

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

The Public Works Committee conducted a regular meeting on Tuesday, February 18, 2020, at the Ramsey Municipal Center, 7550 Sunwood Drive NW, Ramsey, Minnesota.

Members Present: Chairperson Mark Kuzma
 Councilmember Jeff Menth
 Councilmember Chris Riley

Also Present: Public Works Superintendent Grant Riemer
 City Engineer Bruce Westby
 Deputy City Administrator Tim Gladhill
 City Administrator Kurt Ulrich

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Kuzma called the regular meeting of the Public Works Committee to order at 5:03 p.m.

2. CITIZEN INPUT

There was none.

3. APPROVE AGENDA

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

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

4. APPROVE MINUTES

4.01: Approve January 21, 2020, Meeting Minutes

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

Regular Meeting Minutes dated January 21, 2020

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

5. COMMITTEE BUSINESS

5.01: Consider Recommendation on Cost Share Alternatives for Puma Street Development Initiated Expansion and Safety Improvement Project

Deputy City Administrator Gladhill reviewed the staff report.

Chairperson Kuzma asked if a benefit appraisal would be completed as part of the process.

Deputy City Administrator Gladhill confirmed that would be part of the process to ensure the amount of the assessment does not exceed the benefit provided by the project.

Councilmember Riley asked if an assessment would be necessary if an agreement is reached.

Deputy City Administrator Gladhill noted that one of the three parties has not yet agreed to the cost-share and has expressed objection to this proposed cost-share ratio, therefore an assessment would be the necessary path. He explained that even if all three parties agreed, the City would still need to use the 429 assessment tool to collect the payments.

Heather Lorch, Capstone, stated that Capstone feels strongly that with the 30 percent cost-share it would be reasonable that they could pay in advance but because they are unsure of the fees and end cost, they would feel more comfortable having that cost assessed.

Deputy City Administrator Gladhill explained that the assessment roll is very preliminary, and the final assessment amount will be based off the actual cost.

Chairperson Kuzma agreed that assessment would be the best tool in this case. He confirmed the consensus of the Committee for the City to use the assessment tool for the proposed cost-share.

Motion by Councilmember Menth, seconded by Councilmember Riley, to recommend that the City Council approve the proposed Funding Plan for the Puma Street Developer Initiated Expansion and Safety Improvement Project.

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

5.02: Receive Update on Riverdale Drive Development Initiated Expansion and Safety Improvement Project

Deputy City Administrator Gladhill reviewed the staff report noting that the City and Developer agreed to postpone this discussion until the March Public Works meeting at the earliest.

5.03: Consider Request for City to Acquire Driveway Between Blue Velvet Car Wash and Riversbend Bar and Grill

Public Works Superintendent Riemer reviewed the staff report.

Councilmember Riley commented that it appears that the driveway ownership is split equally between Blue Velvet and the strip mall. He asked if the City has spoken with the owner of the strip mall.

Public Works Superintendent Riemer stated that staff has not yet spoken with the strip mall owner.

Councilmember Riley stated that does not want the City to own/purchase that area.

Chairperson Kuzma stated that he would think the owners of the two properties would want to work together to provide access to their customers.

Councilmember Menth stated that he has been involved in a shared driveway agreement in the past for a residential property. He commented that the only two parties involved in a shared driveway are the owners and would not support the City purchasing that land to incur additional maintenance costs.

Motion by Councilmember Menth, seconded by Councilmember Riley, to decline the offer to purchase/maintain Blue Velvet Lane and have it remain a private road.

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

5.04: Discuss Options for Northern Nine (9) Acres of Lot 1, Block 1, Bury and Carlson Addition (Future Public Works Campus Site and Economic Development Parcel)

Deputy City Administrator Gladhill reviewed the staff report.

Chairperson Kuzma noted that he and Councilmember Riley were in attendance at the EDA meeting and therefore have already discussed this case. He commented that it makes a lot of sense to provide the additional flexibility to the public works facility design process.

Motion by Councilmember Menth, seconded by Councilmember Riley, to recommend that the City Council revise the listing from nine acres to seven acres to allow flexibility in the final Public Works Campus Design and direct staff to bring the topic back to the Committee for additional review once the Feasibility Study for the new public works facility is completed.

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

5.05: Consider Recommendation to City Council to Accept Feasibility Report for 2020 Pavement Overlay Improvements, Improvement Project No. 20-02

City Engineer Westby reviewed the staff report.

Councilmember Menth asked the amount of funding that was available when the Committee first reviewed this case.

City Engineer Westby replied that there is currently \$811,000 in the fund but after the unpaid project costs for the two 2019 street reconstruction projects are taken from that account, the available balance would be about \$775,000.

Councilmember Menth commented that it was his belief that one of the three project areas would be selected, as the Feasibility Reports have already been completed, rather than selecting a different road without a Feasibility Report.

City Engineer Westby stated that his understanding of the Committee's motion from January was for Staff to present updated cost estimates at this meeting. He noted that the motion also included staff bringing back alternative options identified in the current CIP that could be completed with the available funding.

Chairperson Kuzma asked if letters were already sent to property owners on the streets identified to receive overlays in 2020 per the current CIP stating that the project would be completed.

City Engineer Westby replied that such letters had been mailed but that a second letter was also sent noting that the pavement conditions would not support a standard mill and overlay so more extensive repairs would be required and that it would be most cost-effective to complete those repairs in the future. He also noted that the letter stated the property owners would receive another letter if improvements were ultimately proposed on their streets in 2020.

Chairperson Kuzma asked for funding information.

City Engineer Westby stated that in the next case it is recommended to reallocate \$250,000 from the 2020 sealcoat budget towards this project for option three. He confirmed that could also be sufficient funding to complete options one or two.

Councilmember Menth asked why one of the roads from the originally proposed project would not be selected.

City Engineer Westby stated that option one, which proposes removing 3.5-inches of pavement and underlying aggregate base and repaving with 3.5-inches of new pavement at an estimated cost of \$835,000, and option two, which proposes completing a full-depth reclamation at an estimated cost of \$811,000 to 1.5 miles of streets would provide less than the standard pavement base section and therefore staff would not be confident that the expected lifespan of the improvements would be reached. He stated that staff would be more confident that option three, which proposes standard 2-inch mill and overlay improvements on streets in the Business Park 95 and Regency Ponds Additions, would provide pavement sections closer to today's standards to allow standard pavement management practices to be applied in the future. Staff is therefore more confident in achieving the expected lifespan on these 2.8 miles of streets so in Staff's opinion option three is the most cost-effective.

Chairperson Kuzma asked the condition of the roads within Business Park 95 and Regency Ponds.

Councilmember Menth asked the paser rating of Business Park compared to the other roadways originally included in the project.

City Engineer Westby confirmed that the roads in Business Park 95 are in poor condition and provided photographs. He provided the different paser ratings. He explained that option three would be most cost effective with the limited funds the City has.

Councilmember Riley stated that the City previously identified what it thought was the best idea, but it was found that the pavement was not conducive to the proposed improvement. He stated that it also appears that the priority has changed, and the recommendation better fits the change in priority because of the limited funding available.

Chairperson Kuzma agreed that repairing 2.8 miles would be a better choice than 1.5 miles.

Councilmember Menth stated that his concern would be that the Feasibility Report is not completed on the recommended roads and therefore it could be unknown as to the pavement thickness.

City Engineer Westby explained that the roads in Business Park 95 should have been built to a higher standard, and that the roads in Regency Ponds have good PASER ratings and were more recently constructed and therefore should have a sufficient pavement section to allow for a 2-inch mill and overlay. However, he noted pavement coring's would be needed to verify this as part of the Feasibility Study process.

City Administrator Ulrich asked how the cost could be impacted by the change in the schedule.

City Engineer Westby stated that overlay plans do not take as long to prepare as reconstruction plans and reviewed the proposed schedule and how that would be impacted by changing roadways proposed for improvement. He stated that there would be a two to three week increase in schedule if the streets are changed.

Chairperson Kuzma stated that he would support the staff recommendation.

Motion by Councilmember Menth, seconded by Councilmember Riley, to recommend City Council acceptance of the Feasibility Report for the 2020 Pavement Overlay Improvements, Improvement Project No. 20-02, and to recommend that a new Feasibility Report be ordered including the streets of Business Park 95 and Regency Ponds 1st, 2nd and 3rd Additions.

Further discussion: Councilmember Riley asked if the other roadways would continue to be maintained. City Engineer Westby stated that staff understands that the other roads were included in the CIP for this year and are not in good condition. He confirmed that continued maintenance would occur. He stated that the collection of additional GPR data will allow staff to

take a deep dive into the CIP this fall to create a CIP that can be followed more closely in the future, rather than having to make these changes year after year.

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

5.06: Consider Recommendation to City Council to Indefinitely Suspend Sealcoat Program and Reallocate Budgeted Funds

City Engineer Westby reviewed the staff report.

Councilmember Riley asked if the results from ground penetrating radar (GPR) are as good as pavement coring's.

City Engineer Westby explained that the radar provides a reading every one foot. He stated that the coring provides physical data on the pavement structure in isolated locations and therefore would continue to be a part of projects. He stated that the GPR provides data on pavement sections along an entire roadway, which is critical to planning future pavement management projects.

Councilmember Riley stated that he would agree with the plan as proposed. The Committee confirmed consensus.

Motion by Councilmember Riley, seconded by Councilmember Menth, to recommend that the City Council indefinitely suspend the City's annual sealcoat program and approve Staff's proposed sealcoat budget reallocations.

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

5.07: Consider Recommendation to City Council to Order Traffic Study for Bunker Laker Boulevard Reconstruction – Armstrong Boulevard to Ramsey Boulevard

City Engineer Westby reviewed the staff report.

Chairperson Kuzma asked where the balance of the money would come from for this project.

City Engineer Westby noted that the CIP sheet was attached to the case and reviewed the different funding that would be used for the project, including the use of MSA funds.

Councilmember Menth stated that he understands that the plan was to improve Bunker Lake Boulevard to five lanes under the JPA. He asked why a traffic study would be needed as this improvement was planned for and is needed as the community continues to grow.

City Engineer Westby explained that City staff met with Anoka County last fall and understood that Ramsey is responsible for upgrading the road, but Anoka County has the final say in the design process and requested the traffic study as part of that process.

City Administrator Ulrich stated that it is possible that the City would not have to build to the most expensive design, if the traffic study supports that, as the City is responsible for designing to a 2040 anticipated use.

Councilmember Riley asked if the traffic study could identify if additional turn lanes could be supported.

City Engineer Westby confirmed that the study could provide support for the discussions with Anoka County related to access points. He stated that the County has stated that they would be open to additional access points, if a roundabout were potentially considered at Center Street and Bunker Lake Boulevard, as that would allow a U-turn type activity.

Chairperson Kuzma asked if the traffic study would address speed.

City Engineer Westby stated that a speed component could be included but the study normally focuses on volumes and turning movements. He noted that it would be the decision of the County as to whether speed would be included. He noted that normally you would improve the roadway and then complete a speed study.

Councilmember Riley stated that this is a County road and the City has to follow the County's specifications and asked why the County would not just take the lead and complete this improvement with the improvement they are doing, with the City reimbursing the cost.

City Engineer Westby stated that the County was very open to partnering on the study and based on the results of the study, the County might be more open to a request to complete both projects at the same time with the County taking the lead. He stated that City staff can continue to have that discussion with Anoka County.

Motion by Councilmember Menth, seconded by Councilmember Riley, to recommend that the City Council order a Traffic Study for the proposed reconstruction of Bunker Lake Boulevard between Armstrong Boulevard and Ramsey Boulevard.

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

6. COMMITTEE / STAFF INPUT

6.01: Staff Updates on Improvement Projects and Items of Interest

City Engineer Westby reviewed the staff report.

6.02: Review Future Topics Calendar

City Engineer Westby stated that it is difficult to get everything on the list completed, as some items continue to be pushed out in order to support the higher priority projects that need to be discussed.

Public Works Superintendent Riemer provided an overview of the City's snowplowing process. He stated that the current benchmark for plowing is eight hours. He stated that if snowplowing times were to be lowered the City would need more staff and more equipment to support that change. He estimated that three or four trucks, with employees, would be needed to make a notable change to the plowing time. He anticipated that in order to maintain the eight-hour benchmark, there would need to be an additional plow/driver in the near future because of the increased residential development that is occurring.

7. ADJOURNMENT

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

Motion carried.

The regular meeting of the Public Works Committee adjourned at 6:33 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Grant Riemer
Public Works Superintendent

Drafted by Amanda Staple
TimeSaver Off Site Secretarial, Inc.