

**City of Ramsey**  
**Agenda**  
**Public Works Committee**  
**Tuesday May 19, 2015**  
**6:00 pm**  
**Lake Itasca Room, 7550 Sunwood Drive NW**

1. **Call to Order**
2. **Citizen Input**
3. **Approve Agenda**
4. **Approve Minutes**
  1. Approve March 31,2015 Meeting Minutes.
5. **Committee Business**
  1. Consider Recommending Council Approval of draft Assessment Agreement for Ridgepoint Residential Development Public Improvements, Improvement Project 15-21
6. **Committee/Staff Input**
  1. Review of Trail Maintenance Policy Framework
7. **Adjournment**

**Public Works Committee**

4. 1.

**Meeting Date:** 05/19/2015

**Submitted For:** Grant Riemer, Engineering/Public Works

**By:** MaryJo Warner, Engineering/Public Works

---

**Title:**

Approve March 31,2015 Meeting Minutes.

**Purpose/Background:**

To review and approve meeting minutes.

**Timeframe:**

5 minutes.

**Observations/Alternatives:**

n/a

**Funding Source:**

n/a

**Recommendation:**

**Action:**

Motion to approve meeting minutes.

---

**Attachments**

Minutes

---

**Form Review**

<b>Inbox</b>	<b>Reviewed By</b>	<b>Date</b>
Grant Riemer	Grant Riemer	05/12/2015 05:28 PM
Kurt Ulrich	MaryJo Warner	05/14/2015 03:47 PM
Form Started By: MaryJo Warner		Started On: 05/11/2015 10:45 AM
Final Approval Date: 05/14/2015		

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

The Public Works Committee conducted a regular meeting on Tuesday, March 31, 2015, at the Ramsey Municipal Center, 7550 Sunwood Drive NW, Ramsey, Minnesota.

Members Present:     Chairperson Chris Riley  
                            Councilmember Jill Johns  
                            Councilmember Melody Shryock

Also Present:         Public Works Superintendent Grant Riemer  
                            City Engineer Bruce Westby  
                            Civil Engineer II Leonard Linton  
                            Asst City Administrator/Economic Development Manager Patrick Brama

**1.     CALL TO ORDER**

Chairperson Riley called the regular meeting of the Public Works Committee to order at 6:00 p.m.

**2.     CITIZEN INPUT**

There was none.

**3.     APPROVE AGENDA**

Motion by Councilmember Johns, seconded by Councilmember Shryock, to approve the agenda, as presented.

Motion carried. Voting Yes: Chairperson Riley, Councilmembers Johns and Shryock. Voting No: None.

**4.     APPROVE MINUTES**

**4.01: Approve January 20, 2015, Meeting Minutes**

Motion by Councilmember Johns, seconded by Councilmember Shryock, to approve the following minutes:

Regular Meeting Minutes dated January 20, 2015

Motion carried. Voting Yes: Chairperson Riley, Councilmembers Johns and Shryock. Voting No: None.

## **5. COMMITTEE BUSINESS**

### **5.01: Consider Options for Addressing Stormwater Drainage Issues in Low Lying, Land Locked Areas**

Civil Engineer II Linton reviewed the staff report and identified the 2014 areas of flooding concern. He identified the wetlands within the City, noting that approximately 20 to 25 percent of the City is wetland. He identified areas of flooding concern from previous years beginning in 1985 and moving forward to 2011 for comparison purposes. He explained the staff report focused on three primary areas of concern, and that the staff report lists these in order of priority based on magnitude and severity of property and structure impacts.

The Gibbon Street area, rated the highest priority in the staff report, was discussed in detail first. Civil Engineer II Linton reviewed several potential routes of relief for this land-locked wetland, including relative elevation differences and any easements that existed along the routes. He discussed that ditch 66 was cleaned a few years prior and that weirs had been installed. He explained that vegetation management can occur within a wetland but the elevation cannot be changed. He noted that similar plans are available for discussion along the other two areas addressed within the case, but that residents from Gibbon Street are in attendance.

Chairperson Riley questioned if there is a good or easy answer.

Civil Engineer II Linton stated that while there is no easy answer there are potential solutions. He stated that the potential routes are where solutions could occur.

City Engineer Westby stated that there could be a combination of ditches and pipes in the routes.

Councilmember Johns stated that it appears the southern route would make the most sense.

Chairperson Riley questioned if the route would simply push the problem down the line.

Civil Engineer II Linton replied that if the water were to be routed into the ditch he believed that it would continue to flow to Trott Brook.

Frank Miske, 17421 Gibbon Street NW, stated that water even reaches high levels at certain times and could also be a concern for overflowing. He stated that the issues on Gibbon Street did not occur until the Iguana Street area was developed. He suggested instead that perhaps the Iguana Street area be routed in the other direction rather than routing their water towards Gibbon Street.

Cassandra Miske, 17421 Gibbon Street NW, confirmed that there is a culvert that drains into the ditch in their yard. She stated that it appears that their yard is the end spot for drainage and that is why she believes they have flooding of their yard. She questioned if the capacity of the ponds in the area could be increased.

Amber Pederson, 17441 Gibbon Street NW, was also present and confirmed that there is a culvert on her property as well.

Civil Engineer II Linton stated would cause the basements in that area to flood as the wetland elevation is currently equal to that of the basements in the area. He stated that this development was platted in 1979, before the creation of the Lower Rum River Water Management Organization (LRRWMO) and before the existing regulations of the City were in existence. He stated that if the development were to come in now the homes would look a lot different as the lowest floor elevation would need to be two feet above the wetland.

Mr. Miske stated that the home at 17540 Gibbon Street regularly has standing water in the home.

Mrs. Miske stated that in previous meetings there was discussion of an infiltration basin.

City Engineer Westby stated that an infiltration basin would not provide much benefit in this situation given the high groundwater level.

Chairperson Riley stated that it is helpful that the homeowners are open to working with the City.

City Engineer Westby stated that this case has identified the three worst flooding areas within the City, acknowledging that the Gibbon Street area is the worst. He stated that staff can focus on Gibbon Street at this time and look at possible solutions in more detail, looking also into the Iguana Street area, to determine the options. He estimated that the solution mentioned could very well exceed a six-figure cost.

Mr. Miske acknowledged that a six-figure cost would be prohibitive and questioned what they are supposed to do in the long-term as their home is flooding.

Councilmember Shryock questioned if the homeowner is eligible for flood insurance and whether that helps.

Mrs. Miske stated that they are not actually located in the floodplain.

City Engineer Westby stated that residents of Ramsey are eligible for flood insurance since the City is enrolled in the National Flood Insurance Program. He stated that there are things that the homeowners could also do to help such as larger pumps and drain tile systems or back up pumps.

Councilmember Shryock questioned if the homeowners could dig deeper in their backyard to provide an area for the water to go.

Civil Engineer II Linton stated that three properties in addition to the homeowners present tonight have submitted flood reports to the City.

Mr. Miske stated that the home at 17540 Gibbon Street is not occupied so they would not have filed a report. He noted that some of the other homeowners did not want to submit a report.

Councilmember Johns confirmed that a retention pond would be investigated as a possible solution.

Mr. Miske stated that the cheaper solution may be to demolish the existing homes and rebuild.

City Engineer Westby stated that this item will be brought back on May 19<sup>th</sup>.

Civil Engineer II Linton provided a brief overview of the other two areas of flooding concern identified within the case, noting that the issues are less severe and the potential solutions would be costly.

City Engineer Westby stated that staff has spoken with neighboring cities but they do not have the same problems because they have more relief and elevation differential.

### **5.02: Consider the Surface Water Management Plan Update**

Civil Engineer II Linton reviewed the staff report and briefly summarized the results of the pipe and pond summary.

City Engineer Westby stated that City Administrator Ulrich could not attend this evening but had asked if there were any cost implications related to the updating of the Surface Water Management Plan. He stated there are no new mandates that will increase costs significantly, but incorporating the Atlas 14 stormwater data will have an impact on future costs as projects will be designed to a higher standard.

Motion by Councilmember Johns, seconded by Councilmember Shryock, to approve the updated Surface Water Management Plan and forward it to the City Council for approval.

Motion carried. Voting Yes: Chairperson Riley, Councilmembers Johns and Shryock. Voting No: None.

### **5.03: Consider Use of Sunwood Drive as Official Detour Route During Highway 10 and Armstrong Boulevard Interchange Construction**

City Engineer Westby reviewed the staff report and stated that bids on the Armstrong Interchange project were opened today and that construction will likely begin in early May and take one year to complete since Armstrong Boulevard will be closed between Sunwood Drive and Riverdale Drive. He reviewed the detour plan as bid with the project, which identifies Bunker Lake Boulevard as the official detour route between Armstrong Boulevard and Ramsey Boulevard. He stated the purpose of this case is to determine if there is interest in requesting that the official detour be changed from Bunker Lake Boulevard to Sunwood Drive. He explained that usually the County prefers to use County Roads for detours. He stated that staff asked the County if they would consider changing the detour route and were advised that they might consider such a request if submitted in writing. He noted that if approved by the County there may be additional conditions, such as a damage claim waiver. He stated that there would not be

an impact to project costs as the signage would simply be placed in a different area. He stated that while some additional traffic would be generated along Sunwood Drive if chosen as the official detour, especially early in the project, some people will still choose to take Bunker Lake Boulevard if they find Sunwood Drive is not as convenient or timely. He stated that staff does not have a recommendation as they believe the vast majority of drivers will select their construction detour routes based on needs and preferences and not on signage, and given the low volume of pedestrian traffic crossing Sunwood Drive.

Councilmember Johns stated that it would not hurt to have additional drivers going past the businesses on Sunwood Drive.

Councilmember Shryock stated that her concern would be that some drivers are not familiar with roundabouts. She did believe that there may be a short-term benefit to the businesses but was concerned with possible safety issues.

Chairperson Riley agreed with the comments made by Councilmember Shryock, noting that he would not want to push that amount of traffic down Sunwood Drive because of safety concerns.

Motion by Councilmember Shryock, seconded by Chairperson Riley, to recommend leaving the official detour route along Bunker Lake Boulevard.

Motion carried. Voting Yes: Chairperson Riley, Councilmembers Shryock and Johns. Voting No: None.

#### **5.04: Business Signage for Armstrong Interchange Detour**

Public Works Superintendent Riemer reviewed the staff report and displayed examples of signs used during construction to identify local businesses. He advised that the banner type sign would have a time limitation, additional cost, and would require additional approval from the Council to be located in the right-of-way.

Councilmember Johns stated that she likes the white sign with the business names.

Councilmember Shryock agreed that she prefers the white sign. She suggested installing the sign right away.

Public Works Superintendent Riemer confirmed that the white sign could be made in house and could be produced in one to two days. He identified the most effective placement of the business signs.

City Engineer Westby questioned if another sign should be placed at Ramsey Boulevard.

Public Works Superintendent Riemer confirmed that an additional sign could be placed at Highway 10 and Ramsey Boulevard.

Chairperson Riley believed that this should be communicated to the businesses to show that the City is being supportive during the period of construction.

City Engineer Westby stated that the *Ramsey Resident* will soon be published and will include an article on the interchange. He advised that there will be a website for the interchange project and noted that link will be mentioned in the article. He stated that a statement can be added noting that the City is going above and beyond with the business signage.

Motion by Councilmember Johns, seconded by Councilmember Shryock, to recommend that the City Council approve Alternative #2, City to fabricate and install local business access signs.

Motion carried. Voting Yes: Chairperson Riley, Councilmembers Johns and Shryock. Voting No: None.

#### **5.05: Consider Street and Pedestrian Facility Lighting Plans – Center Street and Riverdale Drive**

City Engineer Westby reviewed the staff report, which includes lighting plans for the Center Street and Riverdale Drive projects. He reviewed the purpose of the lighting improvements and the proposed lighting plans for the Center Street project noting that TOD grant funds are proposed to fund the lighting improvements which will match the lights throughout the COR.

Councilmember Johns questioned the spacing on the lights.

City Engineer Westby stated that the lights along Center Street would be roughly 80 to 90 feet apart, similar to the spacing of lights along Sunwood Drive.

Councilmember Johns preferred that the lights be aligned directly across from each other as shown in the layout dated 2/24/15.

Councilmember Shryock stated that most other intersections have four lights and questioned why only two lights are proposed for the intersection of Center Street and 145<sup>th</sup> Avenue.

City Engineer Westby stated that it is currently unknown whether 145<sup>th</sup> Avenue will ultimately be extended to the west, and he noted that this intersection will not be as busy as the intersections along Sunwood Drive.

Councilmember Shryock questioned if lighting will be continued on the two one-way roadways along Ramsey Parkway in the future.

City Engineer Westby stated that he is not aware of any plans to light Ramsey Parkway at this time, but noted that the trail in the island between the two one-way roads is lit.

Councilmember Shryock stated that perhaps an additional light should be placed in the area where the trail crosses Center Street at Ramsey Parkway.

City Engineer Westby confirmed that an additional light could be added at the crossing if that is the direction of the Committee.

He then discussed the purpose and proposed lighting plans for the Riverdale Drive project which includes 27 street lights and 27 pedestrian trail lights to ensure there are no long stretches of dark spots along the trails. He advised that the cost for this project would be funded through the street lighting fund.

Chairperson Riley stated he would support the least number of lights that gets the job done, which appears to be what staff has proposed.

Motion by Chairperson Riley, seconded by Councilmember Johns, to recommend that the City Council approve the Public Works Committee's preferred lighting system for Center Street including opposing lights between Sunwood Drive and 145<sup>th</sup> Avenue, tall street lights at each corner of the intersection of Center Street and 145<sup>th</sup> Avenue, and adding a light for the Center Street pedestrian crossing at Ramsey Parkway, and as proposed by staff for Riverdale Drive.

Motion carried. Voting Yes: Chairperson Riley, Councilmembers Johns and Shryock. Voting No: None.

#### **5.06: Request Installation of Priority Street Light at Nowthen Boulevard and Iodine Street**

Public Works Superintendent Riemer reviewed the staff report and stated that a streetlight is proposed for the intersection to provide a safety benefit, as there is currently only a pedestrian light.

Motion by Councilmember Shryock, seconded by Councilmember Johns, to recommend that the City Council approve installation of a LED priority street light on the north side of Nowthen Boulevard near Iodine Street to the existing pole.

Motion carried. Voting Yes: Chairperson Riley, Councilmembers Shryock and Johns. Voting No: None.

### **6. COMMITTEE / STAFF INPUT**

Public Works Superintendent Riemer provided an update on street sweeping, noting that staff is ahead of schedule because of the warm weather. He advised that spring flushing will begin April 6<sup>th</sup> and will be a three-week process. He also provided an update on spray patching which was also completed.

Chairperson Riley referenced the trail in front of Stoney River and asked for additional information.

City Engineer Westby provided additional information, acknowledging that a marked crosswalk for TH 47 does not exist for this trail, that MnDOT wants to investigate trail gaps around this intersection before approving a crosswalk design, and that “Trail Closed” signs are in place.

Chairperson Riley referenced the woods near Stoney River along 47 and stated that there are a number of trees down most likely from a storm and questioned if there is anything that can be done. He stated that perhaps the City could assist in that cleanup effort.

Civil Engineer II Linton stated that he can provide exhibits if any Councilmembers want to go out to Gibbon Street to review the drainage issues discussed earlier.

## **7. ADJOURNMENT**

Motion by Councilmember Johns, seconded by Councilmember Shryock, to adjourn the Public Works Committee meeting.

Motion carried.

The regular meeting of the Public Works Committee adjourned at 8:19 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Grant Riemer  
Public Works Superintendent

Drafted by Amanda Staple  
*TimeSaver Off Site Secretarial, Inc.*

**Public Works Committee**

5. 1.

**Meeting Date:** 05/19/2015

**By:** Bruce Westby, Engineering/Public Works

**Title:**

Consider Recommending Council Approval of draft Assessment Agreement for Ridgepoint Residential Development Public Improvements, Improvement Project 15-21

**Purpose/Background:**

**Purpose:**

The purpose of this case is to consider recommending Council approval of a draft Assessment Agreement for constructing proposed public improvements for the Ridgepoint seven (7) unit single-family residential development, Improvement Project #15-21.

**Background:**

As provided in City Code, Village Bank, owner of real property upon which the Ridgepoint seven (7) unit single-family residential development is proposed to be constructed, has requested the City of Ramsey to construct the required public improvements in support of the Ridgepoint development, after which Village Bank will repay the City over a three (3) year term as established in the Assessment Agreement.

**Timeframe:**

Staff estimates this case will take approximately 30 minutes to present and discuss.

**Observations/Alternatives:**

**Observations:**

The City's use of Chapter 429 assessed improvements has been limited in the past decade, with the Legacy Christian Academy project, done about 5 years ago, being the most recent example. This project installed improvements to the Bunker Lake Road and Armstrong interchange area, extended Bunker lake Road to the west, and constructed a connection to Alpine Drive with Puma Street. That was a 429 project of much larger scale and the City issued a G.O. bond to back the project. This process was used more in the past, when it was easier for a developer to get a financial guarantee (e.g., letter of credit), and the City tax-exempt financing had a bigger interest rate advantage than it does now.

In this case, the Village Bank wishes to develop the property, and the bank claims regulations prohibit the bank from directly using its money to fund development projects. They will be posting 110% government-back securities, pledged to the City, to cover the cost of the project. Consequently, there is virtually no risk to the City. In addition, assessments are still levied against the property. In this current economic environment (i.e., low interest rates, tight credit) it is unlikely a private developer will use this method. The bank is in a unique position because they cannot act as the "developer" per se, and have strong assets that can be pledged to the City as collateral. Private developers are not able to tie-up that much capital in providing the financial guarantees required by the City. A potential benefit to the City is greater control over the development and construction process.

According to the City Attorney, the City is not obligated to approve a request to use assessments as the means for financing improvements.

City code speaks of the subdivider opting to have the City construct improvements, but the City Attorney's opinion is that such an option is only available if the City allows it. A developer cannot force a City to build streets, sewers, and other public improvements. However, there needs to be a negotiated agreement if the City agrees to do the work and assess the costs. The City ordinances also point out that the City reserves the right to install

improvements “as it may elect and upon such terms and conditions as it may deem appropriate under the circumstances.” The bank has the option of selling the parcel to a private party for development, and would likely lose some economic benefit.

Village Bank utilized the engineering consulting firm of Hakanson Anderson to prepare final design plans and specifications for the public improvements. Staff has preliminarily reviewed final plans and specifications as prepared by Hakanson Anderson and finds them to be acceptable for the purposes of constructing the proposed public improvements. Hakanson Anderson also prepared an Engineer’s estimate based on their plans in the amount of \$482,222, and with contingencies, the estimated construction cost is \$554,555. The final amount reflected in the agreement will be based on actual bid costs, plus a small contingency.

The City will also assess the property owner for City staff time required to administer construction, which includes inspections. This cost will be assessed at 5.5% of project costs. Similarly, construction testing will also be assessed at 2% of construction costs.

**Alternatives:**

Alternative Action #1 – Motion to recommend Council approval of the draft Assessment Agreement for Ridgepoint residential development public improvements, Improvement Project 15-21 as proposed

Alternative Action #2 – Motion to recommend Council approval of the draft Assessment Agreement for Ridgepoint residential development public improvements, Improvement Project 15-21 with modifications as follows:

Alternative Action #3 – Motion to recommend Council denial of the draft Assessment Agreement.

**Funding Source:**

City Improvement Project 15-21 is proposed to be funded from the Public Improvement Revolving (PIR) fund, which would then be paid back over a three (3) year term from special assessments levied against Village Bank via the adopted Assessment Agreement.

**Recommendation:**

Staff supports any of the three alternative actions.

**Action:**

Motion to recommend Council approval or denial of the draft Assessment Agreement for Ridgepoint residential development public improvements, Improvement Project 15-21

---

**Attachments**

Draft Assessment Agreement

---

**Form Review**

<b>Inbox</b>	<b>Reviewed By</b>	<b>Date</b>
Patrick Brama	Patrick Brama	05/14/2015 03:02 PM
Grant Riemer	Grant Riemer	05/14/2015 03:10 PM
Kurt Ulrich	MaryJo Warner	05/14/2015 03:47 PM
Form Started By: Bruce Westby		Started On: 05/14/2015 12:35 PM
Final Approval Date: 05/14/2015		

---

(reserved for recording)

### ASSESSMENT AGREEMENT

THIS ASSESSMENT AGREEMENT (this “Agreement”) is made this \_\_\_\_ day of May, 2015, by and between **City of Ramsey**, a Minnesota municipal corporation (the “City”) with offices at 7550 Sunwood Drive N.W., Ramsey, Minnesota 55303, and **Village Bank**, a Minnesota bank with offices at 3350 Bridge Street, St. Francis, Minnesota, 55070 (“Owner”), and is based on the following facts:

- A. Owner is the owner of fee title to the Property, as defined in Exhibit A, attached hereto.
- B. Owner has applied to the City for approval of a subdivision of the Property into Lots 1-7, Ridgepoint, Anoka County, Minnesota (the “Plat”).
- C. The City has approved the Plat subject to certain conditions as specified in that certain Development Agreement between the City and Owner, dated \_\_\_\_\_ (the “Development Contract”), which contemplates that the City and Owner will enter into this Agreement.
- D. The Owner desires to have certain public improvements constructed to serve the Property as described in Exhibit B (the “Improvement Project”). The plans and specifications for the Improvement Project are completed.
- E. The Owner desires to have the City construct the Improvement Project without notice of hearing or hearing on the special assessments levied to finance the Improvement Project, and to levy up to \$ \_\_\_\_\_ of the cost of the Improvement Project against the Property.
- F. The City is willing to construct the Improvement Project without certain notices or hearings, provided that assurances and covenants stated below are made by the Owner to ensure that the City will have valid and collectable special assessments as they relate to the Property to finance all of the actual costs of the Improvement Project at no cost to the City.
- G. Were it not for the assurances and covenants provided in this Agreement, the City would not construct the Improvement Project without such notices and hearings and is doing so solely at the behest, and for the benefit, of the Owner.

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the facts stated above, the mutual promises and agreements set forth below, and for other good and valuable consideration, the receipt and sufficiency of which are hereby acknowledged by the City and Owner, the parties hereby agree as follows:

1. Recitals Incorporated. The facts stated above are hereby incorporated into this Agreement and made a part of this Agreement by this reference.
2. Definitions. Capitalized terms used but not defined in this Agreement are defined as provided in the Development Contract.
3. Petition. The Owner hereby petitions the City for construction of the Improvement Project.
4. Authority. The Owner represents and warrants that it is the owner of 100 percent of the Property, that it has full legal authority to encumber the Property as provided in this Agreement, and that as of the date of this Agreement, it has fee simple absolute title in the Property, which is not subject to any liens, interests or encumbrances, except as listed in Exhibit C.
5. Waiver of Hearings. The Owner waives notice of hearing and hearing pursuant to Minn. Stat. section 429.031, on the Improvement Project, notice of hearing and hearing on the special assessments levied to finance the Improvement Project pursuant to Minn. Stat. section 429.061, and any notice of hearing or procedure specified under the City Charter, and specifically requests that the Improvement Project be constructed and special assessments be levied against the Property without hearings.
6. Waiver of Appeal or Reapportionment. The Owner waives the right to appeal the levy of the special assessments in accordance with this Agreement pursuant to Minn. Stat. section 429.081, or reapportionment thereof upon land division pursuant to Minn. Stat. section 429.071, subd. 3, or otherwise, and further specifically agrees with respect to such special assessments against the Property or reapportionment that:
  - a. Any requirements of Minn. Stat. chapter 429 or the City Charter with which the City does not comply are hereby waived by the Owner;
  - b. The increase in fair market value of the Property resulting from construction of the Improvement Project will be at least equal to the cost of the Improvement Project as set forth herein, and that such increase in fair market value is a special benefit to the Subject Property;
  - c. Assessment of the above-specified cost of the Improvement Project against the Subject Property is reasonable, fair and equitable and there are no other properties against which such cost should be assessed.
7. No Deferral. Owner represents and warrants that the Property is not so classified for tax purposes as to result in deferral of the obligation to pay special assessments, and Owner agrees that it will take no action to secure such tax status of the Property during the term of this Agreement.

8. Assessment. The Owner requests that up to \$\_\_\_\_\_ of the actual cost of the Improvement Project be assessed against the Property created by the Plat as follows:

Parcel Description	Area	Allocation %	Assessment Amount
Lot 1	38,122	22.82	
Lot 2	19,413	11.62	
Lot 3	20,349	12.18	
Lot 4	27,677	16.57	
Lot 5	17,456	10.46	
Lot 6	22,422	13.42	
Lot 7	21,594	12.93	
<b>Total</b>	167,033	100.0	

The composition of the maximum amount of the cost of the Improvement Project is set forth in Exhibit B.

9. Payment of Assessment. The Assessment for the Plat shall be payable in equal semi-annual installments over a period of three (3) years with the first installment due May 15, 2016, and subsequent installments due May 15 and October 15 each year. If the improvements are not completed and actual costs are not determined by November of 2015, the first installment will be due May 15, 2017. The fixed interest rate applied to the Assessment shall be set at the five (5) year U.S. Treasury rate on the date of this agreement plus 2 percentage points.
10. Collateral. The assessment will be pledged at 110% of the principal amount of the assessment using government backed securities rated at least A or higher that will be pledged in the City of Ramsey's name and can only be released by an authorized signer of the City of Ramsey.
11. Successors and Assigns. The covenants, waivers and agreements contained in this Agreement shall bind the successors and assigns of the Owner and shall run with the Property and bind all its successors in interest. It is the intent of the parties hereto that this Agreement be in a form that is recordable among the land records of Anoka County, Minnesota, and they agree to make any changes in this Agreement that may be necessary to effect the recording and filing of this Agreement against the title of the Property.
12. Termination. This Agreement shall terminate upon the final payment of all special assessments levied against the Property from the Improvement Project. The City shall then execute and deliver such documents, in recordable form, as are necessary to extinguish its rights hereunder.
13. City Option to Terminate. The City reserves the right to opt out of this Agreement if the cost of the Improvements exceeds the Assessment Amount prior to execution of this Agreement.
14. Counterparts. This Agreement may be executed in multiple counterparts, each of which shall be an original, but all of which together shall constitute a single agreement.
15. Exclusions. The assessment shall not include any costs related to construction of the public utilities (sanitary sewer and water supply) included in the plans for the purpose of serving a portion of the City of Anoka. All such costs are to be borne by the City of Anoka per the executed Joint Powers Agreement between the City of Anoka and the City of Ramsey.





## Exhibit A

### Legal Description of the Property

#### PROPERTY IDENTIFICATION NUMBER AND LEGAL DESCRIPTION

The subject property has been assigned the following PID numbers by Anoka County:

35-32-25-31-0034  
35-32-25-31-0036

The property is legally described as follows:

That part of Lots 26 & 27, Auditors Subdivision No. 96 lying sely of the following described line: beginning at the intersection of the shoreline of the Mississippi River and a line parallel with and 75 feet sely of the sely line of Lot 7, Dickensons Mississippi Estates - as measured along the sely extension of the nely line of said Lot 7; thence nwly along said sely extension - 75 feet to the NE corner of said Lot 7; thence nely along the nely extension of said sely line - 66 feet to the nely right of way line of Rivlyn Avenue; thence sely along said right of way line to a point 500 feet sely as measured along said right of way line of intersection of said right of way line with the sely right of way line of Poplar Drive, now known as Astugsten Street NW; thence nely parallel with said sely right of way line to the intersection with the following described line also known as Line "A"; commencing at the SE corner of Lot 13, said Auditors Subdivision; thence swly along the swly extension of the sely line of said Lot 13 - 260 feet to the point of beginning of said line; thence ely at an interior angle to the NE of 91 degrees, 30 minutes - 427.1 feet and there terminating. Thence sely along said Line "A" to its point of termination; thence nely deflecting to the left 66 degrees, 50 minutes - 49 feet; thence nely deflecting to the right 36 degrees, 24 minutes - 50.8 feet; thence deflecting right 13 degrees, 50 minutes - 51 feet; thence ely deflecting left 66 degrees 50 minutes - 51 feet; thence nly deflecting to the left 74 degrees, 4 minutes - 168.1 feet; thence ely deflecting to the right 90 degrees, 26 minutes - 99 feet; thence nly deflecting left 89 degrees, 25 minutes - 163.1 feet to the nly line of said Lot 26 and there terminating - and lying nwly of the following described line; beginning at the most nly corner of Lot 14, said Auditors Subdivision - thence swly along the nwly line of said Lot 14 to the most wly corner thereof; thence sely along the swly line of said Lot 14 to the most wly corner thereof; thence sely along the swly line of said Lot 14 to the intersection with a line parallel with and 150 feet nwly of as measured at right angles of the swly extension of the sely line of said Lot 14; thence swly along said parallel line - 500 feet; thence swly deflecting to the right 45 degrees - 900 feet +/- to the shoreline of the Mississippi River and there terminating. Except that part thereof lying sly & wly of Rivlyn Avenue - subject to easements of record.

And - Outlot A Dickensons Mississippi Estate 2<sup>nd</sup> Addition to Anoka County.

**Exhibit B**

**Improvement Project Costs**

<b><u>Bid Prices</u></b>	
Sanitary sewer (incl. trunk, lateral, and service stubs)	\$ _____
Watermain (incl. trunk, lateral, and service stubs)	\$ _____
Storm drainage facilities	\$ _____
Streets (incl. concrete C&G and lot grading)	\$ _____
Trail development	\$ _____
Street striping and signing	\$ _____
Street lights	\$ _____
Sub-total	\$ _____
<b><u>Contingency Costs</u></b>	
10% Contingency	\$ _____
Sub-total	\$ _____
<b><u>Engineering Costs</u></b>	
5.5% City Construction Administration/Inspection	\$ _____
2.0% City Construction Testing	\$ _____
Sub-total	\$ _____
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>\$ _____</b>

**Exhibit C**

**Liens and Encumbrances**

**Public Works Committee**

6. 1.

**Meeting Date:** 05/19/2015

**By:** Bruce Westby, Engineering/Public Works

---

**Title:**

Review of Trail Maintenance Policy Framework

**Purpose/Background:**

**Purpose:**

The purpose of this case is to review the framework that staff proposes to use in developing the City of Ramsey’s draft Trail Maintenance Policy.

**Background:**

The City of Ramsey maintains over 50 miles of paved trails. Currently, maintenance of these trails occurs sporadically on an “as-budgeted” basis. While this approach provides the greatest flexibility from a budgeting perspective, it does not result in the most cost-effective approach to maintaining our trail system, nor does it result in a trail system having a consistent or reasonable pavement rating/level of service. Staff is therefore developing a draft Trail Maintenance Policy that, if followed, will allow the City of Ramsey to maintain its existing system of trails to a specified level of service in as cost-effective a manner as possible. The policy framework below is proposed to be utilized by staff to develop the draft policy.

Trail Inventory –

To maintain the City’s existing system of trails as cost-effectively as possible, each trail segment must be inventoried and cataloged in a database to be maintained and updated by staff on a regular basis. This database will include the initial year of construction, termini points, type of pedestrian ramp, length, width, surfacing type, pavement section, pavement rating, and maintenance schedule for each trail segment, which is very similar to our street maintenance program database. This database does not currently exist but staff is currently in the process of inventorying our trails and should have the database fully developed by the end of this summer.

Trail Rating System –

Staff proposes to use the same pavement rating system as used to rate our public streets which is the Pavement Surface Evaluation and Rating (PASER) system. Staff is already familiar with this system so it would be a simple and cost-effective system to implement for rating the pavement condition on our trails.

Trail Maintenance Improvement Strategy –

Staff proposes to employ a similar strategy for maintaining trails as is used to maintain City streets. This primarily involves focusing our efforts on first maintaining all trail segments currently in good condition to prevent them from quickly sliding into a state of disrepair thereby requiring more expensive maintenance treatments, while targeting a fixed mileage of trail segments requiring overlay or reconstruction projects on an annual basis to slowly re-build our trail system to a specified level of service using an average PASER rating as identified by Council.

As part of the City’s trail maintenance program, various segments of paved trails having good or excellent ratings will be proposed to receive cracksealing, fogsealing, and/or sealcoating improvements on an annual basis to extend the useful life of these trail segments, while trail segments in poor condition will either receive overlays or be reconstructed to return these trails to an excellent condition whereby they can be more cost-effectively maintained in the future.

The benefits of each proposed maintenance treatment are as follows:

- Cracksealing - Seals existing cracks one-quarter of an inch or more in width with hot rubberized asphalt to

extend pavement life. This prevents stormwater runoff from infiltrating through the pavement and into the underlying subgrade. As stormwater runoff enters pavement through cracks it can wash finer aggregate particles to the bottom of the aggregate base creating voids over time. Then as water accumulates in the underlying subgrade, frost heaving can occur during cold-weather months, further damaging the pavement.

- Fogsealing / Sealcoating - Protects and preserves pavement by sealing the surface to protect it from the negative effects of the sun (oxidizes the pavement), stormwater runoff (strips oil from the pavement), and petroleum products deposited on the pavement, all of which cause the pavement to become brittle and crack over time.
- Overlays - Strengthens the pavement section by restoring a portion of the structural integrity of the pavement, while also helping to prevent moisture intrusion.
- Reconstructions - Restores trails to a new condition.

Staff proposes to construct ADA compliant pedestrian curb ramps to existing trail segments during maintenance operations at such time as the abutting trail segment receives an overlay or is reconstructed, or when the street the trail connects to receives an overlay or is reconstructed.

#### Estimated Costs –

Estimated costs will be dependent on numerous factors as discussed herein. After staff receives direction from the Public Works Committee tonight, estimated costs will be discussed with the Committee at the time the draft Trail Maintenance Policy is presented.

#### Financing Options –

Financing options for funding trail maintenance operations include annual budgeting through the general levy, purchasing General Obligation (GO) bonds on a project by project basis, or applying Park and Trail funds as applicable. Public - private partnerships (PPPs) are another option that might be applicable in limited instances. Each option has benefits and limitations which will be discussed in more detail when the draft Trail Maintenance Policy is presented to the Committee for review.

#### **Timeframe:**

Approximately 25 minutes for presentation and discussion. Approximately 20 minutes, including presentation.

#### **Observations/Alternatives:**

Staff requests Committee direction/feedback on any of the proposed policy framework discussed herein. Based on the feedback received tonight, staff will prepare a draft Trail Maintenance Policy for future consideration by the Public Works Committee.

#### **Funding Source:**

Proposed funding sources will be identified within the draft policy. Staff requests input on this item from the Committee.

#### **Recommendation:**

Staff recommends that the Public Works Committee provide as much direction to staff as possible to allow staff to develop a draft Policy that best reflects the desires of the Committee which will aid in future reviews.

#### **Action:**

Committee input is requested on all aspects of staff's proposed framework as discussed within this report.

---

#### **Attachments**

*No file(s) attached.*

---

#### **Form Review**

**Inbox**

Patrick Brama

Grant Riemer

Kurt Ulrich

Form Started By: Bruce Westby

Final Approval Date: 05/14/2015

**Reviewed By**

Patrick Brama

Grant Riemer

MaryJo Warner

**Date**

05/14/2015 03:10 PM

05/14/2015 03:15 PM

05/14/2015 03:47 PM

Started On: 03/06/2015 07:26 AM