

**PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE
CITY OF RAMSEY
ANOKA COUNTY
STATE OF MINNESOTA**

The Public Works Committee conducted a regular meeting on Tuesday, January 17, 2012 at the Ramsey Municipal Center, 7550 Sunwood Drive NW, Ramsey, Minnesota.

Members Present: Chairperson Colin McGlone
 Councilmember Randy Backous
 Councilmember David Elvig

Member Absent: None

Also Present: City Administrator Kurtis G. Ulrich
 Public Works Director Brian Olson
 City Engineer Tim Himmer
 Civil Engineer II Leonard Linton
 Bill Fossing, LSA Design

CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson McGlone called the regular meeting of the Public Works Committee to order at 3:34 p.m.

CITIZEN INPUT

There was none.

APPROVE AGENDA

Motion by Councilmember Backous, seconded by Councilmember Elvig to add as Case #5.1 appointment of Chairperson and Vice Chairperson of the Public Works Committee for 2012 and approve the Agenda as amended.

Motion carried. Voting Yes: Chairperson McGlone and Councilmembers Backous and Elvig.
Voting No: None: Absent None.

APPROVE MINUTES

Motion by Councilmember Backous, seconded Councilmember Elvig, to approve the minutes from the December 13, 2011 Public Works Committee meeting.

Motion carried. Voting Yes: Chairperson McGlone and Councilmembers Backous and Elvig.
Voting No: None: Absent None.

COMMITTEE BUSINESS

Case 5.1 Election of Chairperson and Vice Chair of the Public Works Committee

Motion by Councilmember Elvig, seconded Councilmember Backous to appoint Councilmember Backous as Chairperson of the Public Works Committee.

Motion carried. Voting Yes. Councilmembers Backous and Elvig. Voting No: Chairperson McGlone: Absent None.

Motion by Councilmember Backous, seconded by Councilmember Elvig to nominate Councilmember Elvig as Vice Chair of the Public Works Committee.

Motion carried. Voting Yes: Councilmembers Backous and Elvig. Voting No: Chairperson McGlone: Absent None.

Case 5.2 Consider Stormwater Utility Rate Change for 14600 Nowthen Boulevard

Civil Engineer II Linton reviewed in the staff report that the property owner at 14600 Nowthen Boulevard came to Mayors meeting and asked about changing the stormwater utility rate. Staff reviewed that when the fee was established the property was being used as a commercial application and the rate was set accordingly. Currently, it is being used as storage and staff is recommending changing the stormwater utility rate from commercial to residential.

Public Works Director Olson stated we also look at the amount of impervious surface of a property and it is our impression that this isn't any different than any other typical residential lot.

Councilmember Elvig wants to understand that staff is recommending this property go back to residential and it seems we did collect a study on this three to four years ago and all we could find to work with was to set it up for residential.

Public Works Director Olson commented that we spent a significant amount of time with Green Valley Greenhouse proposal for current storm rate and utility credit and the question of retroactivity and how far back you go. In this case we are being very quick in our response and there won't be any case in retroactivity.

Patrick Hampton, 14600 Nowthen Boulevard NW, stated he wouldn't plan on asking for any retroactive, and his hope is just to get it reduced back to residential.

Motion by Chairperson Backous, seconded by Councilmember Elvig, to recommend to City Council to correct the stormwater utility rate from commercial to residential.

Motion carried. Voting Yes: Chairperson Backous and Councilmembers Elvig and McGlone. Voting No: None.

Case 5.3 Consider Lighting Retrofit for Parking Ramp Project

Public Works Director Olson reviewed in the staff report that attached to the case are a number of options to consider, one is to perpetuate the decision that was made in 2005 to continue with the metal halide lamps. The second is switch out the metal halide lights in the new ramp with fluorescent T5 lamps and the third option is to move forward with retrofitting the existing parking facility as well as changing the design to include new lights that are fluorescent.

Councilmember Elvig asked do you recall what savings were from when we first started the structure.

Public Works Director Olson responded he went back through the last 12 months of electric bills and priced it out based on how much we spent on electricity on that ramp today. He stated 45% of the total cost is lighting, the remainder is the HVAC system.

Councilmember Elvig asked what percentage of lighting was turned off.

Public Works Director Olson responded probably one third on the outside lights but there was a building code requirement that we have to maintain a certain level of lights for emergency purposes.

Leo Offerman from Connexus Energy was present and informed the Committee that what Connexus uses is the IES which is Illuminating Engineers Society of North America.

Mr. Offerman reviewed the RP2098 which is lighting for parking facilities and gave the short version of the standards. He stated this is what they used when they reviewed the plans and what is the recommended maintained illuminance values for parking garages from the report which is attached to the case.

What they are asking for is a minimum of one footcandle for basic light. There is actually two footcandle for daytime so we are allowing some day lighting as well, but for night is one footcandle.

Mr. Offerman stated LED works different and that changes the way they look at lighting all together, it is more important if they are meeting the minimums with good uniformity, and when we look at the plans for T5 lights, the uniformity is very good and it meets the minimums. The average is not quite as high, but that is okay, you can get the averages up by having hot spots.

He went on to explain that what they do is put the whole ramp on a point by point grid, he highlighted where the minimum requirement wasn't met, the only case is by the stairwell where there is going to be other light, so he explained they were able to meet the entire area of the ramp at the minimum level and uniformities were there.

Director of Public Works/Principal City Engineer Olson reviewed as part of his energy analysis,

Option 1 has no annual savings but the cost is going to be \$26,412 dollars a year. Dusk till Dawn is 4,000 hours, we have built into that equation that we know that there are some lights that are going to be on 24 hours a day.

The second option is to change the design to include fluorescent lights. Metal halides are already built into the design. The cost to put in each fixture is roughly the same as it is to put in the fluorescent.

The third option is to change everything out with fluorescents and retrofit the existing structures. He stated it is the retrofit that is most expensive.

Director of Public Works/Principal Engineer Olson reviewed the rebates in Option 3 with the Committee.

Councilmember McGlone stated in this case the payback on the energy and the payback on the retro, all of which he cannot see doing. It would take in some cases 20 years to payback one portion of that and 4-5 years to pay back the rest.

He also stated the idea of thinking about the future in his opinion is to just do what we are doing and get into the future. Theoretically, what we want to have will be cheaper or there may be a new technology by then.

Chairperson Backous wanted to confirm what Councilmember McGlone is saying is to go with Option No 1.

Councilmember McGlone confirmed go with what we got.

Councilmember Elvig stated he ran some numbers himself and having metal halide in the future and programmed retrofitting, you have somebody to help pay for it. What he is concerned about is the exterior of the building. There has to be consistency there and staying with metal halide on the exterior. He knows we are going to be burning more lights than we have in the past and he doesn't see that the numbers are there.

Chairperson Backous wanted to double check the map and stated when he looks at it there is a 10 year payback. He asked what is the payback?

Public Works Director/Principal City Engineer Olson responded it is not a very good payback. He wanted to make sure the Committee and Council had the opportunity to comment on whether we should move forward with the same metal halide lamp fixture and confirmed it is a 10 year payback.

Councilmember McGlone commented there are two paybacks you have to look at, the energy savings payback and the payback on the initial investment of upgrades.

Mr Offerman summarized that metal halides do degrade over time; fluorescents will maintain full luminance virtually 98% until end of life. The expectancy is 24,000 hour rated lamps, these

are pulsar metal halides. At 24,000 hours, half will still be working and half will be out. Connexus does scheduled regroup lamping at 20,000 hours at dusk to dawn usage that is five years.

Motion by Councilmember McGlone, seconded by Councilmember Elvig to recommend to City Council to stay with the 100 watt metal halide light fixtures that we already have.

Motion carried. Voting Yes: Chairperson Backous and Councilmembers Elvig and McGlone. Voting No: None.

Case 5.4 Consider Guard Rail Enhancements for the Parking Ramp

Public Works Director/Principal City Engineer Olson reviewed the staff report and stated that there has been some concern with regard to the height of the guardrails, both on the top floor also in the second and third floors on the north side and the east side.

Mr. Fossing of LSA Design was present to discuss the design features and the two options being presented and the related costs. Basically, Option A is currently right now the guardrail height at the roof level is 43 inches, the concrete portion of it is 2 foot 6 and the steel portion is 13 inches above that. It is basically doubling that existing rail.

Option B would be fully enclosing levels 2 and 3 so there would be screen fencing that would go from the top of the wall to the other side of the lower wall.

Mr. Fossing reviewed the costs for Option A is 147,658 and Option B is \$302,000 and then Items 3 and 4 is separate from that. Item 3 is sunscreen and Option 4 is to fill in the sloping floors.

Chairperson Backous stated they should decide between Option A and Option B first and then talk about 3 and 4.

Motion by Councilmember Elvig, seconded by Councilmember McGlone to recommend to City Council to move forward with enhancements of thirteen inch where there are none on the fourth floor. Staff was directed to bring forward that alternative in a separate case on February 14th.

Motion carried. Voting Yes: Chairperson Backous and Councilmembers Elvig and McGlone.

There were two other alternatives that were discussed that evening. The first item that was discussed was a sunscreen. The sun hits, particularly in the winter months, the eyes of the driver driving from the 1st to the second floor or from the second to third floors and thereby blinds the driver. The recommendation of the Committee was to explore alternative methods to screen the sun similar to the banners that were installed next to the temporary construction access and not spend \$43,325 to provide sun screens.

The last action that was discussed was providing a chain link connection between the internal ramps. The cost of this alternative would result in a change order on the Contract for \$15,911.

Motion by Councilmember Elvig, seconded by Councilmember McGlone to recommend to City Council for staff to explore alternative methods to screen the sun similar to the banners that were installed next to the temporary construction access and not spend \$43,325 to provide sun screens. Also, to explore chain link connection between the internal ramps resulting in a change order on the Contract for \$15,911.

Motion carried. Voting Yes: Chairperson Backous and Councilmembers Elvig and McGlone.

Case 5.5 Consider Crosswalk Signage Options along Sunwood Drive in the COR

City Engineer Himmer reviewed in the staff report that with the recent opening of the VA and The Falls Café there has been a few pedestrians that like to cross Sunwood Drive at Sapphire Street.

It was presented that we have an enforceable crosswalk in the location, which meets state standards. It was discussed a short term quick solution is to draw extra attention to this crosswalk would be to place in-ground pedestrian crossing sign, similar to what is on Alpine Drive today between Nowthen Boulevard and TH 47.

Staff is proposing a couple low cost solutions to install an in-ground pedestrian crossing sign at the intersection of Sunwood and Sapphire, which could be removed in the winter for plowing activities, and purchasing a few kid alert safety signs, which could be moved throughout the COR and City.

Councilmember Elvig stated he realizes the situation but placing anything permanent in the roadway he would be opposed to but anything that is temporary that can be moved around or taken out is fine with him.

Councilmember McGlone agrees that less signage is better; to be putting these in is ugly. He asked if we are ever going to get traffic lights there and asked if this has been issue.

Chairperson Backous stated it may be more of an issue with the VA, and wheelchair crossing and feels the problem is the curvature of the road there.

City Administrator Ulrich wanted to follow up with Councilmember McGlone's concept; like they have on west main in Anoka, and you have bookends on the east and west ends where you place a sign on a post which you don't have to move seasonally, which would be another option.

Councilmember McGlone comments were if he had to go with an option he would rather see an in-street sign placed in the middle of the road.

Motion by Councilmember Elvig, seconded by Chairperson Backous to recommend to City Council to move forward with staff's recommendation to purchase and install the kid alert safety signs and in-street pedestrian crossing signage with the COR, in an amount not to exceed \$1,000.

Motion carried. Voting Yes: Chairperson Backous and Councilmembers Elvig and McGlone.
Voting No: None.

Case #5.6 2011 Review of Engineering Consulting Services

City Engineer reviewed in the staff report that this is a review of how consulting dollars were spent in 2011 and additional funds were put into this fund totaling \$31,500.00.

City Administrator Ulrich commented we did eliminate some full time staff and we put in some contract amounts to make sure we got the work done that was important to do, this came in surprisingly close to what we estimated it would be.

Chairperson Backous asked about the flooding investigations and is that for FEMA purposes.

City Engineer Himmer clarified that is all of the items that came in questions and concerns raised by residents that is going on and we will bring back to a future meeting showing the results and conclusions of that analysis.

Councilmember McGlone asked about some of the line items listed.

City Engineer Himmer stated we have tried to be as self sufficient as we can only going out for those services that we need, you will see some items that probably aren't really engineering services, we've used those to be creative trying to solve some of the other budget issues and not have to bring those forward to you, the intent of this is to only to go for those specialty services that we need.

Director of Public Works/Principal City Engineer Olson added the only other comment is that they intend to bring this back every year as the direction was to report on that.

No action taken, for informational purposes only.

Case #5.7 Consider Request for Moving Mailboxes on Dysprosium Street

Director of Public Works/Principal City Engineer Olson reported that he heard back from the Postmaster and the Postmaster ultimately decided that the mail carrier is not willing to change his route. There is one carrier that delivers to the neighborhood on the east side of Dysprosium Street and another carrier that delivers to the neighborhood on the west side of Dysprosium Street.

There was discussion regarding the garbage cans and recycle bins being placed close to or in the paved travel lanes and parking areas. It was also discussed that people are stopping in the drive lanes to pick up their mail. The discussion continued with sending out a mailing to the residents requesting they park and walk up to their mailboxes and also address the issue at the same time with the proper placement of the garbage cans and recycle bins.

The consensus of the Committee is to send an informational letter out to each resident outlining the request and decision on the potential mailbox relocation, as well as describing the concern related to placement of obstructions in the right-of-way.

COMMITTEE INPUT

Discuss meeting start time for future Public Works Committee meetings.

The consensus of the Committee is to change the meeting start time from 5:30 to 6:00 pm on the third Tuesday of every month.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Councilmember Elvig seconded by Councilmember McGlone to adjourn the Public Works Committee meeting.

Motion carried.

The regular meeting of the Public Works Committee adjourned at 5:08 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Brian Olson
Public Works Director

Drafted by Mary Jo Warner
City of Ramsey Public Works Secretary