection report letter with registration information
 - c. Copy of registration form
 - d. Permit cover letter or Certificate of Compliance with registration information
 - e. Copy of registration log (log must contain notation that producer was verbally notified of registration/re-registration)
 - f. Other

In the event that a new feedlot is registered, the landowner will receive a registration receipt letter and a copy of the registration form. Feedlots that are inspected will receive an inspection report letter. The letter will inform them that their registration has been updated. The inspection form will serve as the registration form. As long as there are no significant changes to the operation of the site, the landowner will not receive a copy of the inspection form but will be informed that the inspection form will remain on file at the County. In the event that a landowner has been issued a feedlot permit, the permit will serve as the updated registration.

2. Please describe the strategy that the county will use to complete the registration update by the January 1, 2010 deadline.

The County intends to inspect about 100 feedlots per year including construction or expansion requests. Registration will be completed at the time of inspection. Feedlots submitting a permit application for construction, expansion or pollution abatement will be re-registered provided the proper permits have been submitted and all pollution problems have been addressed. The remainder of feedlots will be notified of their requirement to re-register by June 20, 2009.

3. For item 2 of this part, please describe the progress you intend to achieve in the 6-month period from July 1 – December 31, 2008.

Between forty and fifty feedlots will be inspected from July 1 – December 31, 2008.

Inspection Strategy: For the 18 month period beginning July 1, 2008 counties are being requested to create a list of priority feedlots for inspection in their county that, by applying standard pollution-risk criteria, may contain a pollution hazard and warrant further evaluation including a site inspection and, as applicable, a MinnFARM model analysis. Please write your response according to items 1 – 3 below. Approaches that counties may want to consider in creating a priority list are:

- a. The county already has a priority list based on a level 3 inventory.
- b. Feedlot prioritization by location: Shoreland, a TMDL watershed, a DWSMA, or some other formally designated area may be chosen.
- c. Feedlot prioritization by size: Larger sized facilities such as 500 – 999 AU or 300 – 499 AU would be typical categories and may be particularly appropriate for counties.

- emphasizing land application evaluations.
- d. A combination of b. and c. above.
- e. Conduct inspections at sites that have not been inspected since January 1, 2002.

1. Explain the approach that the county intends to use to create a list of feedlots that will be followed-up on for pollution hazard evaluation by the CFO. The size of the priority area and/or feedlot size category should be such that you will be able to complete an assessment of these feedlots within the 18 month period. Please state the number of feedlots that you estimate your strategy will generate. (Note: The MPCA will consider the amount of work completed and the complexity of the plan when evaluating county progress in fulfilling their strategy.)

Feedlots in TMDL priority watersheds will continue to be the main priority for inspection. Feedlots in shoreland or within 300 feet of non-shoreland designated waters will also be a priority. Non-shoreland sites in priority areas will be identified using aerial photography. The remainder of inspections will result from feedlots requesting permits for construction or expansion, feedlots involved with a complaint, or feedlots which have not been inspected in the past five years.

2. Complete a level 3 inventory, including conducting a MinnFARM evaluation, at feedlot sites listed under number 1.

An agency approved inspection form is used for each inspection. A Level I Land Application inspection is completed as part of the inspection. All questions under a Level III inventory are addressed in the inspection form. A MinnFARM evaluation will be conducted on open lots without run off control which appear to flow toward sensitive areas. Sensitive areas are identified as lakes, ditches, streams, intermittent streams or waterways, open tile inlets, and certain wetlands. A decision will be made concerning wetlands based on MPCA criteria to determine public waters and waters of the state.

3. For items 1 and 2 of this part, please describe the progress you intend to achieve in the 6-month period from July 1 – December 31, 2008.

Feedlots in the Goose Lake, Reitz Lake, and the Silver Creek subwatershed TMDL project areas have been inspected to date. Land application inspections in those areas will be on-going. The next priority areas will be in the Carver and Bevens Creek Watersheds. Ten feedlots will be inspected in the priority areas. TMDL inspections will be 20% of the inspections completed from July 1 – December 31, 2008. The remainder of inspections will be feedlots in shore land and non-shoreland sensitive areas which have not been inspected in the past 5 years.

Compliance Strategy: Please respond to the following compliance strategy criteria.

1. Indicate the method(s) and practice(s) that the county intends to use in response to feedlots discovered upon inspection to be in non-compliance:

- a. Issue a Letter of Warning (LOW) or a Notice of Violation (NOV)
- b. Issue an Interim Permit
- c. Document in a letter to the owner that indicates another agency (NRCS or SWCD) is working to correct identified pollution hazards
- d. Document in a letter to the owner the agreed upon fixes and a date when they will be done.
- e. Other

Feedlots that are non-compliant because of open lot violations will be issued a Notice of Violation. An interim permit will be required when compliance requires grading or structural work. Typically practices such as use exclusion, surface tile inlet removal, or other fencing projects will not require an interim permit. The NOV will be copied to the SWCD and the landowner will be directed to their office for technical or financial assistance. Once an agreed upon fix or fixes have been determined, the landowner will be given a compliance deadline. Failure to meet the deadline will be followed with continued communication to reach

compliance or referral to the County Attorney's office.

Feedlots that are non-compliant due to manure land application violations or failure to maintain adequate manure application records will be issued a Letter of Warning and will receive follow up education. Repeat violations will be met with increased education efforts. Continued non-compliance will ultimately be referred to the County Attorney.

2. State the timelines (scheduled compliance goals) that the county intends to meet when using the methods and practices identified under item 1.
 - a. Initial communication and or correspondence informing the producer of non-compliance.
 - b. Follow-up contact/communication to evaluate producer progress.
 - c. Decision to escalate compliance action where progress on corrective actions is not forthcoming.

On sites where it is apparent that the feedlot is non-compliant, the landowners will be verbally informed at the time of the inspection. In the case of a land application violation, the landowner may be given a verbal warning depending on the situation. The landowner will receive either a Letter of Warning or a Notice of Violation within one week of the site visit. The landowner will be contacted in a month either by phone or letter following the initial letter to address progress. The letter will contain a contact by date to discuss their plans to move toward compliance. If we do not hear from them at that point, we may try to contact them by phone once again.

Compliance action will be escalated once all attempts to communicate have been exhausted.

Owner Assistance Strategy: Please address the following owner assistance strategy criteria.

Note: Counties are encouraged to design a comprehensive owner assistance strategy. The MPCA will consider the amount of work completed and the complexity of the plan when evaluating county progress in fulfilling this strategy.

1. Indicate the feedlot areas that the county will emphasize in their plans to provide technical assistance.
 - a. Open lot run-off
 - b. Land application
 - c. Milk house waste
 - d. Other

Open lot run-off, land application, and milk house waste will all be addressed during the 18 month work plan.

2. Discuss the method(s) and plans the county will use to implement the areas of emphasis identified by the county under item 1. (1:1 producer assistance; referral to financial and technical assistance providers; group education events; newsletters and news paper articles; county Fair booths)

Each time a pollution problem is identified the landowner or feedlot operator will be informed of financial and technical assistance available to bring their site into compliance. A newsletter will be circulated directly to feedlot owners and operators at least once every two months. The newsletter titled "Feedback" will address a variety of feedlot topics and compliance issues. A tour for Carver County producers will be organized Fall 2008 in cooperation with University of MN Extension to highlight innovative feedlot projects or pollution control projects. We will attempt to coordinate with the Midwest Dairy Association as they launch their sustainability initiative and promote the benefits of producing food in an environmentally positive manner.

3. For items 1 and 2 of this part, describe the progress you intend to achieve in the 6-month period from July 1 – December 31, 2008

Four newsletters will be circulated. A tour will be held October 2008. Forty to fifty feedlots will be inspected bringing one on one communication of compliance requirements and promotion of technical and financial assistance programs. Communication has started with Sherry Newell of the Midwest Dairy Association. Progress of involvement in their initiative will be dependent on the progress of the program.

B. Delegated County Minimum Program Requirements

Part 2 of county feedlot program legislative appropriation language for 2008-09 states that 25% of the total appropriation must be awarded according to the terms and conditions of the following Minimum Program Requirements (MPRs).

1. Inspection Minimum Program Requirement

A delegated county must inspect 7% or more of their feedlots annually, as determined by the table below, to be eligible for the Inspection Minimum Program Requirement award.

Inspection Minimum Program Requirement:	July 1 – Dec. 31, 2008	Jan. 1 – Dec 31 2009
1. Agency-approved number required to be registered (Please enter the feedlot number that is shown for your county in column C of the Award Schedule for the 2008 Feedlot Grant Program.)	<u>268</u>	<u>268</u>
2. County – Agency agreed upon inspection rate. (The inspection rate is 3.5% for 2008 and 7% for 2009 unless otherwise negotiated by the two parties.)	<u>3.5%</u>	<u>7%</u>
3. County – Agency agreed upon inspection number for the identified time period.	<u>10</u>	<u>19</u>

2. Other Minimum Program Requirements

This section contains the established set of non-inspection MPRs that counties, according to 2008–09 county feedlot program appropriation language, must meet or exceed, as applicable, during the course of their program year. There are 25 MPRs listed.

Please complete the following table using checking "YES" or "NO".

Registration Minimum Program Requirements:	YES	NO
1. The county will register and maintain registration data in accordance with MN Rules 7020.0350 Subpart 1. for all feedlots required to be registered. (7020.1600, Subp. 2.A.) <i>File reviews indicate that the county follows MPCA policies regarding:</i> a. Shoreland b. Registered Animal Units – based on the maximum number in the past 4 years	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

<p>2. The county updates registration information and submits updated information with their annual report. (7020.1600, Subp. 2.J.(1))</p> <p><i>MPCA eLINK query indicates that registration updates are made by the county annually (including the "deactivation" of sites).</i></p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>3. The county issues a registration receipt to the feedlot owner within 30 days of receipt of the registration form. (7020.0350, Subp. 5.)</p> <p><i>File reviews indicate that the county has fulfilled the registration receipt requirement in accordance with their registration strategy.</i></p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Inspection Minimum Program Requirements:	YES	NO
<p>4. The county maintains a record of all inspections including a completed copy of an agency-approved inspection form. (7020.1600, Subp. 2.H.)</p> <p><i>File reviews indicate that the county uses an agency approved inspection form and maintains a copy of the completed form in producer files for each inspection.</i></p> <p><i>Inspection form reviews indicates that the county makes a compliance determination for each inspection.</i></p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>5. The county maintains a record of all Level 1, 2, or 3 land application inspections conducted including completed Level 1 Land Application Inspection forms for feedlots of 100-999 AU. (7020.1600, Subp. 2.H.)</p> <p><i>File reviews indicate that the county uses the agency approved Level 1 Land Application Inspection form/checklist and maintains a copy in producer files for each compliance inspection at facilities greater than 100 animal units.</i></p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>6. The work plan contains an inspection strategy that has been approved by the agency. (7020.1600, Subp. 3a.B.(1-2))</p> <p><i>The annual delegation review indicates that the county initiated inspection plans and goals as stated in their inspection strategy.</i></p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Compliance Minimum Program Requirements:	YES	NO
<p>7. The county will notify feedlot operations of the type and extent of the pollution hazards at the feedlot operation in accordance with applicable standards under part 7020.2000 to 7020.2225. (7020.1600, Subp. 3a.B.(5a.))</p> <p><i>File review indicates that the county notifies producers in writing of pollution hazards at a site.</i></p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>8. The county will bring feedlot operations into compliance through the implementation of scheduled compliance goals as stated in their compliance strategy. (7020.1600, Subp. 3a.B.(5))</p> <p><i>File reviews indicated that, in matters of non-compliance, the CFO followed their compliance strategy.</i></p> <p><i>File reviews indicate that a FLEval/ MinnFARM was conducted or that the file contains other documentation showing that corrective actions resulted in the site meeting Phase 2 Open Lot compliance or applicable water quality discharge standards (7020.2000).</i></p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Permitting Minimum Program Requirements:	YES	NO
<p>9. The county will issue permits within the 60/120 day time period according to Minn. Stat. 15.99. (7020.0505, Subp. 5.B.)</p> <p><i>Files reviews indicate that the county:</i></p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

<p>a. Date stamp applications and all its components b. Send 15 Day Incomplete Letters</p>		
<p>10. The county will determine if an EAW is required by reviewing applications to determine if either a mandatory threshold or a phased action is applicable. (7020.0505, Subp. 5.B.) http://www.pca.state.mn.us/publications/wq-fl-10.pdf</p>	☒	☐
<p>11. The county forwards to MPCA all permit applications subject to NPDES permits; animal manure not used as domestic fertilizer; > 500 AU with a liquid manure storage area (LMSA) within 1,000' of a karst feature; >500 AU within a vulnerable DWMSA; and variances. (7020.1600, Subp. 4a.B.) <i>Files reviews indicate that the county is aware of the EPA thresholds (Animal Numbers) that require an NPDES Permit.</i></p>	☒	☐
<p>12. The county will make sure all permit applications are complete. (7020.1600, Subp. 2.C.) <i>Files reviews indicate that the county uses an agency approved application checklist and that applications are complete.</i></p>	☒	☐
<p>13. The county will ensure producer compliance with required notifications. (7020.2000, Subp. 4 and Subp. 5) <i>Public notifications for new or existing feedlots with a capacity of 500 AU or greater proposing to construct or expand must include the following information:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Owner's names or legal name of the facility; b. Location of facility - county, township, section, and quarter section; c. Species of livestock and total animal units; d. Types of confinement buildings, lots, and areas at the animal feedlot; and e. Types of manure storage areas; <i>Public notification completed by:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Newspaper (affidavit in file) b. Written Notice Location c. Conditional Use Permit Notice </p>	☒	☐
<p>14. The county will ensure producer compliance with required local government notifications. (7020.2000, Subp. 5) <i>File reviews indicate that local zoning authorities (township and/or city) have been notified ("Notice of Construction or Expansion") at a minimum of 30 days prior to construction or expansion of new or existing feedlots with a capacity less than 300 AU.</i></p>	☒	☐
<p>15. Appropriate permit issuance after completion of required notifications. (7020.2000, Subp. 5) <i>File reviews indicate that permits have been issued after the appropriate number (20) of business days following public notifications.</i></p>	☒	☐
<p>16. When a manure management plan (MMP) is required, the county shall ensure that MMP conditions have been met according to 7020.2225, Subp. 4.D. <i>File reviews indicate that the county uses an agency approved manure management plan checklist and the submitted plans are complete.</i></p>	☒	☐
<p>17. The county will ensure that producers who submit a permit application that includes a liquid manure storage area (LMSA) meet the requirements set forth in 7020.2100. <i>File reviews indicate that the county uses an agency approved concrete pit construction checklist and the plans and specifications are complete.</i></p>	☒	☐
<p>18. The county will ensure that the following site location and expansion prohibitions are followed. (7020.2005, Subp. 1).</p>		

<p><i>Location restrictions include:</i></p> <p>a. No new feedlots in shoreland, floodplain, 300 feet of sinkhole, 100 feet of a private well or 1,000 feet from community well water supply</p> <p>b. No expansion of an existing feedlot located in a floodplain</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>19. The county will ensure that any pollution problem existing at a producer's site will be resolved before the permit is issued or is addressed by the permit. (7020.0500, Subp. 5.B. and 7001.0140)</p> <p><i>File reviews indicate that the county issues interim permits in appropriate situations.</i></p> <p><i>File reviews indicate that the county conducts an inspection prior to permit issuance.</i></p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Complaint Response Minimum Program Requirements:	YES	NO
<p>20. The county reviews and processes all complaints. (7020.1600, Subp. 1.F.)</p> <p><i>Complaints that are possible health threat, significant environmental impact or indicate flagrant violation are reported to MPCA promptly.</i></p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>21. The county maintains a record of all complaint correspondence. (7020.1600, Subp. 2.H. and Subp. 2.J.(6))</p> <p><i>Complaint Log Review</i></p> <p><i>The record includes the following information:</i></p> <p>a. The type of complaint.</p> <p>b. The location of the complaint.</p> <p>c. The date and time the complaint was made.</p> <p>d. The facts and circumstances related to the complaint.</p> <p>e. A statement describing the resolution of the complaint.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Owner Assistance Minimum Program Requirements:	YES	NO
<p>22. The work plan contains owner assistance goals that have been approved by the agency. (7020.1600, Subp. 2.J.(5) and Subp. 3a.B.(7))</p> <p><i>The annual delegation review indicates that the county initiated owner assistance plans and goals as stated in their owner assistance strategy.</i></p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Staffing Level and Training Minimum Program Requirements:	YES	NO
<p>23. The CFO (and other feedlot staff) attends training necessary to perform the duties of the feedlot program and is consistent with the agency training recommendations. (7020.1600, Subp. 2.K.)</p> <p><i>The county completed a minimum of 9 continuing education units (CEU); each unit consisting of 50-60 minutes of training at MPCA sponsored trainings directly related to the following six competency areas: Regulating new construction; conducting inspections and evaluating compliance; handling complaints and reported spills; responding to air quality complaints, resolving identified pollution problems, communicating with farmers and the agricultural community.</i></p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

<p>24. The county maintains a record of resources used to match grant dollars. (Senate File No. 905, 3rd Engrossment: 83rd Legislative Sessions (2003-2004))</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Air Quality Minimum Program Requirements:	YES	NO
<p>25. The county maintains a record of all notifications received from feedlot owners claiming air quality exemptions including the days exempted and the cumulative days used. (7020.1600, Subp. 2.I.)</p> <p><i>Pumping Notification Log Review</i></p> <p><i>The record includes the following information:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>a. Names of the owners/legal facility name</i> <i>b. Location of the facility (county, township, section, quarter)</i> <i>c. Facility permit number</i> <i>d. Start date and number of days to removal</i> 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The 18-Month 2009 County Feedlot Program Delegation Agreement and Work Plan Review Session Summary

A. County Need Requests. Please state any specific resources that you are requesting the MPCA to provide in administering the county feedlot program in your county:

B. Agency Response/Comment to County Need Requests:

C. Documentation of Work Plan Revisions and/or Alternate Methods for Meeting MPRs. Any work plan revisions including any alternate methods for meeting MPRs that have been agreed to by both parties must be documented in this space.

D. Work Plan Approval

The work plan satisfactorily addresses delegation agreement requirements *Yes* *No*
for the period July 1, 2008 – December 31, 2009.

The comments as recorded in the above parts together with the signatures of represented parties constitute that review of the delegation agreement has been conducted and that agreement of delegated county duties and goals by the MPCA and the county for the July 1, 2008 – December 31, 2009 period has been achieved.	County Feedlot Officer:	
	<hr/>	
	(Signature County Feedlot Officer)	(Date)
	MPCA Representative:	
<hr/>		
(Signature MPCA Representative)	(Date)	

Addendum

18-Month 2009 Delegation Agreement and Work Plan

The purpose of this form is to document any changes/revisions made to the 2009 work plan/delegation agreement as a result of the program review session that will be conducted upon completion of the July 1, 2008 – December 31, 2008 time period.

A. County Need Requests. Please state any specific resources that you are requesting the MPCA to provide in administering the county feedlot program in your county:

B. Agency Response/Comment to County Need Requests:

C. Documentation of Agreed Upon Revisions to the 18-Month 2009 Work Plan. Any revisions made to the 18-Month 2009 Work Plan as a result of the July 1, 2008 – December 31, 2008 review session must be documented in this space.

The comments as recorded in the above parts together with the signatures of represented parties incorporate this addendum into the 18-Month 2009 Delegation Agreement and Work Plan.	County Feedlot Officer: _____	
	_____ (Signature County Feedlot Officer)	_____ (Date)
	MPCA Representative: _____	
	_____ (Signature MPCA Representative)	_____ (Date)



REQUEST FOR BOARD ACTION

AGENDA ITEM : Application for Carver County Transit 2009 funding agreement with MN/DOT

Originating Division: Community Social Services

Meeting Date: August 12, 2008

Amount of Time Requested:

Attachments for packet: Yes NoItem Type: Consent Regular Session Closed Session Work Session Ditch/Rail Authority

BACKGROUND/EXPLANATION OF AGENDA ITEM: We are in the process of submitting the 2009 Minnesota Department of Transportation (MN/DOT) grant application for the operational expenses of the Carver County Transit program. MN/DOT requires a signed, notarized resolution by the County Board agreeing to enter into a contract with MN/DOT for transit funding. The resolution is to accompany the grant application. Once it is approved for funding, a contract will be sent back to the County for formal signature.

MN/DOT's turnaround time requirements on contracts is very short, so as in past years we are requesting the County Board authorize the County Administrator and the CSS Division Director to sign the MN/DOT contract on behalf of the Board.

ACTION REQUESTED: Motion to approve attached resolution submitting the grant application for 2009 State operating funds to MN/DOT, authorizing the County Administrator and CSS Director to sign the contract.

FUNDING

County Dollars =	\$
Other Sources & Amounts =	
MN/DOT	=\$88,000
TOTAL	= \$88,000.00

FISCAL IMPACT

None
 Included in current budget
 Budget amendment requested
 Other:

Related Financial Comments: Reviewed by Division Director

Date: 8/01/2008

**BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
CARVER COUNTY, MINNESOTA**

Date: _____ Resolution No: _____
 Motion by Commissioner: _____ Seconded by Commissioner: _____

**RESOLUTION REQUESTING FUNDING FROM THE STATE OF MINNESOTA
TO PROVIDE PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION SERVICES**

Be it resolved that Carver County enter into an Agreement with the State of Minnesota to provide public transportation services in Carver County, and

Be it further resolved that Carver County agrees to provide a local share of the operating cost and 20% of the total capital costs, and

Be it further resolved that Carver County authorizes the County Administrator and the Community Social Services Division Director to execute the aforementioned Agreements and any amendments thereto.

YES	ABSENT	NO
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

CERTIFICATION

I, Dave Hemze, duly appointed and qualified County Administrator of the County of Carver, State of Minnesota, do hereby certify that I have compared the foregoing copy of this resolution with the original minutes of the proceedings of the Board of County Commissioners, Carver County, Minnesota, at its session held on the _____ day of _____, 2008, now on file in the Administration office, and have found the same to be a true and correct copy thereof.

Dated this _____ day of _____, 2008.

 Dave Hemze County Administrator

Notary: _____



REQUEST FOR BOARD ACTION

AGENDA ITEM : Approval of Sheriff's Office donating 7 mobile computer stands to the City of Carver

Originating Division: Sheriff

Meeting Date: August 12, 2008

Amount of Time Requested: XX

Attachments for packet: Yes No

Item Type: Consent Regular Session Closed Session Work Session Ditch/Rail Authority

BACKGROUND/EXPLANATION OF AGENDA ITEM: The Sheriff's Office is requesting approval to donate 7 mobile computer stands to the City of Carver. We have used mobile computer stands that are no longer compatible with our current computers. They were purchased in 1999. The City of Carver will be responsible for any costs associated to repair and maintain this equipment. They are also responsible for disposing of the equipment when no longer utilizing it.

ACTION REQUESTED: Approve a motion to donate 7 mobile computer stands to the City of Carver.

FUNDING

County Dollars = \$

Other Sources & Amounts = \$

= \$

TOTAL = \$

Related Financial Comments: none

FISCAL IMPACT

None

Included in current budget

Budget amendment requested

Other:

Reviewed by Division Director

Date: July 28, 2008



REQUEST FOR BOARD ACTION

AGENDA ITEM: Sheriffs Office – Joint Powers Agreement with Minnesota DOC Oak Park Heights

Originating Division: Sheriffs Office

Meeting Date: 8/12/2008

Amount of Time Requested:

Attachments for packet: Yes No

Item Type: Consent Regular Session Closed Session Work Session Ditch/Rail Authority

BACKGROUND/EXPLANATION OF AGENDA ITEM: This agreement covers inmates that need to be kept in a secure mental health unit provided by Minnesota department of corrections.

ACTION REQUESTED: Motion for approval of County Board to enter into an agreement with the Minnesota department of corrections for emergency mental health and disciplinary housing

FUNDING

County Dollars =

Other Sources & Amounts =
= \$

TOTAL = \$

Related Financial Comments: Part of 2008 budget.

FISCAL IMPACT

None

Included in current budget
Budget amendment requested

Other:

Reviewed by Division Director

Date: 8/4/2008



REQUEST FOR BOARD ACTION

AGENDA ITEM : Abatements/Additions

Originating Division: Property Records Taxpayer Services

Meeting Date: 8/5/08

Amount of Time Requested: 0 minutes

Attachments for packet: Yes NoItem Type: Consent Regular Session Closed Session Work Session Ditch/Rail Authority**BACKGROUND/EXPLANATION OF AGENDA ITEM:** See Attached.**ACTION REQUESTED:**

Recommend to approve.

FUNDING

County Dollars = \$ - 536.70

Other Sources & Amounts = \$ - 2,749.33

=

TOTAL = \$ -3,286.03

Related Financial Comments:

FISCAL IMPACT None Included in current budget Budget amendment requested Other: Not Budgeted Reviewed by Taxpayer Services Manager*Jamie Engler*

Date:

8-4-08



REQUEST FOR BOARD ACTION

AGENDA ITEM : Carver County Intersection Street Lighting Project – Mn/DOT

Originating Division: Public Works

Meeting Date: August 11, 2008

Amount of Time Requested: none

Attachments for packet: Yes No

Item Type: Consent Regular Session Closed Session Work Session Ditch/Rail Authority

BACKGROUND/EXPLANATION OF AGENDA ITEM: Carver County submitted an application in January, 2007, to the Minnesota Department of Transportation (Mn/DOT) for federal funding to install intersection street lighting at various locations throughout the county. In April, 2007, Carver County was notified that federal funding was being made available to Carver County for the project.

In March, 2008, the "Project Memorandum" for the project was submitted to Mn/DOT. In March, 2008, Mn/DOT notified Carver County that the "Project Memorandum" was approved, and Carver County was authorized to proceed with the project.

This agreement allows for Mn/DOT to act as the County's agent in accepting federal aid in connection with the project.

ACTION REQUESTED: The County Board is requested to adopt the attached resolution and authorize the signing of the State of Minnesota Agency Agreement between the Department of Transportation and Carver County for federal participation in the project.

FUNDING

County Dollars = \$
Other Sources & Amounts = \$28,000.00
=\$
TOTAL =\$28,000.00

FISCAL IMPACT

None
 Included in current budget
 Budget amendment requested
 Other:

Related Financial Comments: Increasing federal funding revenue 03-820-000-0000-5320 and professional services expense 03303-000-0000-6260 by \$28,000 within the engineering department of the Public Works Division (Road & Bridge).

Reviewed by Division Director

Date:

8/1/08

S:\MnDOT\State Aid\ CHSP RSA\MnDOT County Agency Agreement - CHSP Intersection Street Lighting - 2008 - baf

**BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
CARVER COUNTY, MINNESOTA**

Date: August 11, 2008
Motion by Commissioner: _____

Resolution No: _____
Seconded by Commissioner: _____

**State of Minnesota Agency Agreement
between
Department of Transportation and Carver County
for
Federal Participation in Force Account
for
S.P. 10-030-06; M.P.CHSP 07(004)

Rural Intersection Street Lighting**

BE IT RESOLVED, that pursuant to Minnesota Statute Section 161.36, the Commissioner of Transportation be appointed as Agent of the County of Carver to accept as its agent, federal aid funds which may be made available for eligible transportation related projects.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the Carver County Board Chair and the Carver County Administrator are hereby authorized and directed for and on behalf of the County to execute and enter into an agreement with the Commissioner of Transportation prescribing the terms and conditions of said federal aid participation as set forth and continued in "Minnesota Department of Transportation Agency Agreement No. 93140," a copy of which said agreement was before the County Board and which is made a part hereof by reference.

YES	ABSENT	NO
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

STATE OF MINNESOTA
COUNTY OF CARVER

I, David Hemze, duly appointed and qualified County Administrator of the County of Carver, State of Minnesota, do hereby certify that I have compared the foregoing copy of this resolution with the original minutes of the proceedings of the Board of County Commissioners, Carver County, Minnesota, at its session held on the 11th day of August, 2008, now on file in the Administration office, and have found the same to be a true and correct copy thereof.

Dated this 11th day of August, 2008.

David Hemze County Administrator

BUDGET AMENDMENT REQUEST FORM

Submit to Finance Office one week prior to County Board Session.

DEPARTMENT: Road & Bridge

Date of County Board Session: 08/11/08

Fund: 03

Description of Revenue Account funds are to Increased/(Decreased):	Amount	Description of Expenditure Account funds are to Increased/(Decreased):	Amount
Federal grant	\$ 28,000	Road & Bridge engineering	\$ 28,000
TOTAL:	\$ 28,000	TOTAL:	\$ 28,000

A. Reason for Request: See accompanying Board Action.

B. Financial Impact: (To be filled out by Finance Director)

C. Contingency Acct. Beginning Bal.: \$ 300,000

D. Contingency Acct. Adjustment: \$ 200,000

E. Current Balance After Adj.: \$ 100,000

F. Prepared/Requested By: Roger Gustafson

G. Recommend Approval: Finance

H. County Board Decision: Approval/Disapproval

S:\Excel\SHELLS\Budget Amendment Forms.xls\Revenue Form



REQUEST FOR BOARD ACTION

AGENDA ITEM : Award of Bid for SAP 10-599-16 Bridge 10J14 (Hollywood Township Bridge)

Originating Division: Public Works

Meeting Date: August 12, 2008

Amount of Time Requested: N/A

Attachments for packet: Yes No

Item Type: Consent Regular Session Closed Session Work Session Ditch/Rail Authority

BACKGROUND/EXPLANATION OF AGENDA ITEM: Project SAP 10-599-16 includes replacement of Bridge #10J14 located on Vega Avenue in Hollywood Township.

Bids for Project SAP 10-599-16 Bridge 10J14 (Hollywood Township Bridge) were opened on August 4th, 2008. The low bidder on the project is Midwest Contracting LLC, Marshall, MN. The bid amount is \$96,111.00.

ACTION REQUESTED: It is recommended that the County Board award the bid to Midwest Contracting in the amount of \$96,111.00.

FUNDING

County Dollars	= \$
Township	= \$ 10,000.00
Town Rd Acct./	
Bridge Bonding	= \$ 86,111.00
	= \$
TOTAL	= \$ 96,111.00

FISCAL IMPACT

None
 Included in current budget
 Budget amendment requested
 Other:

Related Financial Comments: Above costs are construction costs only.

Reviewed by Division Director

William J. Wickman
LA RMS

Date: 8/6/08

CARVER COUNTY PUBLIC WORKS - ABSTRACT OF BIDS
SAP 10-599-16
BID OPENING: MONDAY, AUGUST 4, 2008 - 2:30PM

ITEM NO.	ITEM DESCRIPTION	UNIT	QUANTITY	ENGINEER'S ESTIMATE		MIDWEST CONTRACTING		LANDWEHR CONSTR		MATHIOWETZ CONSTR		MINGER CONSTR		BURNS EXCAVATING		LATOUR CONSTR		S.M. HENTGES & SONS	
				UNIT PRICE	AMOUNT	UNIT PRICE	AMOUNT	UNIT PRICE	AMOUNT	UNIT PRICE	AMOUNT	UNIT PRICE	AMOUNT	UNIT PRICE	AMOUNT	UNIT PRICE	AMOUNT	UNIT PRICE	AMOUNT
2021.501	MOBILIZATION	L.S.	1	\$11,000.00	\$11,000.00	\$1,500.00	\$1,500.00	\$2,677.90	\$2,677.90	\$6,500.00	\$6,500.00	\$685.00	\$685.00	\$500.00	\$500.00	\$6,200.00	\$6,200.00	\$14,900.00	\$14,900.00
2105.601	APPROACH GRADING	L.S.	1	\$5,500.00	\$5,500.00	\$2,000.00	\$2,000.00	\$6,556.20	\$6,556.20	\$5,000.00	\$5,000.00	\$4,115.00	\$4,115.00	\$1,200.00	\$1,200.00	\$5,000.00	\$5,000.00	\$19,000.00	\$19,000.00
2412.511	10' x 6' PRECAST CONCRETE BOX CULVERT	L.F.	96	\$500.00	\$48,000.00	\$500.00	\$48,000.00	\$46,141.44	\$46,141.44	\$53,376.00	\$53,376.00	\$443.80	\$42,604.80	\$725.00	\$69,600.00	\$525.00	\$50,400.00	\$753.00	\$72,288.00
2412.512	10' x 6' PRECAST CONCRETE BOX CULVERT END SECTION	EA	2	\$10,000.00	\$20,000.00	\$10,000.00	\$20,000.00	\$8,997.50	\$17,995.00	\$17,500.00	\$17,500.00	\$10,215.00	\$20,430.00	\$7,500.00	\$15,000.00	\$14,000.00	\$28,000.00	\$9,020.00	\$18,040.00
2442.801	REMOVE OLD BRIDGE	L.S.	1	\$2,500.00	\$2,500.00	\$500.00	\$500.00	\$2,730.62	\$2,730.62	\$1,500.00	\$1,500.00	\$540.00	\$540.00	\$3,500.00	\$3,500.00	\$500.00	\$500.00	\$1,500.00	\$1,500.00
2451.503	GRANULAR BACKFILL (CV)	C.Y.	439	\$15.00	\$6,585.00	\$14.00	\$6,146.00	\$15.65	\$6,870.35	\$8.00	\$3,512.00	\$16.05	\$7,045.95	\$8.00	\$3,512.00	\$16.60	\$7,287.40	\$30.00	\$13,170.00
2451.509	AGGREGATE BEDDING (CV)	C.Y.	174	\$25.00	\$4,350.00	\$20.00	\$3,480.00	\$29.80	\$5,185.20	\$12.00	\$2,088.00	\$49.00	\$8,526.00	\$31.61	\$5,500.14	\$32.00	\$5,568.00	\$48.00	\$8,352.00
2501.511	18" C.S. PIPE CULVERT	L.F.	45	\$30.00	\$1,350.00	\$25.00	\$1,125.00	\$34.95	\$1,572.75	\$30.00	\$1,350.00	\$34.80	\$1,566.00	\$19.00	\$855.00	\$32.00	\$1,440.00	\$33.00	\$1,485.00
2501.515	18" G.S. PIPE APRON	EA	2	\$250.00	\$500.00	\$150.00	\$300.00	\$186.26	\$372.52	\$140.00	\$280.00	\$275.00	\$550.00	\$87.50	\$175.00	\$240.00	\$480.00	\$195.00	\$390.00
2511.501	RANDOM RIPRAP (CLASS III)	C.Y.	182	\$75.00	\$13,650.00	\$55.00	\$10,010.00	\$107.99.88	\$19,655.88	\$66.32	\$12,070.24	\$96.00	\$15,652.00	\$45.00	\$8,100.00	\$72.25	\$13,149.50	\$75.00	\$13,650.00
2563.801	TRAFFIC CONTROL	L.S.	1	\$2,600.00	\$2,600.00	\$750.00	\$750.00	\$1,160.44	\$1,160.44	\$700.00	\$700.00	\$770.00	\$770.00	\$250.00	\$250.00	\$1,680.00	\$1,680.00	\$1,020.00	\$1,020.00
2573.502	SILT FENCE, TYPE MACHINE SLICED	L.F.	400	\$3.00	\$1,200.00	\$2.00	\$800.00	\$2.32	\$928.00	\$1.80	\$720.00	\$2.75	\$1,100.00	\$2.25	\$900.00	\$2.65	\$1,060.00	\$3.00	\$1,200.00
2575.555	TURF ESTABLISHMENT	L.S.	1	\$2,500.00	\$2,500.00	\$1,500.00	\$1,500.00	\$1,740.67	\$1,740.67	\$950.00	\$950.00	\$2,900.00	\$2,900.00	\$2,000.00	\$2,000.00	\$1,575.00	\$1,575.00	\$3,000.00	\$3,000.00
				TOTAL:	\$119,735.00	TOTAL:	\$96,111.00	TOTAL:	\$104,544.71	TOTAL:	\$105,046.24	TOTAL:	\$106,484.75	TOTAL:	\$111,182.14	TOTAL:	\$122,339.90	TOTAL:	\$166,995.00



REQUEST FOR BOARD ACTION

AGENDA ITEM : Minnesota Inter-County Association Annual End of Session Report

Originating Division: Administration

Meeting Date: 8/12/08

Amount of Time Requested: 30 minutes

Attachments for packet: Yes No

Item Type: Consent Regular Session Closed Session Work Session Ditch/Rail Authority

BACKGROUND/EXPLANATION OF AGENDA ITEM:

Keith Carlson, MICA Executive Director, will be presenting MICA's annual end of session of report. Also present will be Bob Vanasek and John Tuma, MICA intergovernmental liaisons.

ACTION REQUESTED:

No Board action requested. Informational only.

FUNDING

County Dollars = \$

Other Sources & Amounts =

= \$

TOTAL = \$

Related Financial Comments:

FISCAL IMPACT

None

Included in current budget

Budget amendment requested

Other:

Reviewed by Division Director

Date: 8/6/08



REQUEST FOR BOARD ACTION

AGENDA ITEM : Partial approval of bid awards for Bid Package 3: Justice Center interior build-out

Originating Division: Administrative Services

Meeting Date: August 12, 2008

Amount of Time Requested: 30 minutes

Attachments for packet: Yes No

Item Type: Consent Regular Session Closed Session Work Session Ditch/Rail Authority

BACKGROUND/EXPLANATION OF AGENDA ITEM: On July 15, 2008 County staff opened Bid Package 3 bids for interior build-out of the second floor courts addition, renovation of the County Attorney, Court Administration, Court Services spaces as well as tenant finish of the 28,000 s.f. lower level (which will include the jury assembly room, central services, emergency operations center, law library and various conference/training rooms and offices). Additionally, an elevator was planned for and some minor remodeling in the west administration building.

Overall the bids as received were over budget by approximately \$1 million. However, it is clear that in at least three bids, there was a disconnect between the scope of work as specified and the actual bid. These three bids (steel, millwork & low voltage) were the major factors for the overages in the overall budget alone. If these three bids divisions would have come in close to budget the overall bids would have averaged out and been close to balancing.

In addition to scope being added or misunderstood by bidders during the bid process, the County also had a lack of competition in several divisions which added to project costs. For instance, the west administration elevator was not originally part of this construction phase. The casework / millwork bid also changed as we entered the final stages of design and was not part of the original plan. Steel and Low Voltage are other divisions of work where the scope of work does not match work required for the project. Wold Architects, with assistance from Kraus-Anderson Construction Company, will break these divisions of work down further and evaluate actual scopes of work needed for each area. Once these divisions are re-bid additional savings should be realized. In order for the project to hit the budget, savings of at least 20% of the re-bid divisions must take place. Kraus-Anderson and Wold feel confident that the 20% number can be achieved.

On August 5th, the Steering Committee met to discuss ways to bring the costs in line with the budget. Among the value engineering items considered include:

Rebid Cost Savings Goal	\$500,000
Deduct Window Wells & Windows	\$250,632
Court Room Finishes Reduction	\$ 50,000
Adm. West Bid as an Add Alternate	\$150,000
Reduce Scope @ Elevator # 5	\$ 50,000
Total of Scope Changes	\$1,000,632

While there was not complete consensus among the committee members, it was understood that this project is over budget and difficult decisions need to be made.

Of the 24 bid divisions, staff is recommending the Board approve 16 bids (totaling \$4,020,827) and reject and rebid the remaining 8 (totaling \$2,639,498) per the attachment. The 16 base bids will ultimately include deduct change orders that will lead to a project that is on budget. Staff will come back to the Board after the remaining 8 bid divisions are re-bid.

ACTION REQUESTED:

Motion to approve the attached recommended bid awards pending contract review by the County Attorney's Office and Risk Management.

Motion to reject the 8 bid divisions as attached.

Motion to delegate authority to the Administrative Services Division Director to approve of all Justice Center. Project deduct change orders and any individual add change orders for up to \$50,000.

FUNDING

County Dollars = \$4,020,827
Other Sources & Amounts =
= \$4,020,827
TOTAL = \$4,020,827

FISCAL IMPACT

- None
- Included in current budget
- Budget amendment requested
- Other:

Related Financial Comments: Of the 24 bid divisions, staff is recommending the Board approve 16 bids (totaling \$4,020,827) and rebid the remaining 8 (totaling \$2,639,498) per the attachment. The 16 base bids will ultimately include deduct change orders that will lead to a project that is on budget.

Reviewed by Division Director

Date: August 5, 2008

Infrastructure Improvements Project Update

As you will recall, in May 2008 the Board approved a contract amendment with Wold and Kraus-Anderson to design and bid out new facility infrastructure components to replacing to replace the County's aging infrastructure later this year.

Background

An energy/equipment audit was performed and it indicated that significant portions of the equipment in the Government Center is at, or past, the end of its useful life. It also provided several recommendations including a central plant including new boilers and chillers, new roofs, complete lighting retrofit, extensive water conservation measures, updated building automation and controls. For instance:

- The existing boiler serving the Admin and Social Services Buildings is over 40 years old; 10 years beyond expected life. The manufacturer has been out of business for years.
- The situation with the existing chiller is much the same. It is 25 years old (expected 15yrs) and very inefficient.

The County expects utility costs will be significantly reduced with a new central plant: electricity (down by 38%), natural gas (down by 65%), and water consumption (down by 28%) All together, the new equipment would reduce the County's utility and maintenance expenditures by more than \$300,000/year.

Financing

The total project cost is estimated to be \$5,289,140. \$500,000 has been provided for in previous budgets which leaves a balance of \$4,789,140 to be financed. As discussed at the May 27th Board Meeting, the County is planning on using a 15-year tax exempt lease purchase agreement to finance this project.

The expected annual payments would be around \$490,000 which would be offset by the expected annual maintenance and utility expense savings of over \$300,000. The Board will be asked to approve the financing for this project at the same time that the construction bids are presented to the Board for approval which is currently scheduled for late September/early October, 2008.

Initial construction management and design costs will be temporarily financed by Government Center Campus project funding. A final project budget and a proposal for permanent project financing will be presented to the Board when the actual construction project bids are presented for Board approval which is currently scheduled for September 2008. After drawings are complete, KA would bid out the work in the same way work is being competitively bid for all the other construction projects.

**CARVER COUNTY GOVERNMENT CENTER
JUSTICE CENTER COURTS ADDITION INTERIOR FIT-OUT
BP-3**

BID RECAP AND RECOMMENDATIONS

BIDDER	BASE BID AMOUNT	BUDGET	Variance	EXPLANATION OF VARIANCE	Recommendation
--------	-----------------	--------	----------	-------------------------	----------------

DIVISION 6: Site Demolition, Site Clearing, Site Earthwork, Site Utilities

Northwest Asphalt	\$199,600.00	\$205,273	\$5,673.00		Award Bid
-------------------	--------------	-----------	------------	--	-----------

Veit & Company	\$211,478.85				
----------------	--------------	--	--	--	--

DIVISION 7: Landscaping and Sodding

Urban Company	\$30,000.00	\$47,000	\$17,000.00		Award Bid
---------------	-------------	----------	-------------	--	-----------

DIVISION 8: Concrete

Northland Concrete	\$287,400.00	\$263,550	(\$23,850.00)	Our cost estimate did not allow enough for the low productivity of the window well construction.	Award Bid
--------------------	--------------	-----------	---------------	--	-----------

Kelleher Construction Gresser Companies	\$338,534.00 \$360,950.00				
--	------------------------------	--	--	--	--

DIVISION 9: Asphalt Concrete Paving

Northwest Asphalt	\$109,575.00	\$112,320	\$2,745.00		Award Bid
-------------------	--------------	-----------	------------	--	-----------

Bituminous Roadways Midwest Asphalt	\$123,414.00 \$130,500.00				
--	------------------------------	--	--	--	--

DIVISION 10: Masonry and Masonry Restoration

Northland Concrete	\$143,700.00	\$148,225	\$4,525.00		Award Bid
--------------------	--------------	-----------	------------	--	-----------

Gresser Companies Royl Masonry	\$184,450.00 \$231,000.00				
-----------------------------------	------------------------------	--	--	--	--

DIVISION 11: Structural Steel, Metal Decking & Metal Fabrications (Supply & Install)

Red Cedar Steel Erectors	\$549,000.00	\$111,401	(\$437,599.00)	There is a disconnect between the scope and cost for this work. KA is reviewing the cost with other contractors to verify that the bid is excessive.	Re-bid
--------------------------	--------------	-----------	----------------	--	--------

DIVISION 12: General Construction and Selective Demolition

George F. Cook Construction	\$358,000.00	\$414,139	\$56,139.00	Award Bid
Kellington Construction	\$402,640.00			
Jorgenson Construction	\$407,900.00			
Century Construction	\$415,000.00			
Parkos Construction	\$481,200.00			
Gladstone Construction	\$514,955.00			
Mid-America Business Systems	16,532.98			

DIVISION 13: Interior Architectural Woodwork

George F. Cook Construction	\$518,000.00	\$291,650	(\$226,350.00)	Re-bid
-----------------------------	--------------	-----------	----------------	--------

There is a disconnect between the scope and cost for this work. KA is reviewing the cost with other contractors to verify that the bid is excessive.

Paul's Architectural Woodcraft \$589,000.00

DIVISION 14: Waterproofing and Insulation
No Bids Received

\$12,000 \$12,000.00 Re-bid

DIVISION 15: Joint Sealers

Right-Way Caulking \$21,076.00 \$16,000 (\$5,076.00) Re-bid

Caulking is a difficult trade to estimate. The cost is somewhat higher for a project of this type than we typically see but there will be many trips to the site over an extended period of time.

DIVISION 16: Hollow Metal Doors, Finish Hardware, Hollow Metal Frames, Wood Doors

Glewwe Doors	\$134,900.00	\$139,200	\$4,300.00	Award Bid
Kendall Doors	\$135,915.00			

DIVISION 17: Aluminum Entrances, Aluminum Windows, Curtain wall, Glazing and Security Glazing

Val-Pro Glass	\$157,530.00	\$144,600	(\$12,930.00)	Award Bid
---------------	--------------	-----------	---------------	-----------

Brin Northwestern \$201,947.00
Empirehouse \$221,181.00
All Metro Glass \$246,000.00

DIVISION 18: Drywall & Plaster

RTL Construction	\$648,269.00	\$650,000	\$1,731.00	Award Bid
------------------	--------------	-----------	------------	-----------

DIVISION 19: Tile Work

Twin City Pro Floor	\$39,355.12	\$32,400	(\$6,955.12)						Award Bid
CD Tile & Stone	\$58,180.00								
WTG Terrazzo & Tile	\$75,755.00								
Grazzini Brothers	\$80,590.00								
DIVISION 20: Sand Cushion Portland Cement Terrazzo									
WTG Terrazzo and Tile	\$23,300.00	\$10,000	(\$13,300.00)						Re-bid
Grazzini Bros.	\$38,495.00								
DIVISION 21: Acoustical Ceilings and Treatments									
Twin City Acoustics	\$109,730.00	\$122,570	\$12,840.00						Award Bid
Kirk Acoustics	\$114,140.00								
DIVISION 22: Carpet/Resilient Flooring									
STS Flooring	\$147,488.00	\$158,469	\$10,981.00						Award Bid
Master Floors	\$153,500.00								
St. Paul Linoleum	\$163,434.00								
Commercial Flooring	\$172,210.00								
Grazzini Bros.	\$177,451.00								
DIVISION 23: Paint/Wall covering									
Swanson & Youngdale	\$107,940.00	\$155,000	\$47,060.00						Award Bid
Steinbrecher Painting	\$116,500.00								
DIVISION 24: Hydraulic Elevator	\$ 268,952.00	\$130,000	(\$138,952.00)						Re-bid
No Bids Received									
DIVISION 25: Fire Protection									
Olsen Fire Protection	\$118,340.00	\$102,000	(\$16,340.00)						Award Bid
Brothers Fire Protection	\$125,400.00								
Summit Fire Protection	\$154,000.00								
Viking Automatic Sprinkler	\$197,500.00								
DIVISION 26: Plumbing									

KA under estimated the complexity of the elevator work. We understood extending the elevators to another floor but not all the work required to complete that extension. One sole contractor also contributed to the cost overrun.

Difficult to estimate due to the existing system being reconfigured for the new work. Existing piping does not meet current codes and this added to cost.

Award Bid

(\$55,390.00)

\$263,610

\$319,000.00

Modern Piping

- Klamm Mechanical \$338,400.00
- Northern Air Corp. \$357,900.00
- Northland Mechanical \$369,000.00
- Master Mechanical \$398,800.00
- McQuillan Bros. \$426,120.00
- RJ Mechanical \$437,000.00
- Wenzel-Plymouth Plumbing \$489,000.00
- Lakes Mechanical (Combined Bid) \$1,140,000.00

DIVISION 27: Ventilation and Temperature Control

The mechanical and electrical systems were under estimated in spite of contractor pricing to compare with our estimate. The reviewed plans were not complete and the addendums added to the cost of the work.

Bostrom Sheet Metal \$1,110,000.00 (\$49,608.00) \$1,060,392

- Wenzel-Plymouth Plumbing \$1,124,000.00
- Thelen Heating \$1,132,000.00
- Chappell Central \$1,180,000.00
- Modern Piping \$1,188,000.00
- Northern Air Corp. \$1,215,700.00
- Northland Mechanical \$1,508,000.00
- Lakes Mechanical (Combined Bid) \$1,140,000.00

DIVISION 28: Electrical

The mechanical and electrical systems were under estimated in spite of contractor pricing to compare with our estimate. The reviewed plans were not complete and the addendums added to the cost of the work.

C&S Electric \$694,000.00 \$519,687 (\$174,313.00) Re-bid

- Manor Electric \$728,408.00
- Bloomington Electric \$736,000.00
- Weber Electric \$746,000.00
- Mendota Electric \$772,274.00
- Phasor Electric \$773,000.00

DIVISION 29: Communications and Electronic Safety and Security Systems

KA assumed the owner was purchasing the telephone/data cabling and security system.

Apollo Systems \$553,170.00 \$175,322 (\$377,848.00) Re-bid

Totals \$6,660,325 \$ 5,284,808

Scope Changes-Cost Savings Goals

- Rebid Cost Savings Goal \$500,000
- Deduct Window Wells & Windows \$250,632
- Court Room Finishes Reduction \$ 50,000.00
- Adm. West Bid as an Add Alternate \$ 150,000.00
- Reduce Scope @ Elevator # 5 \$ 50,000.00
- Total of Scope Changes \$1,000,632**

Summary	
16 Bid Awards	\$4,020,827
8 Re-bids	\$2,639,498
	\$6,660,325

Carver County Projects

6/12/2008

Project Budgets

Government Center Campus

Description	Government Center Campus
Project Revenue	
Building Capital Improvement Fund	8,200,000
Project Financing for Deferred Maintenance	
Capital Reserves for Deferred Maintenance	
Reallocation of Funds	360,000
Tennant Fit out Costs	
Total Available Dollars	8,560,000
Project Soft Costs	
A & E Fees - WOLD	505,600
A & E Fees - BTR	
Reimburseables / Added Fees	
Commissioning	
Facility Assesment & Study	
Survey	14,500
Soil Tests	21,600
Construction Testing	45,000
Metro SAC/WAC Connection Charge	in permits
Plan Review / Permit	100,000
	in permits
Total Soft Costs	686,700
Construction Costs	
Deferred Maintenance	
Capital Investment	
Construction Bids-BP-1 & 2 w/o alternate roof	979,705
Construction Bids-BP-3	\$6,660,325.12
Lower Level Courts	-
LEC	-
Site Work	-
Elevator Expansion - Admin West	-
Vestibule Addition & Security (metal detector)	-
General Conditions	132,000
CM Fee	176,313
CM Site Services	341,150
Design and Construction Contingency	231,695
Total Construction	8,521,188
FF&E-Owner	300,000
General Conditions-Owner	71,668
Total Owner Costs	371,668
Total current projected budget	9,579,556
Total Over/Under Budget	(1,019,556)
Value Engineering/Scope Savings	-\$1,000,632
Rebid Cost Savings Goal	-500,000
Deduct Window Wells & Windows	-250,632
Court Room Finishes Reduction	-50,000
Adm. West Bid as an Add Alternate	-150,000
Reduce Scope @ Elevator # 5	-50,000
Budget Variance After VE/Scope Savings	\$ (18,924)

Note: Elevator # 5 Revisions will be developed by meeting with the elevator contractor to evaluate options for reductions in the scope of work to accomplish the same end results but with cheaper methods. May include reducing the level of finishes also.