

Upper Midwest A-C Club  
Board Meeting Conference Call Minutes  
Sunday, November 8, 2020 @ 7:00pm

**Call-in Instructions for the call: 866-866-2244**  
**Access Code – 5410765#**

Call to Order – Darrell called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm  
Roll Call – Present: Darrell, Todd, Lori, Tom, Scott, Joan. Absent: Joe, Cody & Lynn  
Also present: Bob Paulson & Brad Grams

TREASURER'S REPORT:

**ASSETS**

Checking = \$ 3,487.66  
Building Fund = \$ 136,340.00  
Money Market = \$ 101,928.04  
Scholarship = \$ 9,252.44

**SUB TOTAL = \$251,048.14**

**LIABILITIES**

Sales Tax Payable \$ 428.42  
Mortgage = \$ 92,795.14

**SUB TOTAL = \$93,223.56**

**TOTAL = \$157,824.58**

**All outstanding deposits have been made and bills have paid.**  
**First installment of building payment of \$15,190 was sent out on 9/30/2020.**  
**First installment of tooling on 2021 Sprayer of \$16,000 was sent out on 9/30/2020.**  
***\*All accounts were balanced and reconciled to the bank accounts as of 11/8/2020.***

**Building project** – When Darrell went to get the building permit a few weeks ago at the City of Hutchinson he was told we would need soil borings on the property before they would issue a building permit. Darrell hired Braun Intertec to do the borings and emailed everyone a copy of the soil boring report and findings. He asked that everyone please review it prior to the call.

In short, findings are that organic material on the property was not removed before fill was brought in and placed on top and no compaction was done as the fill was added. The organic material within the fill is an issue and we will not get a building permit until that is remedied. Braun is recommending that we remove all the fill material down to the organic material & top soil layer, remove all of that organic material, and then replace the fill with proper compaction to build the building. At some points this would be down 14 feet.

Brad Grams joined us on the call and explained again the issue of prepping the original building location would be a huge task to move all that fill, compact and put it back. Brad explained possibly 200 hours of labor at an estimated cost of \$80,000. Todd agreed that moving all of the material twice should be a last resort.

Tom asked if the city would have a problem with re-using the existing fill. As long as the organic material is removed we could use the same fill as long as it is compacted.

Darrell had Brad check different locations on the property to see where the top soil levels were and found that a building parallel to the highway on the north end of the property closest to airport road might be good option for an alternative site.

Brad explained a location closer to the highway where there currently isn't much fill would be a better alternative to only having to move the material once – not twice. This would save time and money. There is time and cost to do this but it would be a better option than the current location.

We all assume the city would make Braun come out and re-test once we are done. No guarantees it would pass once all of the dirt is moved.

We would need to know what the set-back is on the property and how much is right of way. Brad explained we could look at more options once we know what the city says the rules on set-back are. We would fill in the low area that is already there while compacting at each layer.

The fill that was put in this summer is the clay and gravel from the armory site and that fill is over on the north side of the property. That material is suitable for re-use as fill. Todd explained we would have to be very careful not to mix up the fill materials.

Bob asked about the 7 – 9 feet of fill and why it is such an issue. The top soil and organic material that was covered with the fill should have been removed before they covered it with fill. Then the fill should also have been compacted properly, which it wasn't. The organic material is down 15 feet on the south west corner of the proposed building site.

So the option is to use a site on the property that doesn't have the organic soil so far down – easier to remove. Bob asked about the driveway and if that is going to be an issue with the city and the answer is no, we don't need to worry about the driveway because we are not building on top of it.

Darrell explained another alternative is to drill the concrete pillars down past the organic material but that would have to be on each post, which are 6 feet apart. Tom asked what the cost would be to put the concrete posts in. Darrell talked to the builder and they estimate 20% more cost to do the piling posts down that far. Darrell said if we use the longer pilings that would support a building but under no uncertain terms would we ever be able to put a concrete slab inside this building. That is stipulated in the Intertec report.

Bob said we have to determine what the highest water table level would be in an alternative site. Brad said the engineered fill would be impervious to water if compacted correctly and said we would want to stay above the height of airport road anyway.

Brad said he is working on getting his company to donate some time/labor and equipment for either a reduced rate or charitable contribution of some sort. He has a meeting with them tomorrow and will report back on Wednesday what he finds out.

We discussed the alternative of selling this property and buying somewhere else not within city limits. If we do that we would now have to disclose all of these issues to any prospective buyer. So we are pretty much stuck.

We discussed that everyone out there working on the property also needs to be aware of our long term plans to at some point put up another building, potentially attached to this one, that would also need to be approved. Brad explained that moving the dirt now wouldn't be an issue as that top soil and compostable content would be spread out at the sides of the property and the good fill would be reused.

Darrell brought up that the size of our proposed building is another issue. The 60 x 180 (10,800 sq ft) size of the building puts us into a different zoning and regulations of building requirements. According to Section 506 of the Minnesota Building Code.

(U Occupancy – Building Code) determines which type of building permit we would need to apply for and there many more stipulations for a building over 9650 sq feet. Just one of those say that at the size of 180 x 60 we would be required to put in more exit doors. If we stay less than 9650 sq feet we would not have the additional requirements of a bigger building and all of the U Occupancy Classification Section of the 506 would be eliminated. Darrell recommends that we downsize the building to 60 x 160.

Darrell is going to get the set-back requirements and also find out if we can have someone from the city inspecting what we are doing to avoid an additional test. Brad is going to find out the cost on his end and what his company will do for us. We all know there will be cost to do this we just need to know what that cost is.

Todd recommends keeping the building as close to the driveway as possible to keep the cost of asphalt surface to a minimum. That is a requirement for occupancy of the building.

We will have another call on Wednesday November 11<sup>th</sup> this week at 7:00pm to re-group on these issues.

Future Meetings:

**November 11, 2020 @ 7pm – Conference Call**

January 16, 2021 @ 10am – Board Meeting – Lori's Office in Edina.

Adjourn –Lori makes motion to adjourn – Scott seconds - All in favor, motion carries. Meeting adjourned at 8:04pm