

City of Ramsey
Agenda
Public Works Committee
Tuesday September 17, 2013
Immediately following Personnel Committee
Lake Itasca Room, 7550 Sunwood Drive NW

1. **Call to Order**
2. **Citizen Input**
3. **Approve Agenda**
4. **Approve Minutes**
 1. Approve July 16, 2013 meeting minutes.
5. **Committee Business**
 1. Consider Allowing the Use of High Density Polyethylene Pipe for Water Service Line
6. **Committee/Staff Input**
 1. Signal Timing on Hwy 10 Corridor
 2. 2013 Public Works Department Operations and Staffing Survey Results
7. **Adjournment**

Public Works Committee

4. 1.

Meeting Date: 09/17/2013

Submitted For: Grant Riemer

By: MaryJo Warner, Engineering/Public Works

Title:

Approve July 16, 2013 meeting minutes.

Purpose:

The Public Works Committee held its regular meeting on July 16, 2013. Please note there are no meeting minutes for approval for August 20, 2013 due to cancellation of meeting for the Annual Ramsey Business Appreciation Golf Event.

Timeframe:

n/a

Responsible Party(ies)

n/a

Observations/Alternatives:

n/a

Recommendation:

Outcome:

Motion to approve Public Works Committee meeting minutes dated July 16, 2013.

Attachments

Minutes

Form Review

Inbox	Reviewed By	Date
Grant Riemer	Grant Riemer	09/10/2013 02:04 PM
Kurt Ulrich	Kurt Ulrich	09/12/2013 02:07 PM
Form Started By: MaryJo Warner		Started On: 08/21/2013 02:50 PM
Final Approval Date: 09/12/2013		

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

The Public Works Committee conducted a regular meeting on Tuesday, July 16, 2013 at the Ramsey Municipal Center, 7550 Sunwood Drive NW, Ramsey, Minnesota.

Members Present: Chairperson Randy Backous
 Councilmember Mark Kuzma
 Councilmember Chris Riley

Also Present: City Administrator Kurtis Ulrich
 Parks and Assistant Public Works Superintendent Mark Riverblood
 Public Works Superintendent Grant Riemer
 Development Services Manager Timothy Gladhill
 Councilmember John LeTourneau

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Backous called the regular meeting of the Public Works Committee to order at 6:36 p.m.

2. CITIZEN INPUT

There was none.

3. APPROVE AGENDA

Motion by Councilmember Riley, seconded by Councilmember Kuzma, to approve the agenda, as presented.

Motion carried. Voting Yes: Chairperson Backous, Councilmembers Riley and Kuzma. Voting No: None.

4. APPROVE MINUTES

4.01: Approve June 18, 2013, Meeting Minutes

Motion by Councilmember Kuzma, seconded by Councilmember Riley, to approve the following minutes:

Regular Meeting Minutes dated June 18, 2013

Motion carried. Voting Yes: Chairperson Backous, Councilmembers Kuzma and Riley. Voting No: None.

5. COMMITTEE BUSINESS

5.01: Consideration of Permitting Fence Encroachments across Private Property Lines

City Engineer Westby reviewed the staff report, noting the City's policy requires landowners to install fences a foot or more inside their property line in areas where a potential infrastructure conflict exists. He advised of the City's current policy and displayed pictures depicting this situation. As a result, within the Ramsey Town Center 10th Addition, fences are staggered along rear property lines to avoid damaging an existing underground storm sewer system, resulting in the unintended consequence of creating remnant strips of land two or more feet in width between rear fence lines in which property owners are not able to easily maintain their properties so there are blight and nuisance issues. It was noted the resident's request is to extend their side lot line fencing across their rear property line to connect to their neighbor's fence, thereby allowing a shared common rear fence line that would eliminate the remnant strips of property between fences. City Engineer Westby presented staff's recommendation to change the policy to allow neighbors to extend fences across private property lines to connect to neighbor's fences contingent on language being added to the building fence permit to ensure that: City infrastructure will be protected during fence construction activities; access to City infrastructure will be maintained on an on-going basis; property owners will not lose property rights as related to adverse possession laws; and, property owners are reminded to obtain permission from neighbors via a written agreement. He presented the draft language as detailed in the staff report and explained the statute relating to adverse possession. City Engineer Westby stated staff is able to revise the permit language, if so directed.

Chairperson Backous stated the Public Works Committee is familiar with this request, noting it had been misunderstood that the request was to construct fences on the property line. However, the request is to stretch a fence to the property line to connect with those posts. He noted the property owners will have to decide who will have the posts on their property and who will have to stretch their fence to attach to the posts.

City Engineer Westby stated that is a civil matter between two private property owners. Staff recommends having a written agreement and working with the City Attorney to prepare a draft template that property owners could expand upon.

Chairperson Backous stated this would provide more flexibility and not be a requirement, but an option, so he would not object.

Motion by Chairperson Backous, seconded by Councilmember Kuzma, to recommend that the City Council change the City policy allowing fences to be extended across property lines, contingent on the draft (building) fence permit language being reviewed and approved by the City Attorney and subsequently added to all (building) fence permits issued in the future.

Further discussion: Councilmember Riley asked if fences will be allowed side-to-side and also front-to-back and across the utility easements, limiting the City's ability for access of the easement. He felt some day in the future the City will need to remove someone's fence and

property owners will object or want the City to pay for it. Chairperson Backous asked if this agreement would be attached to the title so a new property owner would be aware in case the property is sold. Development Services Manager Gladhill stated that could be required, noting in this case it is magnified because it involves a pipe in the ground. He stated if that is the direction, then the cost for the document recording would be the requirement of the property owner, noting it can cost \$50 to \$100 to record such a document with the title. In addition, it would be necessary for the City to provide an agreement template. Councilmember Riley asked if there are other easements where fences are not allowed to be constructed. Development Services Manager Gladhill stated there would be some easements in which the City would not allow a fence encroachment so staff would have to determine what is in each easement and make a recommendation whether it should be considered for this option. That will be part of staff's standard review. City Engineer Westby stated the City currently allows property owners to construct fences in easements but it is not allowed on the line or on top of infrastructure so the pipe is not damaged. Development Services Manager Gladhill stated this is more about the large stormwater pipe at the rear of the property.

Motion by Chairperson Backous, seconded by Councilmember Kuzma, to recommend that the City Council change the City policy allowing fences to be extended across property lines, contingent on the draft (building) fence permit language being reviewed and approved by the City Attorney and subsequently added to all (building) fence permits issued in the future, and to add a requirement for a written agreement between the property owners that is recorded, at the property owner's expense, for easements that include infrastructure.

Further discussion: Public Works Superintendent Riemer stated he does not object to allowing this option.

Motion carried. Voting Yes: Chairperson Backous, Councilmembers Kuzma and Riley. Voting No: None.

5.02: Consider Partial Vacation of Drainage and Utility Easement at 15069 Helium Street NW

City Engineer Westby reviewed the staff report and stated staff, as directed by the Public Works Committee, again contacted the property owner to discuss options. Because the property owners were not responsive, staff visited the site and found the property owner had constructed a retaining wall roughly five feet off the property line; however, the property owners never received formal approval from the City to construct the retaining wall within the existing easement. City Engineer Westby presented four options for the Public Works Committee's consideration as detailed in the staff report. Staff recommends Option 1, direct staff to meet with the property owners on site to review the wall as constructed to confirm that it was constructed adequately and is located at least five feet off the property line. If staff finds that the wall was constructed adequately and is located at least five feet off the property line, direct staff to take no further action, in which event the City will retain a ten-foot drainage and utility easement along the south property line.

Chairperson Backous asked if a permit is required to construct a retaining wall.

City Engineer Westby answered in the affirmative if the wall is four feet in height.

Chairperson Backous asked about the monetary value of the five foot easement.

City Engineer Westby stated he did not determine a value.

Councilmember Riley asked if the property owner constructed a four-foot wall.

City Engineer Westby stated it may be in the three-foot range.

Development Services Manager Gladhill stated it is still in an easement so a permit would be required regardless of height.

Councilmember Kuzma stated if the property owner did not follow the rules, they should be required to remove the retaining wall and be given an opportunity to purchase five feet of easement.

Chairperson Backous agreed that the City cannot allow construction of retaining walls on public property and he would support Option 2, reviewing how the wall was constructed, and if it is to Code, discuss the cost to pay to leave the wall where it is at, and the cost of the permit.

Councilmember Riley stated the retaining wall also has to be constructed to meet Code requirements.

Development Services Manager Gladhill stated if directed, staff can use the Great River Energy transaction as a starting point to determine the price per square foot.

Councilmember Kuzma stated if the property owner does not agree to purchase the easement and construct the retaining wall to Code requirements, then the City should have a Plan B to require removal of the retaining wall.

Chairperson Backous agreed and noted the building permit will require construction to Code standards.

City Engineer Westby stated Option 1 assures the wall is correctly constructed and leaves five feet of easement in case the other property ever develops.

Chairperson Backous stated his understanding that the neighboring property will never be developed.

Development Services Manager Gladhill explained how this property had been subdivided and restrictions on buildable area until/unless public utilities are installed. He stated he will work with City Engineer Westby on this matter.

City Engineer Westby stated Option 1 is more lenient on the property owner but did not include payment for an easement or filing for a building permit.

Chairperson Backous stated there is a concern for setting precedence so the property owner should be required to pull a building permit.

Motion by Councilmember Riley, seconded by Councilmember Kuzma, to recommend that the City Council approve Option 1, direct staff to meet with the property owners on site to review the wall as constructed to confirm that it was constructed adequately and is located at least five feet off the property line. If staff finds that the wall was constructed adequately and is located at least five feet off the property line, direct staff to take no further action, in which event the City will retain a ten-foot drainage and utility easement along the south property line. In addition, the property owner will be required to pay for a building permit and construct the retaining wall to Code standards.

Motion carried. Voting Yes: Chairperson Backous, Councilmembers Riley and Kuzma. Voting No: None.

5.03: Approve Plans and Specifications, and Joint Powers Agreement for the Mississippi River Trail

Parks and Assistant Public Works Superintendent Riverblood reviewed the staff report and work with other units of government to promote and secure funding for regional trails including the Mississippi River Trail (MRT). He explained the purpose of tonight's case is to approve both the Joint Powers Agreement (JPA) and the plans and specifications for the construction of the MRT between Mississippi West Regional Park in Ramsey and Mississippi Community Park in Anoka. Parks and Assistant Public Works Superintendent Riverblood presented the terms and anticipated timeline. He stated the funding for this trail will be apportioned as indicated in the Financial Summary and JPA with Ramsey's share being funded by the Park Trust Fund that has a present balance in excess of \$4 million. Ramsey's total costs are anticipated to be about \$620,000 and this total will be reduced following reimbursement by Anoka County of \$153,000, bringing an amended total project cost to an estimated \$467,000. It was noted staff recommends approval of the plans and specifications and the JPA.

Chairperson Backous asked about parking restrictions.

Parks and Assistant Public Works Superintendent Riverblood explained there had been a miscommunication relating to parking restrictions being on both sides. However, it was ultimately clarified that parking would only be restricted to one side. In addition, he had also met with a business owner to address concerns relating to impacts.

Councilmember Kuzma asked about the need for a LRRWMO permit.

Parks and Assistant Public Works Superintendent Riverblood stated there will be a shallow ditch section for drainage and the LRRWMO's Engineer indicated he did not understand the island

was sand so he had no concern. Parks and Assistant Public Works Superintendent Riverblood stated he does not think any LRRWMO action will be required.

Chairperson Backous congratulated Parks and Assistant Public Works Superintendent Riverblood on his success with this project.

Parks and Assistant Public Works Superintendent Riverblood described the popular aspects of this trail, noting it will also help the City's retailers.

Motion by Chairperson Backous, seconded by Councilmember Kuzma, to recommend that the City Council approve the plans and specifications and the JPA for the Mississippi River Trail.

Motion carried. Voting Yes: Chairperson Backous, Councilmembers Kuzma and Riley. Voting No: None.

5.04: Cost Estimate for Pedestrian Crosswalk at Alpine Drive and Zirconium Street

Public Works Superintendent Riemer noted the Committee had directed staff to look at the option of constructing the trail to the west instead of toward the main entrance to the east. Staff staked a trail on the south side of Alpine leading into the park and terminating near the picnic pavilion and dog park. A crosswalk would still be installed at the point 200 feet west of Zirconium Street and connected by a ten-foot crushed aggregate trail (limited use trail and to reduce cost). The cost for the basic crosswalk and trail with standard crosswalk signage with striping, four ADA approved pedestrian ramps/curb cuts; 50 tons of recycled material; and, labor/equipment to install trail is \$9,300. If approved, funding would be from the Public Works Operating Budget.

Chairperson Backous stated he looked at the staking, thinks it looks awesome, and is a fairly cheap solution as a result of everyone putting their heads together. In addition, he thinks residents in that area will be happy with it. Chairperson Backous thanked staff for finding a solution, noting it included recycled materials, and comes out in a perfect place by the pavilion and dog park.

Motion by Councilmember Kuzma, seconded by Councilmember Riley, to recommend that the City Council accept staff recommendation to install standard crosswalk signage 200 feet west of Zirconium Street to include 200 feet of aggregate trail on the north side of Alpine Drive and 225 feet of aggregate trail on the south side of Alpine Drive at a cost of \$9,300.

Further discussion: Councilmember Riley asked if there is value in sending the 22 residents a note explaining this project and rationale for its placement, noting it will also create good will. Public Works Superintendent Riemer stated residents attended a past Public Works Committee meeting to revitalize the request and staff will send letters to those residents.

Motion carried. Voting Yes: Chairperson Backous, Councilmembers Kuzma and Riley. Voting No: None.

5.05: Recommend Shelter and Restroom for Riverdale Park – 2013 Capital Improvement

Parks and Assistant Public Works Superintendent Riverblood reviewed the staff report and past consideration relating to a shelter and restroom for Riverdale Park. In addition, this project had been included in a Federal trail grant application to gain a higher score. He described the appearance of the shelter and presented the recommendation of staff and the Park and Recreation Commission to approve the 2013 Capital Improvement as presented within the budget detail. The cost would be \$84,000 and be funded from the Park Trust Fund.

Chairperson Backous asked if the shelter will be the same as constructed in Emerald Pond.

Parks and Assistant Public Works Superintendent Riverblood stated it will appear the same, noting it will be of block construction. The door will be equipped with a panic button to exit the building once locked and staff does inspect regularly to assure it is adequately maintained.

Motion by Councilmember Riley, seconded by Councilmember Kuzma, to recommend that the City Council approve a not-to-exceed amount of \$84,000 from the Park Trust Fund for Riverdale Park's shelter, restroom, and drinking fountain as presented within the 2013 Capital Improvement Plan.

Motion carried. Voting Yes: Chairperson Backous, Councilmembers Riley and Kuzma. Voting No: None.

Parks and Assistant Public Works Superintendent Riverdale stated a "mister" will be purchased with the drinking fountain for installation at Central Park as part of Riverdale's project.

6. COMMITTEE / STAFF INPUT

6.01: Discuss Request to Mow Portions of an Undeveloped Park – Shawn Acres

Parks and Assistant Public Works Superintendent Riverblood reviewed the staff report and described the impact from budget cuts, including reduction of areas to be mowed. He stated Shawn Acres gets little use; however, residents have asked the City to occasionally mow the front portion (near the street) of Shawn Acres Park. If approved, the funding source would be the Park Operating Budget. Staff recommends mowing on an as-needed basis.

Chairperson Backous stated he has no objection to staff's recommendation.

Councilmember Riley asked about the condition of the play slide.

Parks and Assistant Public Works Superintendent Riverblood stated a resident is currently mowing around the swing. He stated he feels compelled to remove the slide, which may be a hazard, but if that is done it will appear the City is taking away a service. It would cost \$25,000 to \$30,000 to replace this play apparatus but it cannot be justified at this park. He stated he will be addressing this situation with the Park & Recreation Commission.

Chairperson Backous asked if there is a lower cost alternative that would still be safe.

Parks and Assistant Public Works Superintendent Riverdale stated such a play structure may not be constructed to withstand years of use. In addition, it would trigger the need for a resilient surface underneath, meeting ADA, and a path with connection to the street.

Councilmember Riley asked if the City is exempt from mowing requirements placed on residents.

Parks and Assistant Public Works Superintendent Riverblood stated staff discussed how to apply long grass code requirements to the City and it was found to be easier to mow occasionally than to continually get calls of complaint.

Chairperson Backous stated there had been significant pressure and direction to staff to stop mowing this type of low use park, which he had not supported.

Councilmember Kuzma stated he would also like the grass within roundabouts to be kept at a reasonable height. Riverblood responded that it had been mowed today, and will continue to be mowed.

The consensus of the Public Works Committee was to recommend that the City Council direct staff to mow the front portions of Shawn Acres Park on as as-needed basis.

The Public Works Committee discussed the turf along Dysprosium Street. Public Works Superintendent Riemer stated the area will be sodded late summer/early fall and watered until winter freeze.

Public Works Superintendent Riemer stated staff talked with Anoka County about the 161st and Armstrong crosswalk and asked Anoka County to cover the cost of the crosswalk lights.

Parks and Assistant Public Works Superintendent Riverblood described the community garden at Tower 1 and encouraged Members to visit that site.

7. ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Councilmember Kuzma, seconded by Councilmember Riley, to adjourn the Public Works Committee meeting.

Motion carried.

The regular meeting of the Public Works Committee adjourned at 7:34 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Grant Riemer
Public Works Superintendent

Drafted by Carla Wirth
TimeSaver Off Site Secretarial, Inc.

Public Works Committee

5. 1.

Meeting Date: 09/17/2013

Submitted For: John Nelson

By: Grant Riemer, Engineering/Public Works

Title:

Consider Allowing the Use of High Density Polyethylene Pipe for Water Service Line

Purpose:

The purpose of this case is to consider amending Ramsey City Code Sec 58-113 (a) which currently reads "The minimum size water service shall be one-inch copper." to allow for the use of HDPE (High Density Polyethylene) pipe in lieu of soft copper for water service lines.

Timeframe:

20 minutes

Responsible Party(ies)

Grant Riemer and John Nelson

Observations/Alternatives:

Since 1985 the City of Ramsey has required all private water services hooked to the municipal water supply be 1"soft copper line. The Minnesota Plumbing Code Section 4715.0420 allows the use of many different types of service lines, including HDPE, however a municipality can require a certain type over others and in 1985 the City of Ramsey chose to require soft copper. The City currently has 4,100+ of these privately owned service lines that connect homes to the municipal water system. In contrast, homes on private well systems have been allowed to use HDPE for many years. All materials used would be required to meet current standards as described by American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM D2239) and be installed in accordance with ASTM D 2774 as listed in The Minnesota Plumbing Code. One of the disadvantages of plastic pipe is that it is harder to locate. Consequently, the installer would also be required to include a 12 gauge, direct bury tracer wire, from the curb stop to the water meter. This wire would be used for locating purposes. The city would still require 1" copper pipe from the water main to the curb stop. This allows the utility department to positively locate our underground utilities.

There are several advantages to allowing poly pipe for water service use and cost is major consideration. A 100' roll of 1" Class C soft copper is approximately \$541.51 depending on the market. The same 100' roll of 1" poly is approximately \$52.65. This factor alone would reduce the number of burglaries at construction sites from copper thieves. As somewhat of a side issue, our police department would save staff time spent on responding to copper thefts and the follow up investigation. Poly pipe also comes in lengths up to 300', where as copper comes in 100' lengths, so the need for splices on longer runs can be eliminated with the use of poly pipe.

Recommendation:

Staff recommends amending Ramsey City Code Sec 58-113 (a) to allow for the use of HDPE (High Density Polyethylene) pipe in lieu of soft copper for water service lines from the curb stop to the residence. 1" copper pipe would still be required from the water main to the curb stop.

Outcome:

Motion to accept staff recommendation to ammending Ramsey City Code Sec 58-113 (a) to allow for the use of HDPE (High Density Polyethylene) pipe in lieu of soft copper for water service lines from the curb stop to the residence.

or

Motion to reject staff recommendation and choose an alternative based on committee discussion

Form Review

Inbox	Reviewed By	Date
Kurt Ulrich	Kurt Ulrich	09/12/2013 02:12 PM
Form Started By: Grant Riemer		Started On: 09/10/2013 08:48 AM
	Final Approval Date: 09/12/2013	

Public Works Committee

6. 1.

Meeting Date: 09/17/2013

Submitted For: Grant Riemer

By: Grant Riemer, Engineering/Public Works

Title:

Signal Timing on Hwy 10 Corridor

Purpose:

Update PW committee on Signal timing on Hwy 10 corridor

Timeframe:

5 Minutes

Responsible Party(ies)

Grant Riemer

Observations/Alternatives:

Staff contacted Kevin Schwartz at MnDot regarding signal timing on Hwy 10 and why such a limited number of cars are allowed to enter the corridor from intersecting roads, such as Armstrong Blvd, Ramsey Blvd, Sunfish Lk Blvd and Thurston Ave. during the morning rush hour. The answer, which is not a surprise to anyone, is the corridor is over capacity. the signals along the corridor are all inter-related. Any changes to the timing at one signal effects the traffic volumes on the whole corridor. The main traffic movement is obviously Hwy 10. If more cars are allowed to enter Hwy 10 from the side roads the traffic congestion builds on Hwy 10. There are cameras at all of the intersections and minor adjustments can be made to the timing, depending on the situation. MnDot has hired a consultant to study the signal timing on Hwy 10 to see if any improvements could be made, but most of the improvements would be limited to off peak hours. Kevin asked me to give out his phone number and he would be glad to explain the signal timing to anyone that would like more information. Kevin's Number at MnDot is 651-234-7840.

Recommendation:

Informational only

Outcome:

N/A

Form Review

Inbox
Kurt Ulrich

Reviewed By
Kurt Ulrich

Date
09/12/2013 02:14 PM
Started On: 09/10/2013 01:08 PM

Form Started By: Grant Riemer

Final Approval Date: 09/12/2013

Public Works Committee

6. 2.

Meeting Date: 09/17/2013

Submitted For: Grant Riemer

By: MaryJo Warner, Engineering/Public Works

Title:

2013 Public Works Department Operations and Staffing Survey Results

Purpose:

Share survey results from neighboring communities on public works staffing levels. Staff would like to share that information with the PW committee.

Timeframe:

10 minutes

Responsible Party(ies)

Grant Riemer

Observations/Alternatives:

The cities of Forest Lake And Lino Lakes conducted informal surveys this past summer comparing like sized cities and their staffing levels. The basic outcome sought was to compare FTE's (full time equivalents) to population and amount of infrastructure maintained.

Recommendation:

Informational only

Outcome:

Informal discussion with PW Committee

Attachments

Lino Lakes Survey

Forest Lake Survey

Form Review

Inbox	Reviewed By	Date
Grant Riemer	Grant Riemer	09/11/2013 09:12 PM
Kurt Ulrich	Grant Riemer	09/12/2013 09:48 AM
Mary Jo Warner (Originator)	MaryJo Warner	09/12/2013 10:03 AM
Grant Riemer	Grant Riemer	09/12/2013 10:23 AM
Kurt Ulrich	Kurt Ulrich	09/12/2013 02:16 PM
Form Started By: MaryJo Warner		Started On: 09/10/2013 02:28 PM

Final Approval Date: 09/12/2013

City	Population	FTE Streets	Streets / Pop.	FTE Parks	Parks / Pop.	FTE Water	Water / Pop.	FTE Fleet	Fleet / Pop.	FTE Total	FTE Total / Pop.
Anoka	17,142	4	4,286	5	3,428	4	4,286	2	8,571	15	1,143
Champlin*	23,089	12	1,924		#VALUE!	3	7,696	2	11,545	17	1,358
Chanhassen	22,952	8	2,869	7	3,279	8	2,869	3	7,651	26	883
Columbia Heights	19,496	7	2,785	5	3,899	7	2,785	3	6,499	22	886
Elk River	22,974	9	2,553	5	4,595	8	2,872	2	11,487	24	957
Forest Lake*	18,375	7	2,625		#VALUE!	4	4,594	1	18,375	12	1,531
Fridley	27,208	9.5	2,864	10	2,721	10	2,721	3	9,069	32.5	837
Golden Valley	20,371	7	2,910	5	4,074	8	2,546	3	6,790	23	886
Hopkins	17,591	7	2,513	7	2,513	4	4,398	2	8,796	20	880
Hugo***	13,332	8	1,667		#VALUE!		#VALUE!	1	13,332	9	1,481
Lino Lakes	20,216	6	3,369	4	5,054	3	6,739	1	20,216	14	1,444
Mounds View	12,155	2.25	5,402	2.25	5,402	4.5	2,701	1	12,155	10	1,216
New Brighton**	21,456	10.5	2,043	2.5	8,582		#VALUE!	2	10,728	15	1,430
Prior Lake	22,796	10	2,280	6	3,799	4	5,699	2	11,398	22	1,036
Ramsey	23,688	4.5	5,264	4	5,922	3	7,896	1.5	15,792	13	1,822
Rosemount	21,874	6	3,646	5	4,375	4	5,469	2	10,937	17	1,287
Shoreview	25,043	7	3,578	7	3,578	8	3,130	2	12,522	24	1,043
Vadnais Heights	12,302	4	3,076	4	3,076	2	6,151	1	12,302	11	1,118
White Bear Lake	23,797	4	5,949	5	4,759	8	2,975	1	23,797	18	1,322

* Parks combined with Streets

** Water/Sewer combined with Streets

*** Parks and Water/Sewer combined with Streets

City of Forest Lake Public Works Department Operations and Staffing Survey

Streets:

City Name	Population	Miles of Pavement	Miles of Gravel	Total Miles Streets	Population per Mile of Streets	Miles Streets per FTE Streets	Street Lights	Street Lights per FTE Streets	Cul-de-sacs	Cul-de-sacs per Total Miles Streets	Inches Snowfall	Plowing Hours	Contract Plowing	Plow to Bare Pavement?
City of Forest Lake	18,500	100	30	130	142	26.0	841	168.2	200	1.54	2	12	1%	No
Hastings	22,500	103	0.5	103.5	217	16.6	700	112.0	95	0.92	1.5	8-10	0%	No
Ramsey	23,000	172	2.6	174.6	132	38.8	798		260	1.49	2	8	0%	No
City of South St. Paul	20,160	75	0.2	75.2	268	9.4	1,064	133.0	36	0.48	2	8-10	0%	No
Hugo	15,000	97.67	24.76	122.43	123	24.5	200	40.0	90	0.74	2	8	0%	No
Waconia	10,697	56	0.28	56.28	190	9.4	53	8.8	75	1.33	1.5	8-10	Minor	No
Mendota Heights	11,000	71	0	71	155	14.2	-	-	50	0.70	2	16	Minor	No
New Brighton	21,456	70	0	70	307	9.3	780	104.0	121	1.73	2	8-10	0%	No
Stillwater	18,000	100	0.5	100.5	179	16.8	50	8.3	100	1.00	2	8	0%	No
City of East Bethel	11,600	132	16	148	78	29.6	36	7.2	167	1.13	2	8-10	0%	No
City of Prior Lake	26,000	100	2	102	255	10.2	100	10.0	190	1.86	1	6-8	0%	No
Average	17,992	97.88	6.99	104.86	186	18.6	420	59.2	126	1.17	1.8	9.2	0.1%	No

City of Forest Lake Public Works Department Operations and Staffing Survey

FTE's

City Name	Population	FTE Streets	FTE Parks	FTE Water	FTE Sewer	FTE Fleet	FTE Admin	Total FT FTE's	Population per Total FTE's	Seasonal Streets	Seasonal Parks	Seasonal Utilities	Total Seasonal	Population per Seasonal FTE's
City of Forest Lake	18,500	5.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	1.00	1.00	12.00	1,542	1.00	4.00	1.00	6.00	3,083
Hastings	22,500	6.25	No data given	2.00	2.00	0.75	3.25	14.25	1,579	2.00	No data g	1.00	3.00	7,500
Ramsey	23,000	4.50	4.00	1.50	1.50	1.50	3.00	16.00	1,438	2.00	12.00	2.00	16.00	1,438
City of South St. Paul	20,160	8.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	1.50	18.50	1,090	1.00	6.00	1.00	8.00	2,520
Hugo	15,000	5.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	-	1.00	10.00	1,500	-	5.00	-	5.00	3,000
Waconia	10,697	6.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	1.00	2.00	15.00	713	1.00	2.00	2.00	5.00	2,139
Mendota Helghts	11,000	5.00	3.00		1.00	1.00	1.50	11.50	957	2.00	2.00	-	4.00	2,750
New Brighton	21,456	7.50	4.50	3.00	2.00	2.00	1.00	20.00	1,073	-	9.00	4.00	13.00	1,650
Stillwater	18,000	6.00	3.50		3.00	1.00	4.00	17.50	1,029	4.00	4.00	2.00	10.00	1,800
City of East Bethel	11,600	5.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	-	1.00	9.00	1,289	1.00	1.00	-	2.00	5,800
City of Prior Lake	26,000	10.00	7.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	26.00	1,000	4.00	30.00	4.00	38.00	684
Average	17,992	6.20	3.00	1.94	1.77	1.11	2.02	15.43	1,201	1.64	7.50	1.55	10.00	2,942

City of Forest Lake Public Works Department Operations and Staffing Survey

Water:

City Name	Population	Water Customers	Customers per Water FTE	City Wells	Water Treatment	Miles Watermain	Miles Watermain per Water FTE	Water Towers	Water Sold Gallons	Gallons Sold per Water FTE
City of Forest Lake	18,500	3,900	1,950	4	3	69	34.5	2	365,000,000	182,500,000
City of Ramsey	23,000	4,200	1,400	8	0	82	27.3	3	679,750,000	226,583,333
Hastings	22,500	7,000	3,500	6	1	80	40.0	4	900,000,000	450,000,000
City of South St. Paul	20,160	6,858	3,429	7	-	88	44.0	4	950,000,000	475,000,000
Hugo	15,000	3,364	1,682	4	-	55	27.5	2	336,782,800	168,391,400
Waconia	10,697	3,800	1,900	6	2	60	30.0	3		N/A
Mendota Heights	11,000	N/A	N/A	0	-	76	N/A	1		N/A
New Brighton	21,456	5,843	1,948	11		92	30.7	4	813,915,000	271,305,000
City of East Bethel	11,600	55	55	4	2	4	4.0	1	3,000,000	3,000,000
City of Prior Lake	26,000	8,001	4,001	7	1	116	58.0	2	600,000,000	300,000,000
Average	17,991	4,780	2,207	5.7	1	72	32.9	2.6	581,055,975	259,597,467

Note: Mendota Heights residents get water service from St. Paul Regional Water Service.

City of Forest Lake Public Works Department Operations and Staffing Survey

Sewer:

City Name	Population	Sewer Customers	Customers per Sewer FTE	Lift Stations	Lift Stations per Sewer FTE	Miles Sewer Line	Miles of Sewer Line per Sewer FTE	Miles Televised	Miles Cleaned	Storm Ponds	Storm Ponds per Street FTE	Catch Basins	Catch Basins per Street FTE	Basins Cleaned
City of Forest Lake	18,500	5,575	2,788	45	23	91	46	10	12	185	37	1,400	280	200
City of Ramsey	23,000	4,200	1,400	7	2	63	21	6.3	21	130		800		varies
Hastings	22,500	7,000	3,500	8	4	80	40	5	30	30	5	1,500	240	100
South St. Paul	20,160	6,858	3,429	2	1	78	39	10	3	15	2	1,400	175	75
Hugo	15,000	3,119	3,119	10	10	51	51		17		N/A		N/A	
Waconia	10,697	3,820	1,910	11	6	52	26	varies	13	150	25	1,400	233	12
Mendota Heights	11,000	4,500	4,500	5	5	76	76	13	13	98	20	1,400	280	-
New Brighton	21,456	5,872	2,936	5	3	77.52	39	18.5	37	103	14	1,204	161	varies
City of East Bethel	11,600	55	55	3	3	3.8	4	-	1.2	56	11	250	50	
City of Prior Lake	26,000	8,001	4,001	39	20	107	54	10.7	36		N/A		N/A	5
Average	17,991	4,900	2,764	14	8	68	39	9	18	96	16	1,169	203	65

City of Forest Lake Public Works Department Operations and Staffing Survey

Parks:

City Name	Population	Number of Parks	Population per Park	Acreage of Parks	Acres Mowed	Acres Mowed per Park FTE's	Miles Sidewalk	Miles Trails	Snow Removal Walks/Trails
City of Forest Lake	18,500	20	925	281.97	200.00	200	10	10	16.0
City of Ramsey	23,000	21	1,190	600	377	38	20	49	50
City of South St. Paul	20,160	15	1,344	245.00	150.00	50	60	9	5.0
Hugo	15,000	17	882	175.00	50.00	50			14.0
Waconia	10,697	20	535	163.95	60.46	30	14	13	25.0
Mendota Heights	11,000	12	917	75.00	100.00	33	0	26	26.0
New Brighton	21,456	13	1,650	160.00	100.00	22	21	4.5	21.0
City of East Bethel	11,600	17	682	300.00	360.00	360	1.2	3.6	0.6
City of Prior Lake	26,000	56	464	1,000.00	300.00	43	30	70	100.0
Average	17,490	21.22	954	333.44	188.61	92	20	23.1	28.6