

City of Ramsey
Agenda
Public Works Committee
Tuesday, October 15, 2019
5:30 pm
Lake Itasca Room, 7550 Sunwood Drive NW

1. **Call to Order**
2. **Citizen Input**
3. **Approve Agenda**
4. **Approve Minutes**
 1. Approve the following meeting minutes.
 1. Public Works Committee meeting dated September 17, 2019.
5. **Committee Business**
6. **Committee/Staff Input**
 1. Correction Regarding Water Efficiency Grant Program
 2. Staff Update on New Retainage Requirements for City Construction Contracts
 3. Staff Updates on Improvement Projects and Items of Interest
 4. Review Future Topics Calendar
7. **Adjournment**

Public Works Committee

4. 1.

Meeting Date: 10/15/2019

Submitted For: Grant Riemer, Engineering/Public Works

By: MaryJo Warner, Engineering/Public Works

Title:

Approve the following meeting minutes.

1. Public Works Committee meeting dated September 17, 2019.

Purpose/Background:

Purpose: To review and approve meeting minutes.

Background: Attached are the meeting minutes for review.

Timeframe:

5 minutes.

Observations/Alternatives:

n/a

Funding Source:

n/a

Recommendation:

To review and approve meeting minutes dated September 17, 2019.

Action:

Motion to approve meeting minutes dated September 17, 2019.

Attachments

Minutes

Form Review

| Inbox | Reviewed By | Date |
|---------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------------|
| Grant Riemer | Grant Riemer | 10/09/2019 10:04 AM |
| Kurt Ulrich | Kurt Ulrich | 10/10/2019 02:57 PM |
| Form Started By: MaryJo Warner | | Started On: 10/09/2019 09:28 AM |
| Final Approval Date: 10/10/2019 | | |

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

The Public Works Committee conducted a regular meeting on Tuesday, September 17, 2019, at the Ramsey Municipal Center, 7550 Sunwood Drive NW, Ramsey, Minnesota.

Members Present: Chairperson Mark Kuzma
 Councilmember Nadine Heinrich
 Councilmember Chris Riley

Also Present: Public Works Superintendent Grant Riemer
 City Engineer Bruce Westby
 Police Chief Jeff Katers

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Kuzma called the regular meeting of the Public Works Committee to order at 5:30 p.m.

2. CITIZEN INPUT

Bruce King, Alpine Acres Board member, stated that he has received a fair amount of inquiries about lowering the speed limit. He referred to the newly adopted State law which allows speed limits to be reduced to 25 mph and asked that the City reduce the speed limit. He noted that in the past the speed trailer was used to deter speeding vehicles, but the speeding just continues once the speed trailer is removed. He requested that the 25-mph speed limit be enacted within Alpine Acres. He confirmed that the spur streets are privately maintained, but there are City streets as well.

Councilmember Riley noted that if the change is made it would need to be enacted city wide and asked if the resident would also support that.

Mr. King stated that his concern is specific to Alpine Acres.

Chairperson Kuzma stated that patrol activity could be increased within the development in attempt to slow the speed of traffic.

Councilmember Riley stated that the people that are speeding are the people within that development and therefore it would be helpful for the homeowners' association to assist in policing that activity.

Mr. King agreed but noted that residents would not respond the same to the Association Board as they would to the City.

3. APPROVE AGENDA

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

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

4. APPROVE MINUTES

4.01: Approve July 16, 2019, Meeting Minutes

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

Regular Meeting Minutes dated July 16, 2019

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

5. COMMITTEE BUSINESS

5.01: Consider Lowering Speed Limit on Residential Roads

Public Works Superintendent Riemer stated that the current speed limit on residential roads is 30 mph. In the past this speed limit was set by the Commissioner of Transportation at MnDOT. Earlier this spring the State Legislature passed a law allowing the local road authority the ability to lower the speed limit on residential roads to 25 mph, if they so choose. A residential roadway is not defined to include all city streets in an area zoned exclusively for housing and are not collector or arterial streets. The change in definition of a residential roadway expands the ability of cities to designate such streets at 25 mph, pursuant to Minnesota Statutes, Section 169.14, Subdivision 2(7). Changing the speed limit on such a street no longer requires a traffic study by MnDOT, nor does it require an engineer analysis by the City. Cities may simply adopt the 25-mph speed limit by Council action, provided the roadway meets the new definition. After speaking with the City Attorney, he advised that any Council action to change the speed limits must be done by Ordinance, because only Ordinances are enforceable by law.

Public Works Superintendent Riemer stated that City staff receives numerous phone calls from residents with concerns about motorists that they feel are speeding in their neighborhoods. Staff from Public Works, Engineering, and the Police Department have discussed the issue and feel, if the City is able to change the speed limit on residential streets, it must be consistent city wide. Staff's reasoning is the cost of the additional signage would be prohibitive and enforcement for the PD would be difficult at best, if the speed limit changed from road section to road section.

Public Works Superintendent Riemer stated that staff does not have a strong recommendation on this issue and can support either speed limit that the Committee and ultimately Council decides

upon. There will be a fairly substantial labor component switching the speed limit signs over though and provided an estimated cost of \$27,000.

Councilmember Heinrich asked if the estimated cost would include the labor and materials.

Public Works Superintendent Riemer confirmed that cost would include both labor and materials. He noted that cost does not include neighborhood signs and therefore is just a rough estimate.

Councilmember Heinrich asked if the change in speed limits would increase the number of speed limit signs.

Public Works Superintendent Riemer confirmed that there would be an increase in signs as signs would be required within neighborhoods.

Police Chief Katers stated that staff discussed this topic and his position is that if the change is made it would be more effective, in terms of enforcement, if the change is made city wide. He explained that from a State point, drivers are taught that if an area is unmarked in a residential setting, the speed limit would be 30 mph, therefore additional neighborhood signs would be required. He noted that if the change is made there would need to be a focus on signage, education and enforcement. He stated that any reduction in speed could reduce potential injuries but asked the threshold that people are willing to accept. He stated that he does not have a strong opinion but in terms of enforcement, if a change is made, he would like it to remain consistent throughout Ramsey.

Councilmember Riley stated that he agrees that the entire City should remain consistent, where it is left at 30 or changed to 25 mph and confirmed the consensus of the Committee.

Chairperson Kuzma stated that it would seem difficult to change the speed limit city wide and did not believe there would be much difference between 25 mph and 30 mph. He stated that he is not in support of changing the speed limit and believed the associated cost to not be worth the benefit.

Councilmember Heinrich asked if there is any information on studies done in other communities that have lowered the speed limit.

Police Chief Katers replied that there have been a few studies but noted that this is all fairly new. He stated that the Minneapolis City Council reviewed this same action and believed that any decision should be delayed for at least one year. He stated that the limited area he researched, when the speed limit is dropped from 30 mph to 25 mph, there has been no significant change in the speed of the drivers.

Councilmember Riley stated that he has heard a lot of complaints related to speed and has always believed that 30 mph is too fast on purely residential streets. He stated that if it is going to be done, it should be applied consistently on all City streets. He noted that it appears that Public Works has already been to think about how this could strategically be done. He stated that he would be interested in this but would want to determine an effective date that would work cohesively with the schedule of Public Works staff. He noted that there are multiple outlets for

education of the public. He stated that he would be in favor of lowering the speed limit on residential roads to 25 mph.

Public Works Superintendent Riemer asked the allowed lag time after the adoption of an Ordinance.

Councilmember Riley acknowledged that two readings are required for an Ordinance but believed that an effective date of choice could be selected.

Chairperson Kuzma asked how this would be funded if approved.

Public Works Superintendent Riemer stated that the majority of cost would be labor. He stated that the activity would most likely need to be delayed until after January 1st in order to utilize the new 2020 budget.

Councilmember Heinrich stated that she has also received concerns from residents related to speed. She agreed that when walking through a neighborhood a vehicle traveling at 30 mph can feel high. She believed that lowering the speed limit to 25 mph would be difficult in terms of enforcement as people believe that the State standard for residential roads is 30 mph. She believed that there would be multiple challenges in implementing this change and was unsure Ramsey would be 100 percent ready for this change. She stated that perhaps the entire Council could be engaged on the topic in order to receive additional feedback.

Chairperson Kuzma stated that he would like to wait and see how it goes in other cities that enact the lower speed limit. He stated that if the change does not work, that additional cost was spent for nothing. He did not believe that signs would slow traffic down. He recommended that the City wait for the time being to review whether the change is effective in other communities.

Motion by Councilmember Riley to direct staff to begin developing a draft Ordinance to lower the speed limit to 25 mph on all residential streets.

Motion died for lack of second.

Public Works Superintendent Riemer noted that the League of Minnesota Cities is currently working on a guidance policy on this topic that could be helpful.

The Committee directed staff to bring the topic back for consideration in six months.

5.02: Recommend City Council Approval of Funding Program for Variolite Street Reconstruction, Improvement Project #20-01

City Engineer Westby stated that the 2.24-mile segment of Variolite Street between Alpine Drive and 173rd Avenue is proposed to be reconstructed in 2020. The pavement on this segment of Variolite Street is in poor condition. Only 13 properties have direct access on this segment of the street and therefore receive special benefit from the proposed improvements and could therefore

be assessed a portion of the cost. The estimated project cost for reconstructing this segment of Variolite Street is \$2,643,600, of which \$315,3330 is estimated to be funded through Stormwater Funds. This leaves an estimated \$2,328,270 unfunded. Municipal State Aid System funds are available to pay for the reconstruction of Variolite Street in 2020 since Variolite Street is an MSA route. In addition, approximately \$203,000 is available from the unexpended street reconstruction fund as recently discussed.

City Engineer Westby stated that from 2015 through 2019, street reconstruction and overlay project funding programs included levying special assessments against benefiting properties to cover up to 25 percent of eligible project costs in compliance with applicable provisions of the City Charter, the City's adopted Special Assessments Policy, and Minnesota Statute Chapter 429. When special assessments pay for a portion of the project costs, the first step in the project development process is to request Council authorization to prepare a Feasibility Report. The Feasibility Report explores numerous aspects of the proposed improvements including whether they are feasible, necessary and cost-effective, and whether they should be completed alone or in conjunction with other improvements. Estimated project costs and a project funding program are also developed in greater detail than what was used to estimate costs and funding sources for the Capital Improvement Program. A preliminary project schedule is also developed within the Feasibility Report. Over the last five years, staff have typically started to develop street reconstruction and overlay projects for the following year in July or August, based on workload and scope of the projects. This is because special assessments were used to pay for a portion of the project costs. Later that fall staff requests City Council acceptance of the Feasibility Report and authorization to prepare plans and specifications. Plans are then approved during the winter and the project is bid over the winter so construction can begin in the spring.

City Engineer Westby stated that the City does not currently have an adopted five-year Street Reconstruction and Overlay Program identifying projects that are eligible for bonding to allow the use of special assessments to pay for a portion of the project costs. However, the City's adopted Special Assessments Policy is still valid and can be used to guide the City in applying special assessments to street reconstruction and overlay projects when bonding is not needed. On July 16, 2019, the Public Works Committee provided consensus direction for staff to proceed on development of the Variolite Street reconstruction project for 2020. However, during that meeting it was discussed that the Committee would consider whether special assessments should be used to pay for a portion of the project costs at a later date. On September 10, 2019, staff received City Council authorization for Hakanson Anderson to complete topographic survey work, and for Northern Technologies, Inc. to prepare a geotechnical report, including the completion of 61 soil borings and pavement corings.

City Engineer Westby stated that staff is now requesting that the Public Works Committee discuss whether special assessment should be used to pay for a portion of the project costs, and then provide a recommendation to the City Council on whether special assessments should be part of the funding program, and, if so, in what amount. If assessments are to be included in the funding program for this project, staff will need to start working on the Feasibility Report as soon as possible.

City Engineer Westby stated that staff recommends the following funding program for this project:

- Municipal State Aid (MSA) funds – MSA funds are proposed to pay for the majority of project costs and will pay for the portion of project costs ultimately proposed to be recovered from special assessment payments.
- Stormwater Management/Utility Funds – SWM/SWU funds are proposed to pay for all stormwater related project costs using a 50/50 split.
- Special Assessments – Assessments are proposed to be levied at a flat rate of \$5,000 per benefiting property.

Councilmember Riley referenced the Feasibility Study, which is only required if properties are to be assessed. He asked and received confirmation that the assessment process adds about five percent to the total project cost. He compared the cost to follow the assessment process to the proposed amount of assessments that would be collected. He noted that while he appreciates the desire to be fair, using assessments would increase the cost of the project by more than the amount that would be collected in assessments. He commented that this is also a collector roadway traveled by thousands of vehicles and only 13 properties would be assessed. He stated that this is an example of a bad road to use assessments on and would not support that option.

Chairperson Kuzma asked for details on the costs involved in the assessment process.

City Engineer Westby reviewed the different elements that are required for a project involving assessments, noting that a Feasibility Report is only part of that cost. He commented that there is value in at least a light version of a Feasibility Report, whether or not assessments are involved.

Councilmember Heinrich asked if other MSA road projects have included assessments or only use of MSA funds.

City Engineer Westby stated Andrie Street, Alpine Drive and Sunwood Drive are examples of MSA streets that were recently reconstructed, and commented that those properties were assessed.

Chairperson Kuzma commented that the policy has been to assess the properties and therefore he believes that the properties should be assessed in the amount of \$5,000. He stated that if the policy needs to be changed, it should be changed as a whole.

Councilmember Riley noted that there would be an additional cost of \$65,000 above the amount collected through the assessments just to follow the assessment process.

Chairperson Kuzma stated that differing from the set policy would set precedent.

Councilmember Riley stated that he would want to discuss changing the policy of the City to not assess when it does not make financial sense.

Chairperson Kuzma agreed that there should be additional discussion by the full Council.

Councilmember Riley stated that the City has never assessed for a lesser amount than was required to follow the assessment policy and therefore this would financially not make sense.

City Engineer Westby stated that since the assessment policy was put into place there really has not been discussion related to changing the policy. He agreed that it would be reasonable to consider and discuss whether the policy should be followed when it would not make financial sense to follow the assessment policy. He stated that perhaps assessments should not be required when the total amount assessed would be less than five to ten percent of eligible project costs. He explained that the City would not complete this project with bonding money as it would not make sense to assess 13 properties 25 percent of this project cost.

Councilmember Riley stated that it would not make sense to follow this policy in this instance as it would cause the City to incur more cost than would be collected. He stated that this simply highlights additional problems with the assessment process. He stated that he would support not assessing for this project and in conjunction recommending that the policy be changed that the assessment policy not be followed when it does not make financial sense.

Councilmember Heinrich stated that she would be interested in looking at the assessment process in more depth. She commented that this is a unique situation where the same amount incurred to follow the process would not be collected back through assessment.

Councilmember Riley stated that this project is needed and there is an available funding mechanism, it simply would not make sense to follow a rule when it would cost more than would be collected.

Motion by Councilmember Riley, seconded by Councilmember Heinrich, to recommend City Council approval of a funding program for the Variolite Street Reconstruction project, Improvement Project #20-01, not including special assessment, and to consider amending the assessment policy to provide flexibility in cases where it would not make financial sense.

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

5.03: Recommend City Council Approval of Ramsey Town Center 9th Addition Pond Lining Improvements, Improvement Project #19-06

City Engineer Westby stated that two unlined stormwater ponds were constructed as part of the Ramsey Town Center (RTC) 9th Addition in the early 2000's. However, the developer walked away from RTC 9th Addition before it was completed. CentraHomes is currently completing this private residential development. Based on current stormwater management and wellhead protection standards, infiltration of stormwater is prohibited in Wellhead Protection Areas, which encompasses all of RTC 9th Addition, including the two ponds. Staff is therefore proposing to line the two ponds in RTC 9th Addition to prevent infiltration.

City Engineer Westby stated that while CentraHomes was developing their plans, staff asked what their costs would be to line the ponds in hopes of executing a reimbursement agreement with them to complete the work all at one time. In order for CentraHomes to obtain quotes, they needed plans for the pond lining improvements. City staff developed the plans and provided them to CentraHomes. Unfortunately, their quotes were significantly higher than the engineer's estimate

developed in-house based on the plans prepared in-house. Staff would like to bid the project this fall/winter in hopes of receiving better bids based on the time of year. He noted that lining the ponds will protect the source aquifer for the City's municipal water supply system. The engineer's estimate of project costs for the improvements is \$85,000. Project costs are proposed to be split evenly between Stormwater Management and Stormwater Utility Funds.

Councilmember Riley stated that this is planned as two ponds and asked if there is a need for two ponds.

City Engineer Westby explained that the current configuration of the pond is two separate ponds, which would not change, but this would be completed as one project. He explained that the intent is simply to line the existing ponds. He stated that filling the ponds was also investigated as an option but was shown to be much more costly than lining the ponds.

Councilmember Riley asked if this would turn into a maintenance problem in the future since this is not providing water treatment. He asked if the water could become stagnant and develop a bad odor.

City Engineer Westby stated that water will flow through the ponds, similar to other ponds in the City, and will therefore perform similarly to other ponds.

Councilmember Riley stated that this appears to be a situation where this should have been a developer responsibility and escrow would have covered the expense, but the escrow was expended, and the developer walked away, therefore this became a City problem.

City Engineer Westby confirmed that information and noted that stormwater funds would be used for the project.

Motion by Councilmember Heinrich, seconded by Councilmember Riley, to recommend City Council approval of Ramsey Town Center 9th Addition Pond Lining Improvements, Improvement Project #19-06.

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

Councilmember Riley asked if the City is being cautious in the inspection of infrastructure, specifically streets, knowing that this project has sat in disrepair for so long.

City Engineer Westby replied that these are private streets and will remain as private streets.

5.04: Recommend City Council Approval of Germanium Street Drainage Improvements, Improvement Project #19-09

City Engineer Westby stated that staff is still working on the details of this project, but it is not yet to the point where it could move forward and asked that the case be tabled to 2020.

Motion by Councilmember Riley, seconded by Councilmember Heinrich, to table the Germanium Street Drainage Improvements, Improvement Project #19-09.

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

5.05: Recommend City Council Approval of Hedgehog Street Drainage Improvements, Improvement Project #19-10

City Engineer Westby stated that the property owner at 15639 Hedgehog Street informed staff in 2018 that stormwater runoff from Hedgehog Street and 156th Lane NW runs through a ditch on their property but lately the runoff is extending outside the easement area to within about 10 feet of their back door. The property owner inquired what the City could do to help prevent stormwater runoff from ponding in their backyard. City staff collected topographic survey data in late 2018 and early 2019 and is not preparing draft plans, specifications and cost estimates for a drainage improvement project that includes re-grading the existing ditch swale along the south property line of 15639 Hedgehog Street, directly across from 156th Lane NW. The ditch and proposed grading improvements are located within an existing drainage easement that fronts several properties in the area. The City will not need to acquire easements to complete this work.

City Engineer Westby stated that staff is proposing to bid the project this fall/winter in hopes of receiving better bids based on the time of year and based on bidding numerous projects at the same time. Staff plans to request City Council approval of plans and specifications and authorization to advertise for bids on September 24th. Construction is proposed to be substantially complete this fall or winter and complete by June 30, 2020.

Councilmember Riley stated that there are several people that have water or wet basements that have never experience that before. He expressed concern that the City would be fixing something that may not be a big problem but agreed that there should not be water in yards.

City Engineer Westby agreed that there have been many calls this year and staff has been reviewing the conditions and prioritizing issues, specifically where water is going off public right-of-way into private property. He noted Staff is working on numerous other drainage improvement projects that will be discussed with the Public Works Committee and City Council in the near future.

Motion by Councilmember Heinrich, seconded by Councilmember Riley, to recommend City Council approval of Hedgehog Street Drainage Improvements, Improvement Project #19-10.

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

5.06: Recommend City Council Approval of Water Efficiency Grant Application

City Engineer Westby reported that the Metropolitan Council is offering grants from \$2,000 to \$50,000 to municipal water suppliers to help increase water efficiency by lowering the cost for residents to purchase and install products that reduce water use including toilets, washing

machines, and irrigation sprinklers and controllers. Municipalities may use grant funds to fund rebates to residents who replace inefficient water-using devices with approved devices that use substantially less water, or for irrigation system audits. The Metropolitan Council administered a water efficiency grant program during the 2015-2017 biennium using \$500,000 from the Clean Water Fund, which yielded an estimated total savings of 52,000,000 gallons of water per year.

City Engineer Westby stated that this grant program requires that products be labeled by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's WaterSense program, or in the case of washing machines, by the U.S. Department of Energy's Energy Star program. Grant funds can only be used for appliance replacement, not for first time purchases for new developments. Municipalities are responsible for developing and operating their own rebate programs. The grant funds will cover 75 percent of program costs, with a require 25 percent local match of which residents must pay a portion of the cost for any device or water use audit they purchase. Grant applications will be accepted through September 30, 2019.

City Engineer Westby stated that the grant funding opportunity seems to be a perfect for the City of Ramsey for several reasons:

- The Environmental Policy Board's 2017-2019 Work Plan includes a tactic to extend the longevity of drinking water supply by reducing demand on groundwater and specifies as a key outcome, the development of incentives and/or programs to promote water conservation. If successful in obtaining the grant funds, the funds could be used to purchase smart controllers and/or soil moisture sensors that could be available for existing water customers that have older, in-ground irrigation systems without these technologies. The EPB discussed this grant program on August 19th and supported an application.
- This grant could help the City to significantly reduce peak demand on the municipal water supply system during summer months, which would allow the City to run fewer wells in the summer, thereby reducing manganese concentrations. This could also allow the City to delay or even omit the installation of new water supply wells in the future.
- The City partnered with the Metropolitan Council on its 2018 Water Efficiency Potential project. This partnership essentially focused on how Ramsey could maximize economic benefits from various residential-based water conservation efforts. Having just recently completed that project should help Ramsey score well on an application for the Water Efficiency Grant Program.
- City staff attended an informational workshop on this grant program at the end of August. If the Committee supports applying for this grant, staff would use what was learned at the workshop to develop the framework for an incentive and/or rebate program, which could then be presented to the City Council for authorization to submit the grant application and supporting information by September 30th.

City Engineer Westby noted that the required local match of 25 percent would come from the City's water enterprise fund, with a portion being reimbursed by payments from residents for any device or water use audit they purchase.

Chairperson Kuzma stated that anything the City can do to encourage saving water is a good thing.

Motion by Councilmember Riley, seconded by Councilmember Heinrich, to recommend that the City Council approve of a Water Efficiency Grant application in the amount of \$50,000.

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

6. COMMITTEE / STAFF INPUT

6.01: Review Wellhead Protection Plan Part 2 Amendment

City Engineer Westby stated that a draft copy of the City's Part 2 WHPP amendment was included in the case along with a copy of the cover letter as submitted to other local units of government for the purpose of soliciting public comment. He stated that a public hearing for this topic is scheduled for the September 24th City Council meeting and asked if the Committee has any questions on the information provided.

Councilmember Riley asked how different the City of Ramsey's Part 2 WHPP amendment is to other cities.

City Engineer Westby commented that the City of Ramsey's Part 2 Amendment is very similar but highlighted a few items that are specific to Ramsey.

6.02: Staff Updates on Improvement Projects and Items of Interest

City Engineer Westby provided a brief update on City improvement projects, Anoka County improvement projects, MnDOT improvement projects, and other items of interest.

Councilmember Riley asked if there has been input from Anoka County regarding the ability to move the Alpine roundabout to occur sooner than planned.

City Engineer Westby replied that the County is currently looking at attempting to move that project and the Bunker Lake Boulevard intersection improvements up sooner. He noted that he will provide another update at the next meeting.

Councilmember Riley asked when the COR infiltration basin will be completed.

City Engineer Westby stated that project has been placed on hold at this time. He explained that there was much more topsoil compared to good fill material which caused challenges. He noted that an unexpected fiber optic line was also discovered which caused additional slowdowns to the project. He stated that the contractor is ready to come back to the site to continue excavation, but there is a delay with the fabricated concrete materials. He stated that staff is attempting to determine if the topsoil material could be used as fill on the future park site. He stated that staff is asking the Lower Rum River Water Management Organization to extend the deadline for the project to June 30, 2020.

6.03: Review Future Topics Calendar

Councilmember Riley referenced items that have remained on the list for a long period of time.

City Engineer Westby acknowledged that some items have remained on the list for multiple years. He noted that development cases tend to take priority and push other cases back on the list.

Councilmember Heinrich asked if additional support is needed in the department in order to expedite cases more quickly.

City Engineer Westby stated that he now has a full-time administrative assistant that is able to provide support. He noted that because the building department is so busy, that employee is assisting to help keep that department on track as well. He noted that the development over the past two years has been very busy, which takes precedent over some of the lesser priority cases.

Councilmember Riley noted that the list includes two speed studies, Sunfish Lake Boulevard and Bunker Lake Boulevard, and asked for an update on the status of those studies.

City Engineer Westby explained that those are County roads and therefore the County makes the request to MnDOT for the studies. He stated that Anoka County has not received the results on either study as of yet.

Councilmember Riley stated that there have been speed concerns on Variolite and was concerned that there would be additional concerns once the road is reconstructed. He asked if anything could be done in conjunction with the project to mitigate the speed.

Public Works Superintendent Riemer stated that the crosswalk will also reappear as an issue with the project.

Councilmember Riley stated that perhaps the turn lane/bicycle lane configuration should be considered as well.

7. ADJOURNMENT

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

Motion carried.

The regular meeting of the Public Works Committee adjourned at 7:21 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Grant Riemer
Public Works Superintendent

Drafted by Amanda Staple
TimeSaver Off Site Secretarial, Inc.

Public Works Committee

6. 1.

Meeting Date: 10/15/2019

By: Bruce Westby, Engineering/Public Works

Title:

Correction Regarding Water Efficiency Grant Program

Purpose/Background:

On September 24, 2019, the Ramsey City Council approved submitting an application to the Metropolitan Council by September 30th for a grant up to \$50,000 to help the City conserve water by lowering the cost for residents to purchase and install products that reduce water use including toilets, irrigation sprinklers and controllers, and to perform irrigation system audits.

During the City Council meeting, Councilmember Kuzma asked Staff if this grant program would be open to all residents, regardless if they were served by City water or a private well. City Engineer Westby responded that the program would be open to all residents. Since such time, Staff has learned that only property owners using municipal water would be eligible for this program.

During the City Council meeting, Councilmember Musgrove asked Staff what the City's maximum cost share would be. City Engineer Westby responded that the City's maximum cost share would be \$12,500, which is 25% of \$50,000. However, the City's maximum cost share would actually be \$16,666.67, which is 33.3% of \$50,000.

Staff applied for the grant funding before the end of September as required. However, Staff is now seeking input from the Public Works Committee as to whether the City Council may have voted differently on September 24th upon knowing that the program is only open to municipal water users, and that the City's maximum share would be \$16,666.67 instead of \$12,250.

If the City Council would not support the grant program and would not accept awarded grant funding, Staff would prefer to withdraw the City's grant application before the Metropolitan Council reviews and approves the City's application for funding.

Timeframe:

Staff estimates 5 minutes will be needed to present this case and address questions.

Observations/Alternatives:

Staff requests consensus direction by the Committee as to whether or not Staff should present a case to the City Council on October 22nd informing them that property owners using private wells for water supply would not be eligible to participate in the water efficiency grant program, that the City's maximum cost share would be \$16,666.67, and requesting that they reaffirm their motion to apply for up to \$50,000 in water efficiency grant program funds.

Funding Source:

NA

Recommendation:

NA

Action:

Provide consensus direction as to whether or not Staff should present a case to the City Council on October 22nd informing them that property owners using private wells for water supply would not be eligible to participate in the water efficiency grant program, that the City's maximum cost share would be \$16,666.67, and requesting that they reaffirm their motion to apply for up to \$50,000 in water efficiency grant program funds.

Attachments

Water Efficiency Grant Program Guidelines

Form Review

Inbox

Grant Riemer

Kurt Ulrich

Form Started By: Bruce Westby

Final Approval Date: 10/10/2019

Reviewed By

Grant Riemer

Kurt Ulrich

Date

10/10/2019 02:22 PM

10/10/2019 02:59 PM

Started On: 10/10/2019 09:59 AM

Metropolitan Council Water Efficiency Grant Program



Overview

The Metropolitan Council (Council) will implement a water efficiency grant program effective September 30, 2019 to June 30, 2022. Grants will be awarded on a competitive basis to municipalities that manage municipal water systems. The Council will provide 75% of the program cost; the municipality must provide the remaining 25%. Municipalities will use the combined Council and municipality funds to run their own grant or rebate programs.

Grants will be made available in amounts with a minimum of \$2,000 and a maximum of \$50,000. Grantees will be required to provide estimated water savings achieved through this program for Clean Water, Land & Legacy Amendment reporting purposes.

Legislative Directive - Minnesota 2019 Session Law

\$375,000 the first year and \$375,000 the second year are for the water demand reduction grant program to encourage municipalities in the metropolitan area to implement measures to reduce water demand to ensure the reliability and protection of drinking water supplies. Fiscal year 2020 appropriations are available until June 30, 2021, and fiscal year 2021 appropriations are available until June 30, 2022.

Grant Program Goal

The goal of the water efficiency grant program is to support technical and behavioral changes that improve municipal water use efficiency in the seven-county metropolitan area.

Critical Points to Remember

- The applying municipality must be a water supplier
- New construction and new developments are not eligible
- Funds are for rebates or grants only; consulting and city staff time are ineligible
- Combined Council and municipality funds cannot pay for 100% of an eligible activity's cost
- A portion of each eligible activity's cost must be paid by the property owner
- Grant recipients must display the Clean Water, Land and Legacy Amendment logo and the Metropolitan Council logo on program-related web pages and paper communications

Grant Program Structure: Administration and Funding

The Water Efficiency Grant Program will be administered by Metropolitan Council Environmental Services (MCES) and will be funded with \$750,000 appropriated by the 2019 Minnesota Legislature. Grant applications will be reviewed and ranked by the MCES Water Supply Planning Unit staff.

Grants are only for water efficiency programs offering rebates or grants to property owners who are customers of the municipal water supply system and who replace specified water using devices with approved devices that use substantially less water.

Grants will be awarded to municipalities in amounts ranging from \$2,000 to \$50,000 for providing rebates or grants to property owners. Municipalities will be responsible for the design and operation of their rebate or grant program and its details. Grant payments to the municipality will be for 75% of approved program amounts. The municipality must provide the remaining 25% of the program cost. Municipality rebates or grants are eligible for reimbursement on device replacements conducted September 30, 2019 through June 30, 2022.

Here is an example showing the grant funding design:

| | |
|--|-----------------|
| Metropolitan Council Grant Amount | \$15,000 |
| Municipality Match | \$5,000 |
| Municipality Grant/Rebate Program Total | \$20,000 |

Eligibility

Per legislative language, the grant program is limited to municipalities in the seven-county metropolitan area.

Municipalities eligible per above must apply to participate and, if approved, sign a standard Council Grant Agreement, before any eligible rebates or grants can be submitted for reimbursement. Agreements shall require that municipalities:

- Entirely pass through grants received (as is being done by MCES)
- Verify purchase of devices to receive grants
- Retain records and cooperate with any audits
- Conduct all communications with property owners and ensure all written communications to property owners include both the Clean Water, Land and Legacy Amendment and the Metropolitan Council’s logo
- Provide quantitative information for state reporting purposes

Eligible water efficiency devices consist of the following:

- Toilet replacement with a US EPA WaterSense labeled toilet
- Irrigation controller replacement with a US EPA WaterSense labeled controller
- Clothes washing machine replacement with an US DOE Energy Star labeled clothes washing machine
- Irrigation spray sprinkler body replacement with a US EPA WaterSense labeled spray sprinkler body
- Irrigation system audit by an Irrigation Professional certified by a US EPA WaterSense program

Expenses eligible for reimbursement are the out-of-pocket cost of the device and its installation only, not to include any owner labor costs. In addition, new construction and new developments are ineligible, as this program is intended as a current infrastructure replacement program.

Application Process

- Applicants must be municipal water suppliers
- Municipalities will submit MCES supplied application form by September 30, 2019. Required information includes:
 - the municipality’s rebate or grant program design and work plan
 - proposed examples of communications to property owners
 - requested total grant amount
 - estimated annual amount of water saved by the applying municipality

- Application form is available at: <https://metro council.org/Wastewater-Water/Funding-Finance/Available-Funding-Grants.aspx>
- Submit competed application to: brian.davis@metc.state.mn.us
- Metropolitan Council will notify municipalities of grant awards and provide grant agreements by December 2, 2019.

Proposal Selection Criteria

In the event that funds requested exceed funds available, the following criteria will be used to determine the amount granted to a given municipality:

- Municipalities that are supplied 100% with groundwater
- Municipalities with identified water supply issues in Master Water Supply Plan Community Profiles or Local Water Supply Plans
- Municipalities' ratio of peak monthly water use to winter monthly water use
- Municipalities' average residential per capita water use
- The order in which applications are received and until grant funds are completely committed

Funding Process and Reporting Requirements

- Utilizing forms provided by MCES, the following information must be reported on a quarterly basis:
 - Number, type and amount of rebates or grants provided to property owners, along with each property address
 - Estimated annual gallons of water saved per device installation
 - Municipality matching funds disbursed
 - Number of unmet funding requests from property owners, if any
- Upon review and confirmation of the above information, MCES will process a grant payment in the amount of 75% of approved total rebates or grants for the reporting period.
- MCES will provide confirmation of grant balances available upon request and reserves the right to amend grant agreements, in collaboration with grantee municipality, if quarterly reporting indicates rebate or grant programs will not fully utilize grant awards within the grant period.

Qualified Activities

- Toilet replacement with a US EPA WaterSense labeled toilet:
http://www.epa.gov/WaterSense/product_search.html
- Irrigation controller replacement with a US EPA WaterSense labeled controller:
<https://www.epa.gov/watersense/product-search>
- Clothes washing machine replacement with an US DOE Energy Star labeled clothes washing machine:
<https://www.energystar.gov/productfinder/product/certified-clothes-washers/results>
- Irrigation spray sprinkler body replacement with a US EPA WaterSense labeled spray sprinkler body
<https://www.epa.gov/watersense/product-search>
- Irrigation system audit by an Irrigation Professionals certified by a US EPA WaterSense program
<https://www.epa.gov/watersense/find-pro>

Reporting Example

| Community | Property Street Address | Property Type | Device Replaced | Cost per Device | # of Devices | Rebate or Grant per Device | Est. Annual Water (Gal) Saved Per Device | Total Rebate or Grant | Municipality Contribution | Eligible Grant Amount |
|-----------|-------------------------|---------------|-----------------------|-----------------|--------------|----------------------------|--|-----------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|
| Anytown | 652 Silvis St | Residential | Clothes Washer | \$624.60 | 1 | \$150.00 | 3,000 | \$150.00 | \$37.50 | \$112.50 |
| Anytown | 1952 Ingram Way | Residential | Irrigation Controller | \$199.99 | 1 | \$100.00 | 8,800 | \$100.00 | \$25.00 | \$75.00 |
| Anytown | 630 Gibbons Ave | Residential | Clothes Washer | \$599.90 | 1 | \$150.00 | 3,000 | \$150.00 | \$37.50 | \$112.50 |
| Anytown | 4424 Barriger Blvd | Residential | Toilet | \$168.00 | 1 | \$50.00 | 4,000 | \$50.00 | \$12.50 | \$37.50 |

Public Works Committee

6. 2.

Meeting Date: 10/15/2019

By: Bruce Westby, Engineering/Public Works

Title:

Staff Update on New Retainage Requirements for City Construction Contracts

Purpose/Background:

The following italicized text was copied from the League of Minnesota Cities website.

A new retainage law was enacted as part of the omnibus jobs, economic development, energy, and commerce finance bill ([First Special Session Chapter 7](#)) in article 9, sections 1 and 13. There were substantial changes this year, so cities should work with their city attorneys when entering into new contracts for public construction projects.

The new requirements, found in [Minnesota Statutes, section 15.72, subdivision 2](#), and [Minnesota Statutes, section 337.10, subdivision 4](#), are effective Aug. 1, and apply to agreements entered into on or after this date.

What retainage is

Retainage is a common practice in the private and public sectors, where a portion of the agreed-upon contract price is withheld until the construction work is complete to assure that the general contractor or subcontractor has satisfied their obligations.

Before the new law, 5% of the construction contract could be held for retainage from the general contractor. The general contractor, in turn, also was permitted to withhold 5% from its subcontractors.

Release of retainage

One of the most significant changes is when retainage must be released. Retainage must now be released no later than 60 days after “substantial completion” of a construction project, with some limited exceptions.

“Substantial completion” is defined consistently in [Minnesota Statutes, section 541.051, subdivision 1\(a\)](#). It is the date when construction is sufficiently completed so that the owner can occupy or use the improvement for the intended purpose. For streets, highways, and bridges, “substantial completion” is defined as the date when construction-related traffic devices and ongoing inspections are no longer required.

The general contractor must pay retainage to its subcontractors within 10 days after receiving retainage payment, unless there is a dispute about the work. The contractor must pay retainage to any subcontractor whose work is not involved in the dispute and must provide a written statement detailing the amount and reason for the withholding to the affected subcontractor.

Allowable withholding

After substantial completion, a city may still withhold (1) 250% of the cost to correct or complete work known at the time of substantial completion, and (2) the greater of \$500 or 1 percent of the value of the contract for “final paperwork.”

Final paperwork is defined as documents required to fulfill contractual obligations including, but not limited to, operation manuals, payroll documents for projects subject to prevailing wage requirements, and the withholding exemption certificate required by [Minnesota Statutes, section 270C.66](#) (IC 134 form).

If any payment is withheld for these reasons, a written statement must be promptly provided to the contractor, including the amount and basis of withholding. Withheld funds must be paid within 60 days after completion of the work or submission of final paperwork.

The new law also contains the following provisions:

- **Retainage reduction must be passed on to subcontractors.** *If the amount of retainage is reduced, the contractor must reduce retainage at the same rate for subcontractors.*
- **Retainage cannot be held for warranty work.** *Withholding retainage for warranty work is prohibited. This provision does not waive any rights to warranty claims.*
- **Certain requirements must be met before payment is made.** *The portion of a construction project funded with federal or state aid is only required to be paid when the federal or state aid has been received. Nothing in this section requires payment for a portion of a contract that is not complete or for which an invoice has not been submitted.*

Cities should work with their city attorney and ensure that terms in their construction contracts are consistent with these changes in the law.

All parties to public construction contracts entered into after August 1, 2019 are subject to these new statutory requirements and limitations regarding the withholding and release of retainage, which is the portion of earned contract funds withheld by the owner from the contractor pending completion of the project.

The most notable changes to the retainage laws that apply to City of Ramsey construction projects include:

- The City must release all retainage within 60 days of substantial completion.
- The Prime Contractor must release to its Subcontractors all remaining retainage as the Prime Contractor receives retainage from the City. Once the Prime Contractor has received retainage from the City, the Prime Contractor must pay retainage on undisputed work to its Subcontractors within 10 days. The Prime Contractor does not need to pay retainage on disputed work, but it must pay the undisputed portion and provide its Subcontractor with a written statement detailing the dispute.
- The definition of “substantial completion” essentially remains the same, in other words when the work can be occupied and used for its intended purpose, but a provision was added for highway, street and bridge work to define substantial completion as when construction traffic control and inspections are no longer needed.
- If punch list work remains after substantial completion, the City may continue to withhold up to 250% of the value of the punch list work. The City must provide the Prime Contractor with a written statement of the amount and reason for the withholding, and the Prime Contractor must provide a copy to any affected Subcontractor that requests it.
- The City may withhold the lesser of 1% of the contract, or \$500, until the final project paperwork (e.g., OEM manuals, prevailing wage documentation, etc.) is provided.
- Withholding for warranty work is not permitted, but neither is any warranty claim waived.

The new law does not require payment for work yet to be completed or for which no invoice has been submitted, and the City does not need to pay for those portions of the work funded with federal or state aid until those funds are received.

In summary, though the new laws mean that Prime Contractors and their Subcontractors may not have to wait as long for their retainages to be paid, there is an increased risk of the premature release of retainages being held to ensure compliance and completion of work, which may increase the risk to the City.

Timeframe:

Staff estimates 5 minutes will be needed to present this case and address questions.

Observations/Alternatives:

Staff is working with the City Attorney to ensure the City's construction contracts are consistent with and reflect these changes in the law.

Funding Source:

NA

Recommendation:

NA

Action:

No action required. This is an informational item only.

Attachments

MN Statute 15.72

MN Statute 337.10

Form Review

| Inbox | Reviewed By | Date |
|---------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------------|
| Grant Riemer | MaryJo Warner | 10/10/2019 03:41 PM |
| Kurt Ulrich | Kathy Schmitz | 10/10/2019 04:11 PM |
| Form Started By: Bruce Westby | | Started On: 10/10/2019 10:14 AM |
| Final Approval Date: 10/10/2019 | | |

15.72 PROGRESS PAYMENTS ON PUBLIC CONTRACTS; RETAINAGE.

Subdivision 1. **Monthly payments.** Unless the terms of the contract provide otherwise, a public contracting agency shall make progress payments on a public contract for a public improvement monthly as the work progresses. Payments shall be based upon estimates of work completed as approved by the public contracting agency. A progress payment shall not be considered acceptance or approval of any work or waiver of any defects therein.

Subd. 2. **Retainage.** (a) A public contracting agency may reserve as retainage from any progress payment on a public contract for a public improvement an amount not to exceed five percent of the payment. A public contracting agency may reduce the amount of the retainage and may eliminate retainage on any monthly contract payment if, in the agency's opinion, the work is progressing satisfactorily.

(b) The public contracting agency must release all retainage no later than 60 days after substantial completion, subject to the terms of this subdivision. If the public contracting agency reduces the amount of retainage, the contractor must reduce retainage for any subcontractors at the same rate.

(c) A contractor on a public contract for a public improvement must pay all remaining retainage to its subcontractors no later than ten days after receiving payment of retainage from the public contracting agency, unless there is a dispute about the work under a subcontract. If there is a dispute about the work under a subcontract, the contractor must pay out retainage to any subcontractor whose work is not involved in the dispute, and must provide a written statement detailing the amount and reason for the withholding to the affected subcontractor.

(d) Upon written request of a subcontractor, the public contracting agency shall notify the subcontractor of a progress payment, retainage payment, or final payment made to the contractor.

(e) After substantial completion, a public contracting agency may withhold no more than:

(1) 250 percent of the cost to correct or complete work known at the time of substantial completion; and

(2) one percent of the value of the contract or \$500, whichever is greater, pending completion and submission of all final paperwork by the contractor or subcontractor. For purposes of this subdivision, "final paperwork" means documents required to fulfill contractual obligations, including, but not limited to, operation manuals, payroll documents for projects subject to prevailing wage requirements, and the withholding exemption certificate required by section 270C.66.

If the public contracting agency withholds payment under this paragraph, the public contracting agency must promptly provide a written statement detailing the amount and basis of withholding to the contractor. The public contracting agency and contractor must provide a copy of this statement to any subcontractor that requests it. Any amounts withheld under clause (1) must be paid within 60 days after completion of the work. Any amounts withheld under clause (2) must be paid within 60 days after submission of all final paperwork.

(f) As used in this subdivision, "substantial completion" shall be determined as provided in section 541.051, subdivision 1, paragraph (a). For construction, reconstruction, or improvement of streets and highways, including bridges, substantial completion means the date when construction-related traffic devices and ongoing inspections are no longer required.

(g) Withholding retainage for warranty work is prohibited. This provision does not waive any rights for warranty claims.

(h) For a project funded with federal or state aid, the public contracting agency is not required to pay that portion of the contract funded by federal or state aid until the federal or state aid payments have been received.

(i) Nothing in this section requires payment for a portion of a contract that is not complete or for which an invoice has not been submitted.

History: *1980 c 464 s 2; 1Sp2019 c 7 art 9 s 1*

337.10 BUILDING AND CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS; PROHIBITED PROVISIONS.

Subdivision 1. **Application of laws of another state.** Provisions contained in, or executed in connection with, a building and construction contract to be performed in Minnesota making the contract subject to the laws of another state or requiring that any litigation, arbitration, or other dispute resolution process on the contract occur in another state are void and unenforceable.

Subd. 2. **Waiver of lien or claim.** Provisions contained in, or executed in connection with, a building and construction contract requiring a contractor, subcontractor, or material supplier to waive the right to a mechanics lien or to a claim against a payment bond before the person has been paid for the labor or materials or both that the person furnished are void and unenforceable. This provision shall not affect the validity of a waiver as to any third party who detrimentally relies upon the waiver.

Subd. 3. **Prompt payment to subcontractors.** A building and construction contract shall be deemed to require the prime contractor and all subcontractors to promptly pay any subcontractor or material supplier contract within ten days of receipt by the party responsible for payment of payment for undisputed services provided by the party requesting payment, including payments under subdivision 4. The contract shall be deemed to require the party responsible for payment to pay interest of 1-1/2 percent per month to the party requesting payment on any undisputed amount not paid on time. The minimum monthly interest penalty payment for an unpaid balance of \$100 or more is \$10. For an unpaid balance of less than \$100, the party responsible for payment shall pay the actual penalty due to the party requesting payment. A party requesting payment who prevails in a civil action to collect interest penalties from a party responsible for payment must be awarded its costs and disbursements, including attorney fees incurred in bringing the action. If an undisputed payment is not received within ten days, the prime contractor or subcontractor of any tier that has not received the undisputed payment may suspend work under the building and construction contract until the undisputed payment is received.

Subd. 4. **Progress payments and retainages.** (a) Unless the building and construction contract provides otherwise, the owner or other persons making payments under the contract must make progress payments monthly as the work progresses. Payments shall be based upon estimates of work completed as approved by the owner or the owner's agent. A progress payment shall not be considered acceptance or approval of any work or waiver of any defects therein.

(b) Retainage on a building and construction contract may not exceed five percent. An owner or owner's agent may reduce the amount of retainage and may eliminate retainage on any monthly contract payment if, in the owner's opinion, the work is progressing satisfactorily. If the owner reduces the amount of retainage, the contractor must reduce retainage for any subcontractors at the same rate. Nothing in this subdivision is intended to require that retainage be withheld in any building or construction contract.

(c) The owner or the owner's agent must release all retainage no later than 60 days after substantial completion subject to the terms of this subdivision. For purposes of this subdivision, "substantial completion" shall be determined as provided in section 541.051, subdivision 1, paragraph (a).

(d) A contractor must pay all remaining retainage to its subcontractors no later than ten days after receiving payment of retainage, unless there is a dispute about the work under a subcontract, in which case the contractor must pay out retainage to any party whose work is not involved in the dispute. If there is a dispute about the work under a subcontract, the contractor must pay out retainage to any subcontractor whose work is not involved in the dispute, and must provide a written statement detailing the amount and reason for the withholding to the affected subcontractor.

(e) After substantial completion, an owner or owner's agent may withhold no more than:

(1) 250 percent of the cost to correct or complete work known at the time of substantial completion; and

(2) one percent of the value of the contract or \$500, whichever is greater, pending completion and submission of all final paperwork by the contractor or subcontractor. For purposes of this subdivision, "final paperwork" means documents required to fulfill contractual obligations, including, but not limited to, operation manuals, payroll documents for projects subject to prevailing wage requirements, and the withholding exemption certificate required by section 270C.66.

If the owner or the owner's agent withholds payment under this paragraph, the owner or the owner's agent must promptly provide a written statement detailing the amount and basis of withholding to the contractor. The owner or the owner's agent and the contractor must provide a copy of this statement to any subcontractor that requests it. Any amounts withheld under clause (1) must be paid within 60 days after completion of the work. Any amounts withheld under clause (2) must be paid within 60 days after submission of all final paperwork.

(f) Withholding retainage for warranty work is prohibited. This provision does not waive any rights for warranty claims.

(g) This subdivision does not apply to a public agency as defined in section 15.71, subdivision 3.

(h) This subdivision does not apply to contracts for professional services as defined in sections 326.02 to 326.15.

(i) Nothing in this section requires payment for a portion of a contract that is not complete or for which an invoice has not been submitted.

Subd. 5. Definition. For the purpose of this section, "building and construction contract" has the meaning given the term in section 337.01.

History: 1997 c 127 s 1; 1998 c 289 s 1,2; 1999 c 116 s 2; 2007 c 140 art 8 s 30; art 13 s 4; 2009 c 66 s 1,2; 2016 c 133 s 1,2; 1Sp2019 c 7 art 9 s 13

Public Works Committee

6.3.

Meeting Date: 10/15/2019

By: Bruce Westby, Engineering/Public Works

Title:

Staff Updates on Improvement Projects and Items of Interest

Purpose/Background:

The purpose of this case is to update the Public Works Committee on current and proposed improvement projects within the City, and on other items of interest to the Committee.

City Improvement Projects

- **Bunker Lake Boulevard and Puma Street Improvements (#18-05)**
 - Completing punch list items, final payment fall 2019
- **The COR Regional Infiltration Basin (#18-09)**
 - Grading substantially complete, storm sewer work in progress
 - Staff is exploring options for using stockpiled materials to better prepare properties in The COR for development
 - WMO Permit extended to June 30, 2020
- **2019 Crackseal Improvements (#19-00)**
 - Work is complete, final payment fall 2019
- **Ford Brook Estates Street Reconstructions (#19-01)**
 - Final assessments adopted (\$3,919.90 + \$1,197.00 = \$5,116.90)
 - Punch list work and final payment in 2020
- **Wood Pond Hills and Chestnut Ridge Street Reconstructions (#19-03)**
 - Final assessments adopted (\$1,445.00)
 - Punch list work and final payment in 2020
- **RTC 9th Addition Pond Lining Improvements (#19-06)**
 - Bids will be opened October 30, 2019
 - Construction in late 2019/early 2020
- **Wetland 114P Outlet Control Improvements (#19-07)**
 - Engineering Staff will collect topographic survey data this winter
 - Construction proposed for 2020
- **Germanium Street Drainage Improvements (#19-09)**
 - Engineering Staff developing plans
 - Construction proposed for 2020
- **Hedgehog Street Drainage Improvements (#19-10)**
 - Bids will be opened October 30, 2019
 - Construction in late 2019/early 2020

Anoka County Improvement Projects

- **Roundabout at Armstrong Boulevard/CSAH 83 and Alpine Drive**
 - Anoka County received \$1.35M in HSIP funds (est. project cost = \$1.5M)
 - Local cost share set per Anoka County Cost Share Policy
 - Anoka County and City of Ramsey to pay \$150,000 each (per \$1.5M est.)
 - Anoka County to begin project design efforts in 2019/2020
 - Construction planned for 2022/2023 pending City and County approvals
 - Awaiting update on construction schedule

● **CSAH 116 & TH 47 Intersection Improvements**

- Construct additional turn lanes at CSAH 116/Bunker Lake Boulevard and State Highway 47/Saint Francis Boulevard
- WSB completing final design
- City Staff stressed importance of communicating proposed improvements to the public and local businesses
- Pedestrian facility connections under discussion

MnDOT Improvement Projects

● **Ferry Street / Trunk Highway 47 Grade Separation @ BNSF Rail Crossing**

- Preliminary design on hold - MnDOT exploring realignment of Highway 47 to remove S-curve at Anoka County fair grounds
- TH 47 traffic study underway
- MnDOT may combine project with Anoka Solution improvements

Items of Interest

● **Northwest Metro Surface Water Supply Feasibility Study**

- Study underway; about 40% complete
- Member cities include Corcoran, Dayton, Ramsey and Rogers
- MCES is funding 100% using Clean Water Funds
- Completion in early 2020

● **Signal System at CSAH 5/Nowthen Boulevard and 170th Avenue**

- Signal system is operational
- Striping on 170th Avenue may be installed to direct drivers over loops

Timeframe:

Staff estimates 5 minutes will be needed for updates and discussion.

Observations/Alternatives:

NA

Funding Source:

NA

Recommendation:

NA

Action:

No formal action required. For Committee review and discussion purposes only.

Attachments

No file(s) attached.

Form Review

| Inbox | Reviewed By | Date |
|---------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------------|
| Grant Riemer | Grant Riemer | 10/10/2019 12:21 PM |
| Kurt Ulrich | Kurt Ulrich | 10/10/2019 02:58 PM |
| Form Started By: Bruce Westby | | Started On: 10/10/2019 09:54 AM |
| Final Approval Date: 10/10/2019 | | |

Public Works Committee

6. 4.

Meeting Date: 10/15/2019

By: Bruce Westby, Engineering/Public Works

Title:

Review Future Topics Calendar

Purpose/Background:

Attached is a calendar of future topics for review and discussion by the Public Works Committee. The calendar includes topics drawn from Committee requests received during meetings and/or unresolved topics previously discussed by the Committee. Calendar dates are estimated based on availability of information, availability of required attendees, staff workload and competing interests and objectives. Dates are therefore subject to change.

Timeframe:

Staff estimates less than 5 minutes will be necessary to review the future topics calendar and address questions.

Observations/Alternatives:

Discussion items shown in red, strike-through text in the attached calendar are proposed to be removed from the calendar moving forward. These items will instead be addressed as part of the items listed in red text.

Funding Source:

NA

Recommendation:

NA

Action:

No formal action required. For Committee review and discussion purposes only.

Attachments

PWC Calendar Oct2019

Form Review

| Inbox | Reviewed By | Date |
|---------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------------|
| Grant Riemer | Grant Riemer | 10/10/2019 11:26 AM |
| Kurt Ulrich | Kurt Ulrich | 10/10/2019 02:58 PM |
| Form Started By: Bruce Westby | | Started On: 10/10/2019 09:55 AM |
| Final Approval Date: 10/10/2019 | | |

Public Works Committee Future Topics Calendar *

| Date | Topics for Discussion – Committee Action |
|-----------------------|---|
| February 2020 | Sunfish Lake Sedimentation Basin Improvements (<i>Westby</i>) |
| March 2020 | Gibbon Street Basement Flooding Funding Options (<i>Westby</i>) |
| Future/TBD | Well Siting Study – Well #9 (<i>Westby</i>) |
| Future/TBD | Sunwood Drive Roundabout Landscaping (<i>Riemer</i>) |
| | |
| | |
| Date | Topics for Discussion – Regulatory |
| Future/TBD | Sunfish Lake Boulevard Speed Zone Study Results (<i>Westby</i>) |
| Future/TBD | Bunker Lake Boulevard Speed Study Results (<i>Westby</i>) |
| Future/TBD | County Ditch Maintenance / Buffer Law (<i>Westby</i>) |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| Date | Topics for Discussion – Policy |
| Future/TBD | Landscaped Median Maintenance Policy (<i>Riemer</i>) |
| December 2019 | Draft Trail Maintenance Policy (<i>Westby</i>) |
| December 2019 | Draft Stormwater Pond Maintenance Policy (<i>Westby</i>) |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| Date | Topics for Discussion – Planning and Budget |
| January 2020 | Municipal State Aid System (MSAS) Revisions (<i>Westby</i>) |
| November 2019 | Review 1996 and 2007 (unadopted) TH 47 Corridor Studies (<i>Westby</i>) |
| Ongoing | Public Works Facility Review/Update (<i>Riemer</i>) |
| Future/TBD | Long-Term Water Supply Plan (<i>Westby</i>) |
| | |
| | |
| Date | Topics for Discussion – Staff Updates |
| Ongoing | Water Conservation Opportunities / Incentives (<i>Westby</i>) |
| Future/TBD | Asset Management Program (<i>Westby</i>) |
| Ongoing | NW Metro Area Regional Surface Water Supply Study |
| Ongoing | Centralized Water Treatment Facility - Preliminary Design Report |
| | |
| | |

* Dates are estimated and are subject to change based on availability of information, staff workload, and competing objectives.