

Work Session  
July 19, 2016

Present: Bjerkness, Kolodge, Langley, Maki, Rock, Wilkinson, Mayor Hallback

Absent: None

Staff: Fritsinger, Barclay, Klassen, Cottingham, Peterson

Other: Jamie Lund, Pine Journal, SKB Environmental Representatives Kyle Backstrom, Ryan O’Gara, Steve Opstad, Dave Wiggins

**SKB Presentation/Discussion**

- Mr. Backstrom gave a brief history of SKB Environmental before presenting the proposed municipal solid waste landfill at the current Shamrock Landfill site on highway 45.
- The municipal waste from Cloquet and surrounding areas currently goes to Superior to the Moccasin Mike landfill which is scheduled to close in 5 years resulting in nowhere for the municipal solid waste to go. SKB is seeking a municipal solid waste permit to provide a place. It is a 3 year process to achieve a permit.
- Discussion of the permit process. SKB stated there are no other local options for a landfill site which will help them receive the certificate of need that must be applied for from the MPCA.
- Overview of the engineering requirements and the modern landfill design which includes a liner that controls bacteria/order and nuisances such as birds and litter. A collection system protects the groundwater which is pumped out and sent to WLSSD.
- If the proposed landfill is successful, it will be used for at least 20 years. There is no design for this location yet.
- Mr. O’Gara stated the goal for this meeting is to make sure the Council understands conceptually how a landfill works and educate as questions are asked. The Council is in agreement they need to see a footprint of the design before any decisions can be made.
- Discussion of financial assurance required by MPCA. Money is set aside for closure, post closure of 20 years, and a contingency action.
- Council questioned environmental hazards and the location of the proposed landfill being next to the St. Louis River. SKB stated they have never had an environmental issue with any of their sites.
- SKB invited the Council to tour their landfill site in Virginia which is similar to what is being proposed here and also tour the St. Louis County landfill.
- Discussion of positive project outcomes over a 20 year period such as more recycling, maintaining low disposal costs, and additional City and County revenue.
- Council questioned if the environmental assessment includes a traffic evaluation. There would be designated roads to get to their facility.

**Budget / CIP Discussion**

- Mr. Fritsinger asked for feedback related to the CIP discussion at the last meeting of reprioritizing the sales tax projects. Mr. Rock commented that the north side of the river needs attention. Also comments on the dire need for improvement at Athletic Park.

- Mr. Fritsinger asked for thoughts on the Public Safety building renovation vs construction of a new building. The draft McGraff report recommended a 6 month time table for the CAFD to make their decision. While waiting for them to make their decision, the City's time line on projects shifts. Mr. Kolodge recommended the Council reconvene after the Regular Meeting to continue the discussion.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:55 p.m. The Council reconvened at 7:25 p.m. at the conclusion of its Regular Meeting.

#### **Budget/CIP Discussion**

- The Council continued discussion on the CIP. The Council inquired to the annual debt service for bonds and questioned whether or not the issuance of a larger sales tax revenue bond would be appropriate. The larger bond would allow some of the prioritized projects to proceed sooner than later. Staff will investigate.
- The Council discussed at length the River Front projects. Staff will revisit the Parks Master Plan and River Front Plan to identify the rationale behind priorities and the priorities themselves. The Council did not support the inclusion of Wentworth Park improvements in the five year plan. Subject to funding, the Council expressed interest in the Dunlap Island improvements still being included in the 2017 budget.
- Discussion of the reclamation of Cloquet Avenue as a new project and supported its inclusion at a higher number in anticipation of broader aesthetic and design considerations.
- In regards to Public Facilities, the members of the Council that serve on the Fire District Board indicated the topic would be discussed by CAFD the following night. There was a great deal of discussion regarding the need to get the CAFD to make both a decision and a decision in a timely manner. Staff was asked to strengthen the verbiage in the letter previously authorized to send to the CAFD Board as soon as possible.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully Submitted,

Brian Fritsinger  
City Administrator