

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

The Public Works Committee conducted a regular meeting on Tuesday, January 16, 2018, at the Ramsey Municipal Center, 7550 Sunwood Drive NW, Ramsey, Minnesota.

Members Present: Chairperson Chris Riley
 Councilmember Jill Johns
 Councilmember Mark Kuzma

Also Present: Public Works Superintendent Grant Riemer
 Parks and Assistant Public Works Superintendent Mark Riverblood
 City Engineer Bruce Westby
 Community Development Director Timothy Gladhill

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Riley called the regular meeting of the Public Works Committee to order at 5:36 p.m.

2. CITIZEN INPUT

There was none.

3. APPROVE AGENDA

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

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

4. APPROVE MINUTES

4.01: Approve November 21, 2017, Meeting Minutes

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

Regular Meeting Minutes dated November 21, 2017

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

5. COMMITTEE BUSINESS

5.01: North Commons Neighborhood Trail or Street Link at Zeolite Street

Parks and Assistant Public Works Superintendent Riverblood reviewed the staff report and stated that the purpose of this case is to assess the Committee's opinion on the development of a short trail segment to link an existing neighborhood to The COR west of North Commons. He displayed a location map and reported the Park & Recreation Commission recommended that the trail concept be pursued.

Parks and Assistant Public Works Superintendent Riverblood explained this short trail link could advance for Council consideration in terms of a mailer for public notification. While the project scope is not fully developed at this time, it is estimated the cost may be less than \$30,000 for the bituminous trail, ADA pedestrian ramps, and trees with naturalized pollinator landscape. He noted this trail would connect neighborhoods, expand across to the playground and community gardens in North Commons, and allow more residents' access to The COR on foot or by bicycle.

Councilmember Kuzma asked the funding source.

Parks and Assistant Public Works Superintendent Riverblood replied that the park trust fund would be used to fund the project and confirmed that there are sufficient funds available.

Councilmember Johns stated that it makes sense to connect that development, and those homes, to The COR.

Councilmember Kuzma asked if there would be an expense to the owner to vacate as discussed.

Parks and Assistant Public Works Superintendent Riverblood stated that there would be some staff time (City cost) for the ordinance that would be prepared. He noted that the additional space would provide flexibility to the homeowners as it could allow an accessory structure, such as a shed, to be built in an area where it currently could not because of the reduced setback that will be available. He explained that currently the property owners are mowing but cannot do anything inside of that area. He stated that the trail option would also provide an emergency access, should that be needed.

Chairperson Riley asked if this would be considered the highest value connection.

Parks and Assistant Public Works Superintendent Riverblood replied that it would not be a high priority but would be more of a low hanging fruit because of the low cost. He stated that the project could be done fairly easy and would provide connectivity, also noting that minimal maintenance would be needed.

Motion by Councilmember Kuzma, seconded by Councilmember Johns, to recommend that the City Council notify public via a mailer to gain input on development of a short trail segment to link an existing neighborhood to The COR west of North Commons.

Further discussion: It was noted that staff should reach out to the two specific property owners if those property owners do not reply to the mailer.

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

5.02: Recommend Authorization for Civil Engineering Planning Services for Highway 10 Planning Effort

Community Development Director Gladhill reviewed the staff report and stated that the purpose of this case is to consider recommending that the City Council authorize a work order with Bolton and Menk to perform planning and engineering services related to future Highway 10 design. He stated staff is only seeking approval for Phase 1 (project justification, concepts, evaluation) not Phase II (vision refinement, preliminary design, funding). He explained that staff has already completed three rounds of refining the scope and scaled back on renderings/visualizations, public meetings, and communication assistance.

Community Development Director Gladhill described the scale and magnitude of the project, noting it is a significant investment with total capital costs of the improvements themselves being over \$70 million.

Community Development Director Gladhill presented alternatives for the Committee's consideration and stated staff recommends proceeding forward with the work order. Bolton and Menk was the engineer for the Highway 10 Access Planning Study so there are a number of efficiencies to use this same firm for this work order as opposed to bringing in a new firm.

Eric Johnson, Bolton and Menk, stated that the previous Highway 10 study had a different vision, focusing on a high-level idea that all parties could agree on. He highlighted some of the differences, noting the desire to have grade separations at the railroad crossings, which will be added as a new element rather than being an afterthought in the previous plan. He stated that this element will also look to the future, rather than just focusing on how the road operates today. He stated that they are pretty confident that the Anoka improvements will be fully funded in 2018 and therefore the improvements will be completed between 2020-2022. He noted that once those improvements are completed, the first stoplight will be at Sunfish Lake and that will become the next priority to fix on the system. He stated that the attempt would be to develop a plan that could gain support from the other communities as well, to ensure that funding could be obtained in the future.

Angie Bersaw, Bolton and Menk, stated that although the problem has been identified, this study will not only focus on the current problems but also on future problems. She stated that a key step in the planning stage would be to ensure that all road owners (Ramsey, Anoka County and MnDOT) can be on the same page. She explained that the first phase of the study will be to develop one vision and noted that the second phase would then dig deeper to determine the elements that would be necessary, which is why it would make sense to split the work into two phases as staff has suggested.

Councilmember Kuzma asked the timeline for this project. He asked how solid the plans would be as the Ramsey improvements would not occur until after the Anoka improvements are completed, noting the estimation that was given of 2022 for completion in Anoka.

Chairperson Riley agreed and asked the shelf life of the plans.

Mr. Johnson replied that the shelf life of the first phase would not expire. He believed that the second phase would have a three to five-year shelf life, until the point where staff would need to complete a quick update review to determine if design standards have changed.

Councilmember Kuzma asked if the engineering costs are included in the cost of development estimates.

Mr. Johnson replied the industry standard is 20 percent for design and delivery and believed that was included.

Community Development Director Gladhill stated that the City would push to have this cost included in the City's ultimate share of the project costs.

Chairperson Riley asked how this would be different than the traffic studies that were already completed.

Mr. Johnson stated that the traffic studies before were based on existing conditions. He stated that at that time it was determined that if MnDOT cannot afford to fix the problems of today, they certainly cannot afford to fix the problems of the future and therefore that element was not included in the previous study. He noted that this process would look further to determine the implications for the future to provide more solid results.

Ms. Bersaw stated that it is important to really determine the problem and how that may change to ensure that you build the right thing that will last. She stated that the modeling will give you the answers to ensure that you are not over building.

Chairperson Riley asked why they would study a no build situation.

Mr. Johnson replied that would give you the baseline and define the need to solve. He noted that it is also a part of the environmental review.

Community Development Director Gladhill noted that this would also show a measurable improvement to show that you would be solving the problem.

Councilmember Johns asked how far out this would project, whether this is a 20 or 40-year projection.

Ms. Bersaw stated that they typically look 20 to 25 years into the future. She stated that if you look beyond that you are making more assumptions than you can handle and therefore the results

become fuzzy. She stated that the traffic modeling would look at the overall network to determine alternate routes and capacity.

Mr. Johnson replied that the model for Highway 10 would be expanded and would be built from the model used by Anoka County for their Comprehensive Plan update. He stated that as other elements are “uncorked” it would unlock alternate routes that could free up capacity.

Councilmember Kuzma asked the funding source for this study.

Community Development Director Gladhill replied that the funding source would be the public improvement revolving fund.

Chairperson Riley asked for details on the number of concepts that would be provided.

Mr. Johnson replied that they will look at a variety of concepts reviewed and confirmed that there would be four concepts plus the no build provided.

Chairperson Riley stated that he is very concerned with the coalition and partners that have already decided that this is the best way, as it could seem that the City would be looking at alternate options.

Ms. Bersaw stated that there was not one answer provided through the access study. She stated that the study was high level, and this will delve into more detail to determine how the railroad would influence the plan and to find the option that would best solve the problem.

Mr. Johnson replied that he thinks this would be a welcome next step from the partnering agencies and municipalities.

Chairperson Riley stated that he would want to make it clear that if this moves forward, the City is working with the partners.

Councilmember Johns stated that this should be done sooner rather than later to provide some answers to local business owners and stakeholders.

Councilmember Kuzma stated that this study could also help to attract future businesses as well.

Chairperson Riley agreed that it will be important to be able to provide some answers of what is and what is not.

Community Development Director Gladhill stated that staff considered making a pitch to the legislature in attempt to gain funding to assist in phases one and two but noted that would delay the process by six months. He suggested to begin with phase one and make the ask of the legislature for phase two. He provided examples of similar actions that other communities are taking with their planning and funding requests for Highway 10 planning. He stated that the City will contribute to the funding of the design regardless, and therefore the City funding the first phase could be appropriate before making an ask of the legislature for future phases.

Councilmember Kuzma asked how this would interact with the efforts of Mr. Tinklenberg.

Community Development Director Gladhill stated that Mr. Tinklenberg believes that this is a necessary step and will help with the City's momentum. He noted that once there is more certainty in the planning, it will increase the priority ranking of the project.

Chairperson Riley asked for additional details on the planning that has been done for the rail crossings.

City Engineer Westby replied that the previous funding applications for the Ramsey rail applications used the cost estimate that was obtained from Anoka County. He stated that the City has not expended funds to do any additional design work on that. He stated that the more information, the better. He noted that the better the estimate and design work is, the higher ranking and more opportunity you will have. He stated that the City will no longer be competing with Anoka once their funding is completed. He explained that the additional design work will solve some of the unknowns including property acquisition costs and whether the crossings should be underpasses or overpasses.

Chairperson Riley asked if the coalition partners have looked at this design proposal.

Community Development Director Gladhill stated that staff first wanted to obtain support from the City Council prior to sharing that proposal. He noted that the partners are aware of the desire to complete the design work. He stated that the recommendation could be to move this forward, contingent on sharing the information with the design partners.

Councilmember Johns stated that perhaps the proposal could be shared with the partners prior to this moving forward to City Council.

Chairperson Riley noted that there are five public meetings scheduled and stated that seems like a lot of meetings.

Community Development Director Gladhill noted that the temperature of the public could be gauged as the process moves along and if that number of meetings is not needed, the schedule can be scaled down. He noted that some business owners and stakeholders like more one on one interaction while others like an open house meeting style. He noted that staff can scale back if that seems appropriate as this moves forward. He stated that all of these options are still within the overall vision. He stated that this would provide flexibility in that smaller pieces can be constructed individually, or they could also be partnered together. He noted that the details will provide a lot of information, and used the example of the cost for property acquisition. He stated that in some instances, a few feet make the difference between partial acquisition and whole parcel acquisition which have major cost differences.

Chairperson Riley stated that he would want to ensure that this is in line with the coalition and wants to prevent the perception that Ramsey is going rogue and working on their own project.

Motion by Councilmember Johns, seconded by Councilmember Kuzma, to recommend that the City Council authorize the work order with Bolton and Menk for Highway 10 Planning and Design Services in the amount of \$499,855, contingent upon staff sharing the information with the coalition.

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

Community Development Director Gladhill stated that he wanted to give the student group that worked on Highway 10 an opportunity to share some ideas and their framework.

Jonathan Reisetter stated that they were part of a land use planning class that worked on Highway 10, specific to Ramsey. He stated that as outsiders they see that Ramsey struggles for geographical notoriety, as the city was developed later and lacked a town center until more recently. He stated that the highway has served as a main street and thoroughfare and during their study they focused on image, business, and connections.

Chris Desroches stated that the image and connectability of Highway 10 do not match Ramsey. He explained that they looked at improving the aesthetic and the entrance to Ramsey. He noted that they would recommend creating a placemaking entrance to the City and carrying that throughout the City in order to better identify Ramsey; using the example of signage. He stated that another element would be the business aspect of Highway 10 and how that could be improved; working with the existing business owners. He recognized the high number of properties that are owned by the City, or have been vacant for over five years. He stated that there is a lot of traffic traveling through the City on Highway 10 and perhaps rather than holding the farmers market on a Thursday within The COR, that could be held on a Friday, on land adjacent to Highway 10, to take advantage of the traffic heading north.

Councilmember Kuzma asked if the signage used within The COR would be transferred into the Highway 10 corridor.

Chris Desroches replied that would be a question for the City to answer, whether they would like to continue that signage or create separate signage for the Highway 10 corridor.

Community Development Director Gladhill stated that the City could take their branding information and apply that to this concept.

Chris Desroches stated that Highway 10 is the main artery into Ramsey and therefore a lot of the experience is traveling through that corridor. He stated that you would want that theme to be something that people will remember. He advised that they also focused on connections and stated that currently there is a lot of way finding signage for business along the corridor. He noted that you would want to provide valuable connections to the places you want people to go.

Chairperson Riley asked if they have access to this information as this was a high-level presentation.

Community Development Director Gladhill noted that there will be an open house meeting next week with these posters, and additional ideas and concepts in poster format. He stated that the PDF format should be available at that time as well. He explained that this is simply a mid-way check-in and additional work will continue through the spring semester.

Chris Desroches stated that there are unique opportunities with community engagement, using signage. He explained that you can build a swell of momentum through community engagement, using the examples of asking the public for input or creating a contest.

Community Development Director Gladhill recognized that this would be a partnership, explaining that the City would improve the public realm while the private sector makes improvements along the corridor as well. He noted that he liked that this concept has set metrics identified as well, which are helpful for staff.

Councilmember Kuzma stated that he is a little concerned that this would create a conflict between the proposal and what exists in The COR. He stated that he does not see the existing design standards tied into the new concepts and noted that the City has spent a lot of money working on the design standards, while this seems to start fresh.

Jonathan Reisetter stated that they spent more time on the ideas for the highway, specifically leading people from the highway to The COR.

Community Development Director Gladhill noted that there has been some rebranding that took place and staff gave direction to look at something new rather than attempting to brand the corridor as The COR or under the current sign design regulations. He noted the difficulty that the parks department had in getting their signs approved.

Councilmember Kuzma stated that he does not disagree. He recognized that people outside of Ramsey are not aware of what The COR is or what it even stands for.

Community Development Director Gladhill explained that this will improve the marketing aspect of The COR while also focusing on Ramsey as a whole.

Chris Desroches stated that they are not branding or design experts, but planning students. He stated that they are coming up with the ideas and concepts and staff and the Council will need to provide additional details, and make additional decisions, as the process moves forward.

Jonathan Reisetter stated that they are excited to hear the feedback from the open house and from the PDF versions that will be distributed to the City.

Community Development Director Gladhill noted that this is a mid-year check in and PDFs are a required deliverable. He noted that the process will continue, and input will be obtained from the open house meetings. He stated that the poster format translates into the open house setting while the more detailed PDFs will be helpful for the City, Council, and other Boards/Commissions.

5.03: Provide City Council Recommendation for 2018 Crackseal and Sealcoat Improvements, Improvement Project #18-04

City Engineer Westby reviewed the staff report and purpose of the case to consider recommending City Council approval for 2018 Crackseal and Sealcoat Improvements, Improvement Project #18-04. He displayed maps depicting the proposed 2018 crackseal and sealcoat improvements and overall map of locations of all streets proposed to receive improvements, as well as individual project areas designated as Areas A-F. City Engineer Westby stated a total of 22.71 miles of public streets are proposed to receive crackseal and sealcoat improvements in 2018 in addition to fogsealing all cul-de-sacs in the project area.

Chairperson Riley referenced Map B, in which the City is only doing two small cul-de-sacs. He stated that seems inefficient and asked if it would be more efficient to instead include those areas with future improvements that are closer to that area.

City Engineer Westby replied that the cul-de-sacs are within one half mile to one mile from other areas proposed to be improved. He stated that those areas are recommended to be included in order to stay on a proper maintenance schedule.

Public Works Superintendent Riemer explained that this will be the first seals for those cul-de-sacs and therefore it is important to have those seals completed in order to stay on the proper maintenance schedule and receive the longest lifespan for the roadway surface.

City Engineer Westby presented the project cost summary, noting the current engineer's estimate for all proposed improvements is \$623,169.69. In order to ensure that as much of the \$500,000 budgeted for this work will be spent, staff proposes to split the project into a base bid including several project areas with a resultant estimated project cost of just under \$500,000, with the remaining areas being bid as alternate bids.

City Engineer Westby presented alternatives for the Committee's consideration and stated staff recommends approval for the 2018 Crackseal and Sealcoat Improvements, Improvement Project #18-04, with funding from the general fund using the \$500,000 that is budgeted annually for these improvements.

Motion by Councilmember Kuzma, seconded by Councilmember Johns, to recommend City Council approval for 2018 Crackseal and Sealcoat Improvements, Improvement Project #18-04.

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

5.04: Provide City Council Recommendation for Metropolitan Council Water Efficiency Potential Project

City Engineer Westby reviewed the staff report and purpose of the case to consider participating in a Metropolitan Council Water Efficiency Potential Project. He referenced the November 27, 2017, e-mail from the Metropolitan Council indicating a Water Efficiency Potential Project was

commissioned to assess the economic potential of whether an aggressive water conservation program could reduce a community's expansion of water supply to meet future residential needs.

City Engineer Westby noted that based on current water use data and project population growth, Ramsey ranks 19 out of all Twin Cities metro cities as a potential candidate community for economic analysis of potential peak water demand reduction. The Metropolitan Council believes the City of Ramsey can potentially benefit from such an analysis and would like to know if the City is willing to be included in the study.

City Engineer Westby presented alternatives for the Committee's consideration and stated staff recommends approval to participate in a Metropolitan Council Water Efficiency Potential Project. He suggested that action be made contingent upon a favorable response from the Metropolitan Council on whether the participation would not be related to required mandates.

Chairperson Riley agreed that is a very real concern or question. He stated that the best way to avoid that would be to not participate. He noted that one of the City's closest neighbors, Andover, is number one on the list and therefore the City could ask to see the recommendations from that City to determine what could be done in Ramsey.

Councilmember Kuzma noted that the population of Andover is higher than Ramsey.

City Engineer Westby agreed that Andover is 1.5 times larger than Ramsey in terms of the population served. He agreed that Andover may participate and could have some telling results.

Councilmember Johns noted that there could be some unique factors that could be helpful to the community, such as business makeup and peak times.

City Engineer Westby stated that it would be helpful to have apples to apples comparison for information but acknowledged that the results from Andover will be helpful. He stated that the City is working to increase water conservation efforts through the RCP program. He noted that staff does work directly with the Metropolitan Council on numerous water related issues. He stated that he would not be comfortable bringing this forward to the City Council without a favorable response from the Metropolitan Council.

Chairperson Riley stated that he would prefer not to participate and simply ask to see the results from Andover.

Councilmember Johns stated that if participation would be helpful and would not have a cost to the City, other than a few hours of staff time, and would not have any requirements that come along with it, she would support participation.

Councilmember Kuzma stated that if there is a favorable response that the City will not be required to do anything outside of the study he would support participation. He asked if participation in this study would gain additional support from the Metropolitan Council on regional water solutions.

City Engineer Westby stated that a City Council work session presentation is being planned for February regarding an option for the Met Council to complete a feasibility study at no cost to the City for a regional surface water treatment facility in Ramsey. He noted that the City would need to have at least two other neighboring communities as partners. He stated that the feasibility study will provide cost information on the possibility of a surface water treatment facility and noted that staff would continue to work with the Metropolitan Council on that possibility whether or not this study is approved.

Motion by Councilmember Kuzma, seconded by Councilmember Johns, to recommend City Council approval to participate in a Metropolitan Council Water Efficiency Potential Project, contingent that the results would be applied equally across the metro region.

Motion carried. Voting Yes: Councilmembers Johns and Kuzma. Voting No: Chairperson Riley.

5.05: Provide City Council Recommendation for MnDOT Delegated Contracting Process Agreement #1029992

City Engineer Westby reviewed the staff report and purpose of the case to consider approval of MnDOT Delegated Contracting Process Agreement #1029992. He explained that pursuant to Minnesota statutes, the Commissioner of Transportation must be appointed an agent of the City of Ramsey to accept Federal Aid funds that are awarded to the City for eligible transportation related projects. The City cannot directly accept awarded Federal Aid funds for such projects as they must be processed through MnDOT.

City Engineer Westby presented alternatives for the Committee's consideration and staff's recommendation for approval of MnDOT Delegated Contracting Process Agreement #1029992.

Councilmember Johns stated that she would prefer for this to come back to the Committee after the comments from the City Attorney are received.

City Engineer Westby stated that the agreements are written very differently and therefore it is hard to review the documents side by side.

Chairperson Riley asked if MnDOT allows changes to the letter.

City Engineer Westby replied that minimal changes may be allowed. He noted that typically most changes requested by the City are not allowed.

Councilmember Johns noted that the approval could be made contingent upon approval of the City Attorney.

Motion by Councilmember Johns, seconded by Councilmember Kuzma, to recommend City Council approval of MnDOT Delegated Contracting Process Agreement #1029992, contingent upon approval by the City Attorney.

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

6. COMMITTEE / STAFF INPUT

6.01: Staff Updates on Improvement Projects and Items of Interest

City Engineer Westby provided an update on current and proposed improvement projects.

Councilmember Kuzma referenced Puma Street and the intersection at Alpine. He asked if the sightlines have been reviewed to ensure safety.

City Engineer Westby stated that tree clearing operations west of this intersection began last year but proper erosion control measures were not installed prior to work beginning and therefore the work was not completed. He noted that the intent is to remove the remaining trees and knock down the hill to open the sightlines this spring. He continued to provide an update on the Puma Street utilities extension and the Bunker Lake Boulevard and Puma Street improvements. He provided an update on The COR regional infiltration basin development. He stated that additional Anoka County and MnDOT projects were included on the update list and noted that he will attempt to follow up on projects that have not seen progress attempting to gain further updates.

Councilmember Kuzma asked for an update on the flashing turn lights on Armstrong at Bunker.

City Engineer Westby noted that although the City approved the development of the plans, he was still awaiting information from Anoka County. He noted that once he sees the final cost estimates he would share that information with the Committee and City Council.

Chairperson Riley asked for an update on the plans in Anoka for 47 and Ferry Street. He stated that Ramsey should stay on top of those plans to ensure that something is not approved that would be detrimental for Ramsey.

City Engineer Westby stated that the last update he received was that Anoka is working on the preliminary design that would then be shelved until funding is made available.

Chairperson Riley stated that he would want to ensure that the plans would not negatively impact Ramsey.

City Engineer Westby stated that he would continue to follow up with Anoka.

City Engineer Westby stated that there was discussion at the November meeting regarding a drainage and utility easement and provided background information. He stated that the recommendation of the City Attorney is to pass a resolution restricting all use of the easement until such time a regional trail is available north of the property. He noted that he spoke with the property owner and the owner asked if there is something that can be done to simply restrict the

use by hunters. He noted that he is still awaiting a response from the City Attorney. He asked if the Committee would like to see the item again before it moves to the Council.

Chairperson Riley stated that the Committee made a decision and offered an alternative and therefore the easiest thing would be to do nothing. He stated that he does not see a reason to bring the case back to the Committee, or to Council.

Councilmember Johns agreed that the decision had been made. She noted that the property was received through park dedication and therefore the City is not interested in vacating the property.

Public Works Superintendent Riemer provided an update on the recent plowing activity.

Informational; no action required.

6.02: Review Future Topics Calendar

City Engineer Westby provided a summary of the Public Works Committee future topics calendar. He stated that he would also like to review the City's street maintenance program with the Committee at some time, if possible.

Councilmember Johns stated that perhaps that would be better received during a City Council worksession.

City Engineer Westby stated that the City Council worksessions tend to fill up and therefore there is not always enough time available.

Councilmember Riley requested that a review of the application of State Aid funds be placed on the calendar.

7. ADJOURNMENT

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

Motion carried.

The regular meeting of the Public Works Committee adjourned at 7:54 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Grant Riemer
Public Works Superintendent

Drafted by Amanda Staple

TimeSaver Off Site Secretarial, Inc.