

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

The Public Works Committee conducted a regular meeting on Monday, March 16, 2020, at the Ramsey Municipal Center, 7550 Sunwood Drive NW, Ramsey, Minnesota. Appropriate social distancing was observed during the meeting.

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

Also Present: City Engineer Bruce Westby
 Deputy City Administrator Tim Gladhill
 Parks and Assistant Public Works Superintendent Mark Riverblood

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Kuzma called the regular meeting of the Public Works Committee to order at 5:00 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 February 18, 2020, Meeting Minutes

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

Regular Meeting Minutes dated February 18, 2020

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

5. COMMITTEE BUSINESS

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

Deputy City Administrator Gladhill reviewed the staff report and stated that staff recommends that the City Council confirm direction to continue funding discussions with the City, offering to pay up to one third of the project costs on the Pearson Properties Frontage (excluding Anoka County parcel). He noted that Capstone Homes is recommending that the City contribute 50 percent of the cost of the Pearson Properties Frontage (excluding Anoka County parcel).

Tom Bakritges, Capstone Homes, stated that it has been a good experience to work with City staff. He noted that they have tried to be consistent with what has been done with the City in terms of cost-share on other road projects. He stated that the one third/one third/one third split has always been discussed. He stated that this is an important road for the City and developer, and they are comfortable with the one third/one third/one third split. He stated that they are open to allowing the City additional time to find additional funding allocations, which would reduce the costs for all parties and therefore support option 4A.

John Dobbs, representing the Pearsons and Pearson properties, echoed the comments made by Capstone. He stated that staff has been amazingly supportive throughout this process over the past two years. He noted that the challenge has always been the cost of the County frontage of Riverdale Drive. He stated that the funding challenge is how the road can be built without the County contributing. He stated that they have a similar view to Capstone and hope to find a way through this.

Chairperson Kuzma stated that the challenge is the amount of \$118,000 and asked if that amount could be split three ways as well.

Deputy City Administrator Gladhill noted that is up for discussion. He clarified that amount is allocation for the County parcel. He confirmed that could be split three ways. He noted that staff could also speak to the County to determine if the cost could be paid upfront and then reimbursed by the County when the parcel sells.

Chairperson Kuzma asked where the funding would come from for the City portion.

Deputy City Administrator Gladhill reviewed some available funding sources the City could utilize.

Councilmember Riley confirmed that the City has identified funding sources for its portion of the cost-share and that the issue is the County's portion, which equates to about \$118,000. He noted that the County will receive additional funds for its parcel when it sells if the road is constructed.

Deputy City Administrator Gladhill explained that the County has funds allocated through its CIP and does not have funds or priority identified for this improvement, or the sale of that parcel.

Chairperson Kuzma asked if the developers would be open to splitting the \$118,000 three ways.

Mr. Bakritges replied that they have not talked about that scenario and is not comfortable discussing that because the parcel is owned by the County. He stated that he could be open to it but there would need to be further discussion because the land is owned by the County.

Chairperson Kuzma stated that he is attempting to find a solution that could allow the project to move forward, noting that there could be a possibility that the funds could be reimbursed at a later date.

Mr. Dobbs stated that the numbers move around, but everyone is on the same page with the one third/one third/one third split. He stated that there is something to be said about improving another property owner's value five-fold that seems wrong. He stated that they would like to continue to be supportive of the project.

Councilmember Riley stated that he understands that point of view. He stated that having the shortfall, the City may possibly have to delay the development one year to find a solution. He explained that if everyone shares the additional cost at a rate of about \$40,000 each, that could allow this to move forward.

Mr. Dobbs noted that he would have to speak with the Pearsons, noting that his prior comment was as a consultant. He acknowledged that everyone has worked hard to get this far, and he would like to continue discussions.

Mr. Bakritges stated that if this action is what the Committee would recommend, he would want to ensure that the City leaves open the option of investigating other funding sources that could bring down the cost and believed there to be enough time to do that.

Deputy City Administrator Gladhill agreed and asked if the Committee would be comfortable allowing staff and the developers to find that solution and define a timeframe.

Councilmember Riley stated that he would be willing to support splitting the additional cost three ways, otherwise would feel that the project would have to be moved back one year.

Chairperson Kuzma echoed the comments of Councilmember Riley. He stated that if the agreement of splitting the County cost equally between the three parties could be reached, the Committee could forward that to the Council and that would not preclude staff from looking at additional funding sources.

Councilmember Menth asked where the gap is coming from.

Deputy City Administrator Gladhill explained that is the portion for the County parcel frontage.

Mr. Bakritges stated that they would support that concept but would like to stress that staff continue to investigate alternate sources of funding, as mentioned in the staff report.

Motion by Councilmember Riley, seconded by Councilmember Menth, to recommend that the City Council confirm direction to continue funding discussions with the City offering to pay up to one third of the project costs on the Pearson Properties Frontage.

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

5.02: Center Street Area Capital Improvement Planning

Parks and Assistant Public Works Superintendent Riverblood reviewed the staff report and recommendation to proceed and approve the planning activity outlined in the case.

Chairperson Kuzma asked if the design cost would cover both the park and pump house areas.

Parks and Assistant Public Works Superintendent Riverblood provided additional details on the elements that are included in the design, including the pump house elements and Center Street improvements.

Chairperson Kuzma asked if the pump house elements would include filters that may be necessary for water treatment.

Parks and Assistant Public Works Superintendent Riverblood noted that would be a separate activity, and they would ensure not to plan anything in areas that would perhaps need to be disturbed in the future for water treatment improvements.

Councilmember Menth asked for additional details on how the improvements would be added.

Parks and Assistant Public Works Superintendent Riverblood replied that the pump house material is meant to have material clad onto it, explaining that the new materials would be added to the existing structure. He provided additional details on the location of the temporary section of road and trail that would be improved.

Councilmember Riley agreed that this is the right time to improve the pump house as the area around it continues to develop.

Councilmember Menth noted that the last Council meeting included a discussion on the desire to hold apartment buildings to certain standards and agreed that the City should hold itself to the same standard.

Motion by Councilmember Menth, seconded by Councilmember Riley, to recommend to the City Council to approve \$11,800 for Center Street area capital improvement planning.

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

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

City Engineer Westby reviewed the staff report and recommendation that the City Council accept the Feasibility Report for Amended 2020 Pavement Overlay Improvements, Improvement Project No. 20-02A. Based on the pavement core analysis findings from both mill and overlay feasibility reports, the time of year as related to receiving competitive bids on projects, and the fact that the City is again discussing funding options for pavement management program projects, Staff does not recommend pursuing overlay improvements in 2020.

Councilmember Riley asked why the streets in Regency Ponds would look good and still not have enough pavement.

City Engineer Westby stated that the roads were sealcoated, which can make the road look better than the underlying conditions. He reviewed the ratings for the roads, which were 6, 7 and 8 and therefore seemed that they could be overlaid. He stated that after reviewing the pavement cores, much of the pavement is degrading from the bottom up. He reviewed information on the estimated timeline and the different factors that continue to impact that schedule. He stated that staff would recommend not moving forward on an overlay project this year for reasons noted earlier, and to allow Staff to focus on the Variolite Street Reconstruction project to ensure it can move forward this year. He noted that the overlay funds could be used for additional pavement corings and/or crack seal improvements, as needed.

Councilmember Riley stated that Business Park 95 is in bad shape and asked what would be done with those streets.

City Engineer Westby stated that the City would continue to patch those streets this year. He stated that there were two streets that had pavement sections that could support mill and overlay while the remainder requires full depth reclamation. He stated that he would prefer to delay that project to the next year when it can be better planned for and more is known about road funding.

Councilmember Riley asked if the streets would be good enough for businesses to use this year.

City Engineer Westby confirmed that the streets would be usable, although patching would not look as good aesthetically.

Councilmember Riley stated that originally, the City's plan for roads included completing mill and overlays but it continues to be the situation that mill and overlays cannot be completed. He asked if that would impact the City's plan and if other cities have similar problems.

City Engineer Westby noted that Anoka stopped completing mill and overlays in 2009 on older roads and are only doing full depth reclamations on its older roads. He confirmed that this will change the City's pavement management program for many of its streets.

Motion by Councilmember Menth, seconded by Councilmember Riley, to recommend that the City Council accept the Feasibility Report for Amended 2020 Pavement Overlay Improvements, Improvement Project No. 20-02A.

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

6. COMMITTEE / STAFF INPUT

6.01: Staff Updates on Variolite Street Reconstruction, Improvement Project No. 20-01

City Engineer Westby provided an update on the current status of the design options for Variolite Street in preparation of requesting City Council approval of the Feasibility Report on April 14th.

Councilmember Riley suggested placing signs out stating that the road is going to be reconstructed, as some residents do not seem to know about the upcoming project.

City Engineer Westby stated that staff will review that option once Public Works Superintendent Riemer returns from vacation.

6.02: Staff Updates on Improvement Projects and Items of Interest

City Engineer Westby reviewed the staff report, providing an update on current and proposed improvement projects within the City and on other items of interest to the Committee.

6.03: Review Future Topics Calendar

City Engineer Westby reviewed the future topics calendar.

7. ADJOURNMENT

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

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

The regular meeting of the Public Works Committee adjourned at 6:22 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Grant Riemer
Public Works Superintendent

Drafted by Amanda Staple
TimeSaver Off Site Secretarial, Inc.