

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

The Public Works Committee conducted a regular meeting on Tuesday, January 18, 2022, at the Ramsey Municipal Center, 7550 Sunwood Drive NW, Ramsey, Minnesota.

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

Also Present: Public Works Superintendent Grant Riemer
 City Engineer Bruce Westby
 Economic Development Manager Sean Sullivan
 Parks and Assistant Public Works Superintendent Mark Riverblood

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

Musgrove asked to change the order of the cases to consider Case 5.06 before Case 5.05.

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

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

4. APPROVE MINUTES

4.01: Approve November 16, 2021, Meeting Minutes

None.

5. COMMITTEE BUSINESS

5.01: Cost of Gravel Road Maintenance/Cost of Paving Remaining Gravel Roads

Public Works Superintendent Riemer reviewed the case and stated that based on the fact that there is no dedicated funding source for this project at this time, staff recommends continuing with the current maintenance practice, until such time a funding source can be developed to pave the remaining gravel roads.

Chairperson Riley asked if the total of gravel roads includes 173rd which will be paved as a part of the Makowsky development.

Public Works Superintendent Riemer confirmed that to be true.

Chairperson Riley asked about the lifespan of the current grader.

Public Works Superintendent Riemer replied that \$4,000 was recently spent on repairs and estimated a lifespan of two to three years or more depending on the ongoing maintenance needs. He estimated a replacement cost of \$350,000 to \$400,000.

Councilmember Musgrove asked why FEMA 2019 numbers were used.

Public Works Superintendent Riemer replied that FEMA updates those numbers every two years. He stated that the 2021 numbers were just released but the case was drafted in November.

Councilmember Musgrove asked if including this on the CIP would be a good idea so that it can continue to be considered. She asked if any of these street segments would be eligible for TIF.

Public Works Superintendent Riemer replied that TIF is not available this far north and the project has not been included in the CIP.

Chairperson Riley stated that the idea of replacing gravel roads has been a continued discussion. He stated that perhaps this paving could occur prior to the time the grader would need to be replaced.

Councilmember Woestehoff asked if federal grant funding has been pursued for this purpose.

Public Works Superintendent Riemer replied that he has not explored that option and was unsure if that would be a funding source for this type of project. He noted that paving some of the gravel roads would be easier than others as some go through wetlands or adjacent to the river which would have additional costs for wetland impacts and drainage requirements.

Councilmember Musgrove asked if any of those roads with wetland impacts would qualify for distribution of wetland funding.

City Engineer Westby replied that he did not believe they would be eligible projects as they are not included in the Capital Improvement Program (CIP).

Councilmember Musgrove asked if the projects were placed in the CIP would they then be an eligible project.

City Engineer Westby replied that could be an option if the right funding source presented itself.

Chairperson Riley asked if this type of project would fall under the assessment policy.

City Engineer Westby confirmed that to be true and confirmed that the cost would be 100 percent assessed against property owners that petitioned for the project. He stated that if the project were led by the City, the cost would be split 50/50 between the City and assessments to property owners.

Chairperson Riley commented that there seems to be agreement that the roads should be paved but noted that perhaps this becomes a new case where they could discuss phasing and funding.

Councilmember Musgrove suggested that the roads also be split into categories to identify those that may have wetland impacts.

Chairperson Riley asked if staff could identify the roads that would be easier to pave versus those that would be more difficult.

City Engineer Westby confirmed that staff could do that.

Chairperson Riley commented that the next step would then be to determine how those roads could be paved in a reasonable time period.

Councilmember Musgrove noted that 173rd Avenue could be removed from the list as that would be completed with a development project.

Jeff Sailor, 7650 178th Lane NW, noted that ten years ago staff spoke with the residents, and they were not interested in having their gravel roads paved. He provided additional details on the maintenance that is completed on the gravel roads during a year. He was surprised at the increase in cost to pave the roads as compared to the estimate ten years ago. He commented that all summer when you drive a vehicle it creates a lot of dust.

Bridget Sailor, 7650 178th Lane NW, stated that she is more concerned with safety, commenting on the current conditions of the gravel road.

Jeff Sailor stated that the buses also cause a lot of stress on the gravel road.

Chairperson Riley commented that the City has a goal to pave the roads, but the question remains with funding. He noted that currently there would be an assessment of 50 percent which would not seem reasonable. He noted that it seems there is consensus to develop a plan, but the roads would not be paved in the foreseeable future.

Councilmember Musgrove commented that it is her understanding that some of the roads that would be paved would continue to have a ditch drainage system and that would make a difference in the project cost.

Chairperson Riley asked what a reasonable time period would be for staff to bring this back for further discussion.

City Engineer Westby commented that he would request at least three months as there are a lot of factors to consider, along with other factors such as staffing.

Councilmember Musgrove commented that seems ambitious with the activity for the first quarter. She stated that perhaps six to nine months would be a better timeline.

It was the consensus that this item would return to the Committee within six months.

5.02: Consider Sound Wall Improvements East of Highway 47, North of Xkimo Street

City Engineer Westby reviewed the case and provided options the group could consider.

Chairperson Riley invited the resident present to address the Committee.

Mr. Blakely commented that there were emails between himself and City Engineer Westby after the previous meeting when this was discussed. He stated that they noticed more noise after the construction of Stoney River. He suggested that a hybrid option be considered that would block the noise bouncing off the Stoney River building.

City Engineer Westby asked for clarification on his request.

Mr. Blakely identified the end of the existing wall. He stated that one of the proposals seemed to end the noise wall at the arrow identified on the map, while the other would connect to the existing wall on the other side. He suggested a length in between those two in order to buffer the noise that bounces off Stoney River.

Councilmember Woestehoff asked if an opinion has been received from the City Attorney.

City Engineer Westby stated that he did explain the issue to the previous City Attorney, and it was his opinion that the City would not be able to go back to the developer because the City reviewed and approved the plans and that is what was constructed. He noted that the development agreement did not include any other specifications on the noise wall.

Councilmember Woestehoff asked if the plans identified a six-foot wall or just identified a noise barrier.

City Engineer Westby provided additional details on the plans that were drafted that matched the design of the existing wall, including the height. He noted that there were no details in the plan related to the height compared to the grade of the ground.

Councilmember Woestehoff suggested that the new City Attorney provide input as well. He stated that if everyone's expectation was a noise wall, that is not what was provided. He stated that he

does like the suggestion of the resident but would also be interested in the cost difference to go to the other sound wall.

Chairperson Riley agreed to obtain input from the new City Attorney. He noted that it appears the City did not get what it wanted, but it did get what was on the paper. He hoped that the engineer would donate their time to redo the work. He stated that at minimum, moving the fence to where it should have been should be done at a cost of \$50,000. He agreed that the \$50,000 should be the City responsibility and the fence should be reclaimed and reused.

Councilmember Musgrove asked if the developer is going to let the City use the fence to move to the other location.

City Engineer Westby stated that from the feedback provided in the letter, it sounded like the developer was opposed to spending additional money, but he was unsure they would be opposed to the City relocating the fence.

Councilmember Musgrove commented that it would look silly to have two fences. She stated that MnDOT has a program for noise walls, noting that projects are currently listed through 2026. She asked if there is potential for the City to construct the noise wall and recoup costs later.

City Engineer Westby replied that is the program he discussed earlier which is meant for older developments and noted that this would not be eligible.

Councilmember Woestehoff asked if the fence would be owned by a Home Owner's Association or individual property owners.

City Engineer Westby replied that the property the fence lies on would fall to individual property owners. He stated that he can check with the developer to see where the properties lie within the development and homeownership process.

Councilmember Woestehoff commented that his concern is that if this does not move forward quickly, additional hurdles can be added by working with three property owners.

Chairperson Riley asked for clarification on where the end of the wall was marked, and which properties would be covered.

City Engineer Westby commented that the development agreement is silent on this topic. He noted that the plans showed the wall ending at that point.

Chairperson Riley commented that it would seem to make sense that the wall would cover the third property.

City Engineer Westby commented that would seem to make sense, but he could not find any documentation supporting that.

Councilmember Musgrove commented that she believes there was a line identified in the materials provided in the cases for the development.

Chairperson Riley asked who owns the outlot and whether a fence could be put along that property.

City Engineer Westby stated that he is unsure who owns that property. He stated that the City could ask the question as to whether a fence would be allowed or could work with MnDOT to place it in the right-of-way.

Chairperson Riley stated that he would support the option to extend the fence to the third property at a cost of \$50,000 as he believes that would be the original intention. He commented that he did not believe the City would have asked the developer to place a fence/barrier on someone else's property. He asked the funding source that would be proposed.

City Engineer Westby commented that he would want to discuss that with the Finance Director and bring additional information back. He noted that typically the PIR Fund would be used but that balance is dipping low.

Chairperson Riley commented that to finish the gap was an estimate of \$125,000, noting that the resident has requested a hybrid, ending in between the two options.

Councilmember Musgrove asked that staff gather input on the funds that would be available for the \$50,000 and then provide information on the funding that might be available to extend the fence further.

Councilmember Woestehoff commented that he would support doing at minimum what was expected of the developer. He noted that while he would be interested in the additional cost to extend the fence further, he would be hesitant without knowing where the funding would come from for that.

Chairperson Riley commented that it would seem extending the fence to the resident requested mark would have an additional cost of \$62,000 beyond the \$50,000.

City Engineer Westby stated that staff will obtain the opinion of the City Attorney, speak with the engineer to determine if they would provide assistance with design services, speak with MnDOT, and bring back additional information on the funding sources. He stated that staff would also review the site conditions and property owners. He stated that staff can bring this information back to the February meeting.

Chairperson Riley commented that perhaps an additional wall segment could be added to the 47 corridor discussion and kept separate from this item.

5.03: Review of Pavement Conditions on Bowers Drive

Public Works Superintendent Riemer reviewed the case and noted that staff recommends to make necessary repairs to the pavement on Bowers Drive during the summer of 2022 using in house staff and equipment.

Chairperson Riley asked and received confirmation that staff would handle this work in the normal course of business.

Public Works Superintendent Riemer confirmed that staff would address the larger issues first, noting that this work would not be a priority and would be treated as fill in work when time is available.

Chairperson Riley commented that this road is ranked at a six and therefore is not included in the work list at this time. He asked if the rating would deteriorate in the next set of years to where a mill and overlay could not be completed and a reconstruction would be needed.

Public Works Superintendent Riemer commented that he would not anticipate that the road would deteriorate in that manner. He stated that roads are rated each year and if the condition fell in that manner, it would be moved up.

Chairperson Riley commented that perhaps a presentation could be provided to the full Council explaining the road condition rating and how that is done and the repairs that are needed at different points. He noted that there has been a lot of discussion related to funding, but it may help to have more explanation on the process behind the rating process as well.

City Engineer Westby provided additional explanation on pavement conditions and how they can be rated.

It was the consensus to place an item on a future Council worksession to provide additional details on pavement rating and to direct staff to complete necessary temporary asphalt repairs to Bowers Drive during the summer of 2022.

5.04: Consider Site Improvements to Parcel 46 and The Waterfront in The COR

Economic Development Manager Sullivan presented the case and stated that staff recommends gathering additional information on the cost of each facet of the project internally and report back to the Committee for further discussion.

City Engineer Westby provided additional details on the wetland impacts and the options for wetland replacement or the purchase of wetland credits which would have an additional cost. He also provided details on the ten-year recapture zone within the waterfront area.

Chairperson Riley asked if this half of The COR drains to the infiltration basin.

City Engineer Westby commented that the infiltration basin was designed to treat the entire area of The COR.

Councilmember Musgrove stated that it is her understanding that the infiltration basin would provide the ability to cover any building or development within The COR area. She asked if that only applies to the infiltration area of The COR or the entire area. She asked if the stormwater basin on parcel 46 could be filled in if the infiltration basin was designed for the entire area of The COR or whether there would be benefit to leaving that stormwater basin to be used for future development on that parcel.

City Engineer Westby replied that the infiltration basin covers the entire area of The COR, whether it is in the ten-year delineation zone or not. He stated that there is no infiltration occurring on parcel 46. He stated that there is a stormwater pond that was constructed as part of a different project when Armstrong Boulevard improvements were completed. He stated that the plan would be to relocate the wetland features in order to have the full site developable.

Chairperson Riley asked if there is a reason for where the wetlands were created.

Parks and Assistant Public Works Superintendent Riverblood commented that a wetland needed to be relocated and this was the place chosen at that time.

Councilmember Musgrove asked if the stormwater pond could remain on parcel 46 if all the lowland/wetland were filled.

City Engineer Westby commented that it would depend upon the development proposal.

Councilmember Woestehoff asked if the stormwater pond would continue to be required by the County for stormwater treatment.

City Engineer Westby confirmed that treatment would continue to be required.

Councilmember Musgrove asked if a wetland could be relocated beyond The COR area and suggested the old public works area.

City Engineer Westby replied that the wetland could be relocated outside of The COR. He was unsure of the hydrology of the old public works site. He noted that a consultant would look at City owned properties to determine a good site for relocation.

Councilmember Musgrove commented that it would seem the decision would be based on which option is more costly, relocation of the wetland or the purchase of wetland credits. She asked staff for input on what currently occurs when the City receives development interest in the parcel but then determines it is too costly because of the work that is needed, specifically whether they look at another parcel in Ramsey or move to another community. She stated that if developers were interest in other parcels, she would question how much the City should invest in the property at this time versus waiting until additional fill can be brought to the site through the development of other parcels.

Economic Development Manager Sullivan replied that the development interest in the site has been in the upper two thirds of the site to develop townhomes similar to other areas of The COR.

He stated that the idea is that this is a large tract of land and there is economy of scale for a developer to construct a number of homes on the parcel, therefore there are not many similar parcels in Ramsey. He stated that the other issue is related to timing and because the wetlands issues and timing is unknown, the developers have walked away. He stated that his suggestion was that there would be a way to make the needs of the waterfront site and this parcel work together. He stated that the upgrade of Zeolite Street would also be needed as part of the development of parcel 46. He provided additional details on the future land use and development potential of this area of The COR.

Councilmember Musgrove asked if the wetland would need to be filled for the residential development.

Councilmember Woestehoff confirmed that the site would need to be raised about three feet.

Parks and Assistant Public Works Superintendent Riverblood provided background details on the planning work that has been completed for the park and waterfront area. He commented that there would be value in grading, establishing turf, and planting trees for that site. He believed that this would make sense from a timing perspective but noted that this would be an issue of balancing costs. He asked if the Committee would like to go into the level of detail to obtain more cost information and details.

Chairperson Riley asked if there is a ballpark estimate.

Economic Development Manager Sullivan commented that there is not yet an estimate. He stated that more of the cost will be recouped through the sale of the retail development areas rather than the residential component.

Chairperson Riley commented that the City would be doing this work to get townhomes, as that is the interest in the parcel. He noted that does not seem to be a huge priority of the residents at this time.

Councilmember Musgrove stated that she prefers townhomes and like the product being constructed at the corner of Ramsey Boulevard and Bunker Lake Boulevard. She stated that she likes the idea of having business along Sunwood Drive. She asked if the expectation would be that the City could use the fill from the waterfront area for this purpose and whether that would be enough.

Economic Development Manager Sullivan commented that there is some dirt from that site but not nearly enough.

Chairperson Riley commented that the study would provide additional details on what would actually be needed.

Councilmember Woestehoff stated that he would be supportive of the additional study and agreed that making the site closer to shovel ready would provide benefit. He stated that there would be benefit, the question would be related to the cost and available funding.

Economic Development Manager Sullivan provided details on TIF and how that can be used. He stated that parts of this could be TIF eligible. He noted that if the costs are incurred in the next two years, they would be eligible expenses but reminded the group that the funds would also need to be generated through development.

Parks and Assistant Public Works Superintendent Riverblood commented that the costs are really unknown at this time because of the different factors involved. He believed that having the knowledge of the cost estimated would be very useful, even if the City chooses not to move forward on the project as that information could be shared with developers that come forward with interest.

Chairperson Riley confirmed that it appears everyone supports gaining more information.

Economic Development Manager Sullivan commented that Centra Homes is very interested in the residential portion of the property. He stated that it would be cheaper for the City to do the wetland work than it would be for the developer. He stated that there would need to be a decision on whether there is interest in completing that work.

Councilmember Musgrove commented that it would be nice to know where that process is and how it would impact the cost. She stated that she would like to see the stormwater pond stay along Armstrong and be lengthened.

Economic Development Manager Sullivan commented that the stormwater pond is the least important to move as that could be something developers design around or modify. He stated that the focus would be the wetland and removing it from the site.

Chairperson Riley confirmed that the group would like more information on the costs of moving the wetland and adding fill to the site.

Councilmember Musgrove believed that the Council should also have a discussion related to the guiding of the property.

Chairperson Riley commented that the Council has had that discussion several times before. He noted that he would support the fact-finding mission at this time.

Economic Development Manager Sullivan confirmed that staff would gather more information and report back to the Committee.

5.05: Consider Recommendation for City Council to Reject Bids for Water Treatment Plant Trunk Watermain Improvements, Improvement Project #21-08 (Previously Case 5.06)

City Engineer Westby reviewed the case and recommendation of staff and SEF to recommend that the City Council reject the bids for the Water Treatment Plant Trunk Watermain Improvements,

Improvement Project #21-08. It was noted that staff will present a case to the Council to reject the bids on January 25, 2022.

Councilmember Musgrove asked if the motion should include the intent to rebid in the fall.

City Engineer Westby stated that he would prefer to monitoring pricing and then bring something back for rebidding at that time.

Chairperson Riley confirmed that he would like to provide the flexibility to staff.

Councilmember Musgrove agreed that she would like to wait on this project until the time project materials possibly decrease in cost.

Motion by Councilmember Musgrove, seconded by Councilmember Woestehoff, to recommend that the City Council reject bids for the Water Treatment Plant Trunk Watermain Improvements, Improvement Project #21-08.

Further discussion: Councilmember Woestehoff commented that his biggest fear is that material costs are not going to decrease. He stated that water treatment plants were an allowed expense under the ARP and therefore the City is not the only one that will be completing this work. City Engineer Westby commented that while he agrees, the City already has its plans ready. He noted that staff will look into alternative materials as well that could perhaps decrease project costs.

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

5.06: Consider Boulevard Trees for the Barren Side of Sunwood Drive in The COR (Previously Case 5.05)

Parks and Assistant Public Works Superintendent Riverblood reviewed the case and stated that staff recommends issuing an RFP for this project, before spring/summer 2022, with a wide window for contractor completion of the work to obtain the best pricing, possibly with an alternative quotation option of a spring 2023 completion. City Council can assess the value and consider authorizing the addition of boulevard trees to Sunwood Drive once quotes are received.

Chairperson Riley asked if there is concern with losing the trees when sidewalks are installed.

Parks and Assistant Public Works Superintendent Riverblood replied that he believes that it could be feasible to add the sidewalk and not impact trees but agreed that it could be easier to complete a sidewalk without trees. He believed there is merit in obtaining quotes. He stated that they may find a nursery that wants to sell trees that are getting too large.

Chairperson Riley asked if the current trees have an irrigation system and whether that is necessary.

Parks and Assistant Public Works Superintendent Riverblood confirmed that irrigation would be necessary. He commented that it would add value to the trees and turf.

Councilmember Woestehoff commented that it would make sense to plant trees on the other side to make it appear more equal. He commented that the existing boulevard has power poles and asked if that would be included as well

Parks and Assistant Public Works Superintendent Riverblood commented that would be included but in a future phase.

Councilmember Musgrove stated that she could see a reason to continue to plant trees on the side they already exist to extend to the cul-de-sac. She asked the reason to install trees on the other side where there are already businesses that do not have trees.

Parks and Assistant Public Works Superintendent Riverblood identified the areas where both sides of the road have trees and the areas where only one side has trees.

Councilmember Musgrove commented that she is not in favor of this but agreed it could be a good idea to complete the RFP. She stated that she could support adding trees were there is potential development, but the other two areas should wait for development and that should be a portion of the developer's cost. She was unsure why the City would not leave that to the developers that will eventually come forward especially when there can be potential damage to trees during construction.

Parks and Assistant Public Works Superintendent Riverblood stated that he believes trees can be protected during construction. He stated that it is unknown when developers will come, noting that it has been almost 20 years since development in The COR began. He stated that when the City completes infrastructure improvements, development is attracted to that.

Councilmember Woestehoff commented that he does see that point. He asked if the City received credit back for landscaping completed when a development agreement is drafted. He stated that one other reason to complete this action now would be that wetland will be filled through the previous case action, and this would add additional greenery.

Economic Development Manager Sullivan commented that while it is always possible to roll that into the cost for land, developers will come back with all the fees and development costs they will be paying. He stated that he would hate to add another fee for that reason. He believed that the trees along the boulevard help marketability of the land, noting that larger trees add more value. He agreed that having a head start on the ability of the trees to grow helps to provide visibility to business when it does come in. He stated that there is development occurring within The COR.

Parks and Assistant Public Works Superintendent Riverblood commented that the trees will appreciate in value and the trees and irrigation line will add value to the land.

Councilmember Woestehoff commented that he would be in favor of seeing an alternate where this is only done on City property, with the option for private developers to participate at their own cost.

Councilmember Musgrove commented that she could see that this would be something considered for City owned land. She asked the source of funding, whether TIF or EDA funds could be used.

Economic Development Manager Sullivan commented that trees would not be eligible for TIF.

Parks and Assistant Public Works Superintendent Riverblood commented that the Finance Director may support this as an element of streetscape.

Economic Development Manager Sullivan commented that he would be very reluctant to use that type of funding.

Councilmember Musgrove commented that she would support using EDA dollars as the intention would be to make the area more marketable for development.

Chairperson Riley commented that they could leave the funding source open with the intention to review the use of TIF or EDA funds.

Economic Development Manager Sullivan commented that staff should then present this to the EDA to obtain its funding.

Councilmember Musgrove commented that if the trees can be protected from future development, she would have less concern. She asked the benefit or lack of benefit to add in the cost for the sidewalk and electricity, if TIF funds could be used. She commented that it would seem to make sense to go into that area one time to complete those improvements.

Councilmember Woestehoff commented that the difference would be the substantial cost difference. He stated that while it is a good idea in terms of efficiency, the trees are a good long-term investment that could be done now while the sidewalk could sit dormant for ten years.

Chairperson Riley agreed that while he likes the idea, trees would gain value, but the sidewalk would lose value.

Parks and Assistant Public Works Superintendent Riverblood commented that a sidewalk would have a design cost of about \$20,000 and then a full bidding process would need to be followed. He agreed that a sidewalk would have a cost in excess of about \$500,000 to \$700,000.

Motion by Councilmember Woestehoff, seconded by Councilmember Musgrove, to authorize an RFP for the installation of boulevard trees and irrigation on City owned properties in The COR, consistent with the proposed Capital Improvement Project.

Further discussion: Councilmember Musgrove asked that discussion occur with the other property owners to determine if they would like to participate as well. Chairperson Riley agreed that he would love to see other property owners participate but would not want the City to be paying for improvements on private property.

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

6. COMMITTEE / STAFF INPUT

6.01: Receive Updates on Improvement Projects, Studies, 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 to the Committee.

Chairperson Riley asked for an update on how the new Public Works Facility is functioning.

Public Works Superintendent Riemer commented that the facility has been working great, providing details on efficiency that has been added by the new layout and features within the building/site.

6.02: Review Future Topics Calendar

City Engineer Westby reviewed the future topics calendar.

Chairperson Riley noted that there has been a lot of discussion related to parks, specifically improving existing parks equipment versus adding new parks. He asked if this is something that should come to the Public Works Committee.

Parks and Assistant Public Works Superintendent Riverblood provided examples of items within the parks that have come to the Committee and would continue to do so, such as capital improvements, providing the examples of shelter roof replacement and boardwalk improvements. He noted that the Park Commission is implementing the new Playground Replacement Policy, which was previously approved by the City Council. He noted that notifications will be mailed to the neighborhood surrounding Rabbit Park. He noted that those responses will be reviewed by the Park Commission at its March meeting. He stated that two parks that have playground equipment that is not used will come before the Council to be declared as surplus and those items would then be removed. He recognized the turnover in the parks/public works departments that have caused delays.

Chairperson Riley commented that he would prefer to have less stuff in better condition than more stuff in bad condition.

Councilmember Musgrove asked if there have been any comments about the Bear Park lights.

Parks and Assistant Public Works Superintendent Riverblood commented that the parts have been ordered and will be installed in the spring.

Councilmember Musgrove asked if the water conservation incentives were part of the watershed-based funding.

City Engineer Westby replied that was part of the water efficiency grant the City received. He confirmed that there are still available funds, and the City will be requesting that the Council allow water efficient washing machines to be added to the list of eligible items.

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 8:18 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Grant Riemer
Public Works Superintendent

Drafted by Amanda Staple
TimeSaver Off Site Secretarial, Inc.