

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

The Public Works Committee conducted a regular meeting on Tuesday, October 19, 2021, at the Ramsey Municipal Center, 7550 Sunwood Drive NW, Ramsey, Minnesota.

Members Present: Chairperson Chris Riley
 Councilmember Debra Musgrove
 Councilmember Matt Woestehoff

Also Present: City Engineer Bruce Westby
 Economic Development Manager Sean Sullivan
 Civil Engineer II Joe Feriancek
 Tom Bakritges, Capstone Homes
 John Dobbs, Re/Max Results

1. CALL TO ORDER

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

2. CITIZEN INPUT

There was none.

3. APPROVE AGENDA

Motion by Councilmember Woestehoff, seconded by Councilmember Musgrove, to approve the agenda, as presented.

Motion carried. Voting Yes: Chairperson Riley, Councilmembers Woestehoff and Musgrove.
Voting No: None.

4. APPROVE MINUTES

4.01: Approve September 21, 2021, Meeting Minutes

Motion by Councilmember Woestehoff, seconded by Councilmember Musgrove, to approve the following minutes:

Regular Meeting Minutes dated September 21, 2021

Motion carried. Voting Yes: Chairperson Riley, Councilmembers Woestehoff and Musgrove.
Voting No: None.

5. COMMITTEE BUSINESS

5.01: Discuss Potential Pedestrian Crossing at Hwy 47/142nd Avenue

City Engineer Westby reviewed the case and the staff recommendation to work with MnDOT in 2027 to explore safe alternatives for a pedestrian crossing in the area.

Councilmember Musgrove asked if there are trails planned through the parks department for that area on that side of the street.

City Engineer Westby replied that there are no plans at this time.

Councilmember Woestehoff commented that it appears there is a section of sidewalk along 47 on the west side but a segment appears to be missing that would provide connection to a controlled intersection.

City Engineer Westby confirmed there is a segment missing and there are currently no plans to make such connections.

Councilmember Musgrove referenced the undeveloped parcels and asked if there has been discussion to improve the area where pedestrians have created a trail. She asked if there are plans to improve that trail area.

City Engineer Westby replied that he is unsure and noted that they are attempting to wait for development to bring that connection.

Economic Development Manager Sullivan commented that the undeveloped parcel is City owned and there had been discussion of the City putting in that trail segment, but it would be difficult to predict what development would bring and what the trail segment would need to look like.

Chairperson Riley stated that this segment has been identified on the trail gap list for many years. He stated that perhaps that segment should be pushed more.

Councilmember Musgrove stated that it would make sense to look into that option in working with MnDOT, as students use that segment to get to the high school. She agreed that it would be worth looking into because it has been discussed for a long time.

Councilmember Woestehoff stated that he would support the recommended motion to work with MnDOT in 2027 but would also support that segment being working into the parks system discussion for trail gaps. He did not however believe that striping and a flashing signal would create a safe pedestrian crossing in that location.

City Engineer Westby confirmed that there is no immediate plan to push the improvement before 2027, but to think about that area as opportunities arise to fill the trail gaps.

Councilmember Woestehoff stated that he would be interested in creating a trail improvement and if the eventual developer does not like that trail, they can change it. He clarified that the trail segment he is mentioning would go south, west of Hwy 47 to Bunker Lake Boulevard.

City Engineer Westby stated that staff can discuss that option and bring it back to the Committee.

Chairperson Riley stated that he was thinking about the east side of the road from 142nd towards Xkimo going north.

Councilmember Musgrove commented that both sides would be worth looking into.

Chairperson Riley agreed that it would not make sense to create a pedestrian crossing at 142nd.

City Engineer Westby commented that this would be added to the future topics list to bring back in the spring.

5.02: Consider Revised Cost Share Framework for Riverdale Drive Extension Improvement Project Related to Riverstone South; Case of Capstone Homes and Pearson Properties of Ramsey

Economic Development Manager Sullivan reviewed the staff report and noted that staff has worked hard to bring forward a creative solution to fund the Riverdale Drive Extension and tree preservation credit that utilizes MnDOT grants, Ramsey HRA funds and PIR funds. This project will open up more land for residential and commercial/industrial development and increase safety for existing and future Ramsey residents and businesses. Staff recommends that the City Council approve the revised Cost Share Framework including Tree Preservation, including the City contribution to the County property, updating planned grant fund revenue and ROW acquisition cost.

Chairperson Riley commented that there are a lot of numbers and there has been a lot of previous discussion on this topic. He asked if the developer is comfortable with the proposed plan.

Tom Bakritges, Capstone, confirmed that staff did an excellent job in its presentation, and this is several years in the making, through collaboration and they agree with what is presented. He stated that weather permitting, this plan would allow them to begin construction in February or March of 2022. He stated that they have been meeting weekly with staff and everyone agrees this would be the best path forward.

John Dobbs, representing the Pearsons, agreed with the comments of Tom Bakritges. He commented that Economic Development Manager Sullivan has stepped into this and done well in the past few months. He stated that the Pearsons support this proposal.

Councilmember Woestehoff stated that if the developer wants to build in early 2022, he would be curious as to when the road would be constructed.

City Engineer Westby replied that staff has been working through that in the past few weeks after receiving grant funds. He explained the review process that is necessary from MnDOT in order to use those funds. He stated that if the Committee accepts the framework, staff would bring this forward to the Council on October 26th and request development of plans for the road and utilities. He stated that they would propose to work on those two elements separately in order to complete the utilities while awaiting MnDOT approval for the road plans. He estimated that the road project could be bid in July with contract award and the work to be completed by September 2022.

Councilmember Woestehoff asked if that timeline would align with the schedule of the developer.

Mr. Bakritges replied that they will be constructing homes. He noted that there is an existing farm road that runs through the County property and can be utilized for construction. He stated that schedule should align with them.

Chairperson Riley asked for clarification on the numbers proposed with the cost share and the agreement for cost share between the Pearsons and Capstone.

Economic Development Manager Sullivan stated that the Pearsons and Capstone already have an agreement on how they will share the cost, based on the linear footage. He stated that Capstone does not want to contribute more than their linear footage and they are not willing to change their agreement.

Chairperson Riley understood there is a separate agreement between Capstone and the Pearsons but noted another option which would avoid using the PIR fund.

Economic Development Manager Sullivan stated that this scenario utilizes voluntary assessments. He stated that under the scenario that Chairperson Riley presented, Capstone would pay a larger assessment, which they have stated they are not willing to do. He stated that the scenario mentioned by Chairperson Riley would in essence reopen negotiations.

Mr. Dobbs stated that the Pearson agreement is in writing with Capstone and goes back to before a time when a proposal was presented to the City. He stated that it is not something that would easily be renegotiated as it goes back to the time the purchase of the property was first discussed.

Mr. Bakritges stated that the cost share that was previously agreed upon is still maintained through this revised agreement, although he understood that the funds the City will be using for its portion are now different. He stated that the City was unable to receive grant funds for the tree purchase and this would still allow for the project and road construction to move forward.

Economic Development Manager Sullivan commented that the point of Chairperson Riley is valid in that if everyone could agree, they could use HRA funds and not use the PIR fund but from a negotiation standpoint they could not reach that point.

Councilmember Musgrove commented that she is glad to see the County property price reduced. She stated that the City has asked for the tree area to be preserved and because staff has looked for other options, that did not work out, she would be comfortable moving forward in the method

proposed. She stated that there are a lot of benefits to having the Bowers Drive access changed onto Highway 10, which helps existing residents.

Motion by Councilmember Musgrove, seconded by Councilmember Woestehoff, to recommend that the City Council approve the revised Cost Share Framework including Tree Preservation, including the City contribution to the County Property, updating planned grant fund revenue and ROW acquisition costs, and the Public Works Committee feels that a contribution to a collector road has a broader public benefit and that the revised cost share framework is close to the original framework originally approved (non-binding) by the City Council.

Motion carried. Voting Yes: Chairperson Riley, Councilmembers Musgrove and Woestehoff. Voting No: None.

5.03: Receive Sound Wall Request Letter from Residents East of State Highway 47, North of Xkimo Street

City Engineer Westby reviewed the staff report and asked for input from the Committee.

Chairperson Riley invited the residents to provide input.

Ted Blakely, 5041 Xkimo Court, commented that staff did a great job providing background and describing what they are looking for. He stated that he and his wife have lived in their home for about 20 years and when they first moved in there was less traffic on Highway 47. He stated that since that time there has been an increase in traffic and the noise levels increased after the senior living home was constructed west of Highway 47. He believed that perhaps the noise is bouncing off that building towards the other residential properties. He stated that when they sit on their deck, they often have to pause conversation until loud vehicles pass by. He stated that he can also hear traffic inside his home because of the noise level. He stated that there is a walking path along 47 and the sound wall further up the road provides a huge difference in mitigating the noise from traffic. He stated that many of the residents that live on the cul-de-sac now work from home and therefore have no escape from the traffic noise, therefore the issue can become a bigger problem.

Rick Bailey, 5021 Xkimo Court, commented that he is hugely dissatisfied with the experience they are having because of the impact of loud traffic noise. He agreed that he and his wife have to stop conversations when sitting outside because of loud traffic. He commented that he has lived in his home for 13 years and the problem has exponentially increased during that time. He commented on the impact the noise has perpetually and it impacts their quality of life.

Mr. Blakely agreed that the problem wears on them daily and decreases their level of satisfaction in living in that area.

Mr. Bailey commented that the speed increases at the stoplight and therefore traffic accelerates at that point.

Megan Blakely, 5041 Xkimo Court, commented that they are the closest house to the road. She stated that at some point they lost leverage with the builder and asked if there were a part of the

City process that would include visual inspection of the land. She asked whose responsibility it would be to ensure the intent of the sound wall is provided. She stated that she is concerned that this will result in a way that makes them want to move from the cul-de-sac.

Mr. Bailey stated that his email included a drawing showing the noise wall extension going further than it does extend.

Chairperson Riley asked if the error was on the City or developer. He asked if the recourse against the developer has been lost.

City Engineer Westby commented that he can see what was communicated with the residents and agreed that does not align with the plan. He stated that what was built did align with the approved plan. He stated that the last 18 months have been a difficult situation to operate in with numerous people working remotely, acknowledging that communication has lacked and there has been change in staff members that perhaps broke down the process. He stated that moving forward, staff needs to be clear with the residents and developers as to what a wall of this manner would be. He stated that it was never stated in resolution or agreement that the wall would be from the southwest corner of the plat to the northwest corner, that the wall would be six feet in height from the existing pavement, etc. He stated that in future cases, staff will ensure that language is clear, and those specifications are made. He did not think it was the fault of any one person or thing. He stated that the proposed grading was not on the noise wall plan, which only showed existing grading. He acknowledged that the existing and proposed grading are different.

Councilmember Woestehoff asked if the noise wall to the north is in the Highway right-of-way.

City Engineer Westby commented that he believes that is on private property.

Councilmember Woestehoff commented that he feels the pain of the residents as he lives off Variolite where traffic moves at high speeds. He stated that he would not support the sign about the noise law as he feels that will entice people to move at higher speeds. He stated that in terms of leverage with the developer, there were notes from the Planning Commission review which states that the wall would be consistent with the existing noise wall. He noted that the EPB also suggested a noise study.

City Engineer Westby replied that he is unsure if the study was completed.

Councilmember Woestehoff stated that he believes this should be continued to be worked on as it is a problem worth solving and the developer should be involved.

City Engineer Westby stated that he has not reached out to the former Community Development Director to see if he has input that could provide assistance. He commented that could be useful moving forward. He noted that he would also follow up on the study and review various past sets of minutes. He stated that the noise wall to the north appears to be within the easement, just outside of the MnDOT right-of-way.

Councilmember Woestehoff asked if the same conditions exist in the area being discussed.

City Engineer Westby replied that the easement ends where the noise wall ends. He stated that this is an undeveloped corridor moving south and there are some trees that provide a buffer as well.

Councilmember Musgrove stated that if a sound wall were built on the other side of the trail, they would not be in the right-of-way.

City Engineer Westby replied that when you reach the west plat line, MnDOT right-of-way comes into play which is why the wall was constructed in the area it exists.

Mr. Bailey stated that when standing on the trail, you can look down on the wall.

Chairperson Riley commented that it is a six-foot-tall wall, it is just in a hole.

City Engineer Westby commented that the developer believes that the wall covered the homes they constructed, whereas the expectation of the existing residents was that the wall would extend further. He confirmed that the plans were approved by the City in the manner constructed.

Councilmember Musgrove thanked the residents for providing input and continuing to express their opinions. She stated that from the beginning the concern of the residents and Planning Commission was that there would need to be a sound wall there. She stated that she agrees that there needs to be a change to how the description is recorded. She noted that the intent was to have a wall similar to the other walls along 47, which are up high and provide a barrier. She stated that she does not feel that it would be worth addressing it more with MnDOT. She stated that there are not funds available. She asked if MnDOT has any future project plans in that corridor that could impact that wall.

City Engineer Westby stated that MnDOT only has plans to complete an overlay of the corridor in 2027. He stated that when they complete that overlay, they will review whether widening or pedestrian improvements are needed but they do not plan for expansion. He stated that he is not aware of any such improvements, noting that pedestrian improvements were already made at this intersection and Alpine Drive.

Councilmember Musgrove commented that posting signs and increasing enforcement would not provide the desired outcome. She asked staff to focus on potential funding and cost estimates to have a sound wall installed that met in the intent of the Planning Commission and City Council. She was unsure how it would look to have two sound walls and was unsure if the developer would be in agreement with the City moving the wall of the developer to the desired location. She asked the typical timing for sound wall installation.

City Engineer Westby stated that in terms of timing for a noise wall, it would depend on the circumstances. He noted that generally grading would begin and the noise wall would be installed during that time when utility work is completed. He stated that if the noise study was not completed, the City could go back to the developer and that could provide leverage.

Councilmember Woestehoff commented that he believes that they should talk to MnDOT because of the right-of-way that would be needed to complete the sound wall for those additional properties. He commented that would make it a continuous wall with the property to the north, which is more visually pleasing and would provide sound mitigation. He stated that if a new wall were constructed on the other side of the trail, he would simply remove the existing wall.

Councilmember Musgrove commented that if a sound wall is placed on the street side of the sidewalk there would be less visual impact for drivers. She commented that if the sound wall is placed on the other side of the sidewalk, it would be less likely to have impacts on future road projects.

Councilmember Woestehoff agreed that as they move towards the intersection, he would want to ensure there is sufficient visibility for drivers.

Chairperson Riley asked if the direction is for staff to pursue what would be necessary to construct the wall. He also asked for input from staff on the different elements that have been discussed. He stated that he would prefer the wall extend to the end of the plat where it was intended. He stated that he would also want to engage the developer as it sounds like there is blame to be shared, therefore he would support a cost share.

Councilmember Musgrove asked if the additional could be priced out as it appears to be a small portion.

Chairperson Riley commented that he does not believe that section is small but noted that staff could provide a general cost estimate as an alternative.

Mr. Blakely asked if there could be a compromise to extend the wall further, although recognized it may not be able to extend all the way to the other sound wall.

City Engineer Westby confirmed that he has sufficient direction.

Mr. Blakely asked for input on the timeline for that process.

City Engineer Westby replied that the Committee will meet again in November but does not meet in December. He commented that staff has a lot of work to complete in order to provide meaningful answers and responses to address this issue. He noted that perhaps staff could bring this back in January or February.

5.04: Consider Recommending City Council Authorization to Prepare Plans and Specifications for 2022 Pavement Management Program Projects

City Engineer Westby reviewed the staff report and recommended that the Committee recommend that the City Council authorize preparation of plans and specifications for 2022 Pavement Management Program projects.

Councilmember Musgrove asked if there was a 79 percent increase in the cost.

City Engineer Westby replied that the cost should not have been that much different.

Councilmember Musgrove referenced Autumn Heights, which is projected similar to expected. She asked what staff used as an estimated cost increase.

Civil Engineer II Feriancek stated that he went back and reanalyzed using the cost per mile formula. He stated that they budgeted a one percent increase for the next five years in order to build in inflation. He stated that there may need to be some soil corrections in Autumn Heights, which may be reflected in the increase.

Councilmember Musgrove commented that she believed Autumn Heights to be a reasonable increase compared to the other projects.

Mr. Feriancek stated that those projects are looked at differently because of the improvements needed.

Councilmember Musgrove referenced Waco Street and asked if it would be cheaper to reconstruct and leave the curb where it is if the residents like that.

Mr. Feriancek replied that he believes the condition of the curb and gutter is good and there would be spot replacements. He stated that they have not looked at the alternative of leaving that in place. He noted that while the upfront costs may be higher, they would be doing multiple overlays in the future and there would be additional plowing time as well.

City Engineer Westby agreed that the upfront costs would be higher but there would be operational and maintenance savings in the future. He stated that staff could attempt to review the options on cost.

Councilmember Musgrove stated that she believes it would be worth getting the input from the residents on that road.

Chairperson Riley asked if that could be included as an alternative. He stated that he would be interested in the cost difference before they go out to bid.

City Engineer Westby stated that the item could be pushed to the next Committee meeting in order to provide that additional information.

Chairperson Riley stated that he is only interested in the cost estimates for the options and would not direct staff to solicit input from the neighborhood.

Councilmember Woestehoff stated that he likes the narrowing as it would save staff time and provide consistency. He recognized that there would be a higher cost now, but there would be savings in the future.

City Engineer Westby provided clarification on the width of the road and right-of-way. He noted that segment is extremely wide and is the only street of that width in the area.

Councilmember Woestehoff asked if the additional information could be a part of the recommendation to the Council, rather than bringing this back to the Committee and causing a delay. He stated that he is personally comfortable with the project as outlined but if there is a desire to see the other option, that should be presented at the Council to continue the timeline.

Councilmember Musgrove confirmed that she would be comfortable with the additional information being provided to the Council.

Motion by Councilmember Musgrove, seconded by Councilmember Woestehoff, to recommend City Council authorization to prepare plans and specifications for 2022 Pavement Management Program projects, along with alternative options for Waco Street.

Motion carried. Voting Yes: Chairperson Riley, Councilmembers Musgrove and Woestehoff. Voting No: None.

6. COMMITTEE / STAFF INPUT

6.01: Receive Staff Updates on 148th Lane NW Cul-de-Sac and Easement Vacations

City Engineer Westby provided an update on the 148th Lane NW cul-de-sac and easement vacations.

Mr. St. Claire stated that their home was built before the easement was placed on the property and before the other neighbor constructed a home and moved into the property. He stated that when they had to obtain the variance there were some misleading things. He commented that they had to sign something, which they should not have had to. He explained that the current detached garage is 11 feet from the easement. He stated that when they wanted to construct the pole building, the opinion of City staff changed on where the front yard was for their property. He stated that the variance was based off the interpretation that the front yard was now their side yard. He stated that when they were going through the variance process, City staff encouraged them to pursue vacation of the easement as that would negate the need for a variance. He stated that when they spoke with the neighbor, they stated that they were not planning to develop but wanted the option to sell for development in the future, which is why they moved forward with the variance. He stated that they continued to do what staff said was necessary in order to move forward. He stated that if the City wants to make a turnaround, they do not have a problem with that, but if they plan to extend further, he would have an issue. He stated that the interpretation of City staff on where his side yard and front yard are located have complicated things. He identified where his garage and pole building are located. He commented that they are okay with whatever has to be done, they just want to be able to pave their driveway at some time and plan for what will be done in the future.

Councilmember Musgrove stated that the case mentions that public works would like a cul-de-sac or turnaround before winter. She stated that the St. Claires have been working on their variance

and issue for over 18 months. She asked what would be stopping the City from vacating the St. Claires' portion of the easement and allowing any future needs to be accommodated by the other property if that property wants to develop. She commented that the St. Claires have done a lot in trying to make things work and follow the path they are directed upon.

Chairperson Riley commented that the variance has been issued and clarified that the issue remaining is related to the vacation of the easement.

City Engineer Westby identified the right-of-way that would be necessary for a full cul-de-sac, which would go way into the driveway and therefore would not be an option. He stated that staff has discussed this and decided to take that off the menu because it would not work. He stated that in order to allow the other property to develop, perhaps four or five lots could be created on that other property. He stated that if that property owner wanted to retain the existing home, they would need to ensure the setbacks work. He stated that they are attempting to avoid issues in the future without knowing what would happen in the future. He stated that they want to ensure that whatever is done, the property could be served by the roadway. He stated that staff could work with the St. Claires to develop the solution.

Mr. St. Claire confirmed that they are willing to work with staff.

Chairperson Riley asked the benefit that this would provide to the City.

City Engineer Westby replied that he does not have an answer for that.

Chairperson Riley asked if it would be a mistake to let the easement go and then need it back in the future.

City Engineer Westby confirmed that would complicate future development if that were to occur.

Mr. St. Claire commented that Ramsey Elementary has a wetland preservation teaching path and walkway through the back of the school and the area behind his home. He stated that they have zero artificial light in the back of the property, which is home to several different types of wildlife. He stated that homes do not have to be built everywhere. He stated that the neighborhood is all old houses, and it would not make sense to develop new homes on the same road. He noted that if the other property is developed, it could be served by a private road.

Mrs. St. Claire commented that if there were a road put in, it would change the character and use of their property.

Mr. St. Claire commented that whatever the City wants to do, it would need to take over a section of their property. He commented on the landscaping, trees, and boulders on their property.

Mrs. St. Claire commented that they have been in a spot where they do not know what will happen and has put them in the position twice to have conversations with their neighbor which they do not want to have as they have not been pleasant.

Chairperson Riley commented that it would seem that the City would get a turnaround of some sort out of this, as there is currently not adequate space for a turnaround.

Councilmember Musgrove stated that there appears to be a 66-foot easement on the 25-foot-wide dirt road and asked if that is normal or unusually wide for a little country road. She asked if the road would ever be constructed wider.

City Engineer Westby replied that right-of-way varies from 60 to 80 feet. He stated that 66 feet of easement would accommodate any standard road design, gravel or bituminous.

Councilmember Musgrove stated that part of the recommendation to vacate the easement through the planning process was because there was no desire to develop. She stated that if a turnaround were constructed, trucks would be able to turn around and if there is future development the easement on the other side of the road could be used to make that happen.

City Engineer Westby stated that in the case the St. Claire easement is vacated, the easement on the other side would remain. He stated that the concern would be how to transition onto the other property.

Mr. St. Claire commented that it would be doable to use the turnaround to get onto that other property.

Councilmember Musgrove asked if a portion of the easement could be vacated due to the existing setbacks and variance issued. She noted that would help to alleviate concern that the St. Claires have with where the road would be located in the future.

Councilmember Woestehoff stated that he understands the perspective of the St. Claires, but the property to the south also has rights. He stated that it would be tough to vacate an easement that may be needed in the future.

Mrs. St. Claire stated that if the easement is vacated, she would be able to maintain a line of privacy between the properties.

Councilmember Woestehoff commented that there is nothing new impending or scheduled to occur, and therefore there is no urgency to make a decision. He stated that from his perspective, doing nothing is always an option and in this case is the option he would suggest.

Chairperson Riley asked if there would be intention to pave to the end of the easement, if and when it is paved.

City Engineer Westby stated that based on the other uses he would not see a benefit to paving to the end with the exception of building a cul-de-sac for full around ability for emergency vehicles. He stated that if an emergency vehicle had to go down the road, there is no way to turnaround with the exception of using a driveway.

Chairperson Riley asked if there would be any compromise, such as narrowing the easement and whether that would accomplish some goals but keep rights in place.

City Engineer Westby replied that if the intent is to serve properties with a road, if the property to the south develops, the road would need to swing south and that would probably preclude them from keeping the existing home.

Councilmember Woestehoff commented that would be the problem of the developer and not the City.

Councilmember Musgrove commented that it appears the home to the south is setback further than the St. Claire home.

Mrs. St. Claire confirmed that their home is close to the roadway, along with their garage and septic.

Councilmember Woestehoff stated that at the end of the day, everything is replaceable if it is gravel. He stated that perhaps there is a way to create a turnaround within the existing easement and it remain gravel.

Mr. St. Claire commented that the hammerhead they proposed would be 33 feet by 66 feet and would allow a large fire truck to complete a three-point turn.

Councilmember Musgrove commented that the hammerhead would allow for turnaround space for emergency vehicles and service vehicles than currently exists. She stated that would provide for the needs at this time. She stated that if the hammerhead is completed, she would like to see the St. Claire easement vacated.

Mr. St. Claire commented that they are okay with the way the road is.

Mrs. St. Claire commented that this situation just keeps coming up and it is stressful to not have a plan or something certain.

Mr. St. Claire commented that if the City wants to remove trees to create a large cul-de-sac, they would have to live with it but is unsure what the point would be.

Chairperson Riley asked if the hammerhead could be constructed at this time as it would exist within the easement.

Mr. St. Claire commented that would be 100 percent within the easement.

City Engineer Westby commented that the St. Claires agree with the hammerhead, but they would also need to consult the neighbors to the south.

Mr. St. Claire commented that the neighbors to the south support a hammerhead.

Mrs. St. Claire commented that it continues to be a loop where they need to react and respond to things that change on the City's end. She expressed frustration with the process they have gone through the past 18 months.

Councilmember Musgrove referenced direction from the Planning Commission that was given in April of 2020 for staff to begin work on vacating the easement, which did not happen and is where the frustration comes from. She noted that the residents follow through on what they needed to for the variance and home occupation permit, but the City never followed through on the vacation of the easement.

City Engineer Westby stated that generally 60 foot is the minimum right-of-way or easement the City would want. He stated that perhaps there could be an option to vacate a strip of the easement or whether the property owner desires the entire easement vacated.

Mr. St. Claire commented that it would not make sense to have a ten-foot strip, as that still creates a jam in the future. He commented that the property to the south does not intend to develop their property but does not want to lose the value of their property for the time it will be sold. He noted that the property to the south could still have buildable lots and maintain their value with the St. Claire portion of the easement vacated. He stated that someone could purchase the property that wants horses and then the property would not develop, but the value would still be realized at the time of sale.

Mrs. St. Claire commented that there could still be buildable lots on the property to the south with the vacated easement on their property, noting that the road could go through the property to the south to access homes, if homes are eventually built.

Chairperson Riley commented that his issue is that the City currently has something, and he would need to justify why the City would give away something it already has that could be needed in the future.

Mr. St. Claire commented that he would respond that it is because of bad planning. He stated that his home was allowed to be constructed where it is and where the detached garage was allowed to be placed. He noted that the opinion of front and side yard changed from City staff in 2020. He stated that he should have never been required to go through the expense and time to obtain a variance to construct the pole building. He stated that even during the variance discussions he was told by City staff to vacate the easement and they chose to go through the variance process in order to avoid problems for other properties.

Mrs. St. Claire stated that they had to go through the variance process because they were strong armed by City staff. She commented that they only live on the property, and they do not complete landscaping work on the property.

Mr. St. Claire commented that this would fix something the City was wrong about and would be a situation in which the City could do the right thing.

Chairperson Riley commented that if the City vacated this easement and the property to the south wanted to develop in the future, would it then be the responsibility of that property owner to provide sufficient easement for the road. He asked if there would be any liability for the City in vacating the easement.

City Engineer Westby replied that he could not answer that.

Councilmember Woestehoff acknowledged that the property owners have gone through a lot. He stated that if the easement is vacated, that could bring more problems in the future, perhaps just not for the St. Claires.

Mr. St. Claire commented that if a hammerhead were installed it would provide turnaround space. He noted that if a cul-de-sac were built, the City would need to purchase wetland credits.

Motion by Councilmember Riley, seconded by Councilmember Musgrove, to recommending City Council to keep the easement necessary to construct the turnaround and vacate any remaining easement on the St. Claire property the easement contingent upon consultation with the City Attorney to ensure that vacating the easement would not provide issues of liability for the City.

Further discussion: City Engineer Westby stated that staff would like to get the turnaround in before winter. Chairperson Riley commented that staff should determine what is necessary for the turnaround and then proceed. He stated that he would prefer the hammerhead design but would support what is needed.

Motion carried. Voting Yes: Chairperson Riley, Councilmembers Musgrove and Woestehoff. Voting No: None.

Chairperson Riley briefly recessed the meeting.

Chairperson Riley reconvened the meeting.

5. COMMITTEE BUSINESS (Continued)

5.05: Consider Recommending City Council Authorization for Flashing Yellow Arrow Study at the Intersection of Sunwood Drive and Ramsey Boulevard/CSAH 56

City Engineer Westby reviewed the staff report and asked for input from the Committee.

Chairperson Riley asked why this intersection was chosen.

City Engineer Westby replied that this was the intersection brought forward through resident request. He noted that this is one of the primary intersections in The COR that does not have flashing yellow.

Chairperson Riley asked if this would be the intersection staff would say is most pressing.

City Engineer Westby confirmed that it has the highest volume of traffic.

Councilmember Musgrove asked what would be different about this request compared to the other intersection the City reviewed and decided not to move forward on because of the cost. She stated that the City can do the traffic counts, could it also complete the study to provide a cost savings.

City Engineer Westby recognized that the Council reviewed this issue on other intersections but recognized the high cost to complete all the improvements. He stated that this request was brought forward by a resident. He stated that staff does not have a traffic engineer and therefore cannot complete the study.

Councilmember Woestehoff stated that perhaps it would make sense to look at the improvement in the future, closer to when Highway 10 work will be completed, as it would be helpful to have the flashing arrow when that is a detour route.

Chairperson Riley stated that the funding source would be the PIR fund. He stated that the City will end up doing this anyway and therefore the sooner it is done, the more benefit it provides to residents. He stated that perhaps direction is provided to complete one per year until the intersections are completed.

Councilmember Woestehoff agreed that the flashing yellow arrows are beneficial.

Councilmember Musgrove stated that she believed there is a list and estimated cost. She agreed that it would be helpful to create a plan to get these done.

Motion by Councilmember Musgrove, seconded by Councilmember Woestehoff, to recommending City Council authorization to hire SEH Inc. to analyze the feasibility of modifying the signal system at the intersection of Sunwood Drive and Ramsey Boulevard/CSAH 56 to add flashing yellow arrow operations and direct staff to create a plan to improve one intersection annually.

Motion carried. Voting Yes: Chairperson Riley, Councilmembers Musgrove and Woestehoff. Voting No: None.

5.06: Consider Recommending City Council Approval of Plans and Specifications and Authorization to Advertise Bids for Improvement Project #21-08, Water Treatment Plant Trunk Watermain Improvements

City Engineer Westby reviewed the staff report and recommendation to recommend City Council approval of plans and specifications and authorization to advertise bids for Improvement Project #21-08, Water Treatment Plant Trunk Watermain Improvements.

Councilmember Musgrove asked if this was the project the City hoped to save funds on by aligning the project with the County project on Bunker.

City Engineer Westby replied at previously the City was unsure of the timing of the Anoka County project and what that project would entail. He stated that the City prefers to get this work completed to avoid additional project costs that could come from completing the work after the County project.

Councilmember Musgrove commented that it seems to make sense to get ahead of this and attempt to obtain the best pricing.

Chairperson Riley asked the amount of the bids that were rejected.

City Engineer Westby replied that this was not bid because they anticipated steep price inclines.

Chairperson Riley agreed that it makes sense to provide as much time as possible for a contractor to lock in the best pricing.

Motion by Councilmember Woestehoff, seconded by Councilmember Musgrove, to recommend City Council approval of Plans and Specifications and authorization to advertise for bids for Improvement Project #21-08, Water Treatment Plant Trunk Watermain Improvements.

Motion carried. Voting Yes: Chairperson Riley, Councilmembers Woestehoff and Musgrove. Voting No: None.

6. COMMITTEE / STAFF INPUT (Continued)

6.02: Review Final Northwest Metro Regional Surface Water Supply Study

City Engineer Westby reviewed the executive summary of the final Northwest Metro Regional Surface Water Supply Study. He stated that the cost would be too high to move forward unless the option of groundwater is no longer an option.

6.03: Staff Updates on Improvement Projects and Items of Interest

City Engineer Westby provided an update on current and proposed City, County and MnDOT improvement projects and studies and on other items of interest.

Councilmember Musgrove referenced the Ramsey gateway sign that was previously located at the Bunker and 47 intersection and asked when that discussion would come back.

Chairperson Riley agreed that sign should be discussed.

City Engineer Westby confirmed he would add that to the future topics calendar.

6.04: Review Future Topics Calendar

City Engineer Westby and the Committee reviewed the future topics calendar.

7. ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Councilmember Musgrove, seconded by Councilmember Woestehoff, to adjourn the Public Works Committee meeting.

Motion carried.

The regular meeting of the Public Works Committee adjourned at 9:06 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Grant Riemer
Public Works Superintendent

Drafted by Amanda Staple
TimeSaver Off Site Secretarial, Inc.