

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

The Public Works Committee conducted a regular meeting on Tuesday, November 15, 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: City Engineer/Interim Public Works Director Bruce Westby
 Assistant City Engineer Joe Feriancek
 Civil Engineer IV Leonard Linton

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

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

4. APPROVE MINUTES

4.01: Approve October 18, 2022, Meeting Minutes

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

Regular Meeting Minutes dated October 18, 2022

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

5. COMMITTEE BUSINESS

5.01: Consider Recommendation to City Council to Approve Plans and Authorize Bids for City Improvement Project #22-17, Ramsey Villas North Sound Wall Improvements

City Engineer/Interim Public Works Director Westby reviewed the staff report and stated that staff recommends alternative one if the Committee supports constructing a sound wall along the west edge of the Ramsey Villas North residential development. He noted that staff would recommend alternative two if the Committee supports constructing a sound wall along the west edge of the Ramsey Villas North residential development, including salvaging and installing the existing fence to the Highway 47 right-of-way.

Chairperson Riley stated that he believes the old fence should be removed as part of this project. He asked if there would be any cost savings in reusing that versus just using new fence.

City Engineer/Interim Public Works Director Westby replied that there would likely not be a cost savings. He stated that when contractors salvage and reinstall something, it will not be warrantied. He noted that the existing fence would be fairly difficult to salvage and reinstall because of the four-foot footings.

Councilmember Woestehoff referenced the existing fence, which is on private property and therefore owned by the homeowners. He stated that while he agrees that should be removed, it would require the approval and authorization of the homeowners. He noted that the first property most likely prefers having the fence in place while the second property would most likely prefer removal with replacement of a wall that does what was intended. He stated that he would want to hear the input from the homeowners that have the fence on their property. He stated that if the fence is left in place, it would seem silly to have two fences in place. He asked if there was feedback in putting the new fence west of the trail, between the trail and the road.

City Engineer/Interim Public Works Director Westby replied that snow removal on Highway 47 and the trail would impact the fence in that placement.

Councilmember Woestehoff stated that he supports removing the existing fence, or at least part of it, but would want the input of the residents as the fence technically now belongs to those homeowners.

City Engineer/Interim Public Works Director Westby identified the area where the fence would be proposed to start, noting there would be about 20 feet between the new fence and existing fence.

Councilmember Woestehoff stated that it would be important to advise the homeowners that the new fence would not be on their private property and therefore would not be their fence, whereas the existing fence is on private property and would be the property of the homeowners.

Councilmember Musgrove asked for details on the proposed location and length of the fence.

City Engineer/Interim Public Works Director Westby provided additional details as requested.

Councilmember Musgrove noted this proposed fence length of 265 feet and the length proposed in the preliminary plat of 245 feet. She stated that the meeting notes from that discussion mentioned the possibility of the City extending that to the exiting wall. She did not believe the short fence provides a sound wall for the property that would be open and exposed. She was unsure that this would be effective and noted that she would support a further extension but recognized the possibility of that is not high. She asked what would occur if one homeowner wants the existing fence removed and the other does not. She stated that while she agrees that two fences would not look the best, she believed the existing fence should be left in place. She asked if the first fence panel should be at an angle to better direct noise back towards the street.

Chairperson Riley commented that the intention of this first part of discussion was simply for clarification and not full discussion. He stated that he would now like to open the floor for resident input.

Ted Blakely, 5041 Xkimo Court NW, thanked staff and the City for making good progress on this issue. He referenced the two options and asked if Plan A could be approved to keep momentum moving. He stated that he did not want to see any delays in waiting for homeowner response on whether the existing fence should be removed.

Chairperson Riley agreed that was a good suggestion, noting that staff did provide an option to include an alternate bid which would remove a section or all of the existing fence.

Rick Bailey, 5021 Xkimo Court NW, asked the timeframe for bidding and when construction would be anticipated to begin.

City Engineer/Interim Public Works Director Westby replied that he does have the contact information for the two property owners and therefore staff can reach out to them quickly. He stated that once direction is provided on the plans, staff will update the plans within one month and bring those forward to the Council for authorization to bid the project. He stated that the bidding process is typically about five weeks and provided details on the contract process. He estimated up to three months for the process from tonight to when the Council could be presented with a construction contract.

Councilmember Woestehoff commented that it sounded like Councilmember Musgrove wanted a longer fence and asked if her desire was to extend it south towards Xkimo or north to the other fence.

Councilmember Musgrove replied that her desire was to extend north to the other fence.

Councilmember Woestehoff asked if the new sound wall could not be extended to the south because of conflicts with snow removal and utilities.

Chairperson Riley commented that there would be an additional cost of \$15,000.

Assistant City Engineer Feriancek replied that there are a lot of utilities in that area. He stated that in the review there was not really a benefit sound barrier wise going south because they would simply be creating another wall that serves no function.

Councilmember Woestehoff stated that he would prefer to have the first panel at an angle rather than going further to the south. He noted that the plans as proposed would already exceed what the City originally agreed to in the preliminary plat.

Chairperson Riley agreed with angling the first panel for aesthetic purposes and to act as a barrier for sound. He noted that the intention of this project is to complete what the City thought was going to be done and what the City agreed to. He agreed that this would be more than what was agreed to in the preliminary plat, therefore he is comfortable with this proposal. He commented that he would support having a bid alternative for the removal of the existing fence, should that be desired, but noted that he would not support salvaging and reusing as that does not seem to provide cost savings.

Councilmember Woestehoff asked if it would be possible to connect the new fence and existing fence at the corner, if the first property owner agrees.

Chairperson Riley commented that he assumed that they would be connected.

Councilmember Musgrove asked if another panel would be necessary to connect the fences.

Civil Engineer IV Linton replied that he would recommend against connecting the two walls. He explained that the existing fence is on private property and if that is connected to the new fence in the right-of-way, a new property owner would likely believe that they own the property out to the new fence.

A resident commented that whatever option is chosen, he would not want a gap that would allow sound through it.

City Engineer/Interim Public Works Director Westby commented that he did not envision connecting the fences. He commented that there are numerous utilities along that corridor that they want to avoid. He stated that if the existing fence were left in place, they could angle the end panel of the new fence.

A resident asked if there would be cost savings in leaving the existing fence. He commented that the simplest solution would seem to be just putting in a new fence straight along Highway 47.

Assistant City Engineer Feriancek commented that the two fences are about 27 feet apart. He stated that if the new fence were brought to the start of the old one, they could get close, within about 15 feet. He stated that there are some buried utilities that they want to avoid.

Councilmember Woestehoff stated that he would like to take the fence as close to Xkimo as possible and inform the two residents of the project. He stated that the City could offer to remove

the existing fence from their properties if desired and assess that portion of the costs back to the residents.

Chairperson Riley agreed that the fence is run along the edge, as originally desired. He was unsure that the old fence needs to be considered as that is on private property.

Councilmember Woestehoff stated that he agrees, but still feels like those residents should be informed about the project and if those residents desired the existing fence to be removed, perhaps there would be a cost savings that could be offered by having the City contractor remove the fence.

Councilmember Musgrove agreed with going as close as they can with the fence and angle the end. She agreed that the existing fence should be left in place and if the homeowners want that removed, they could do that. She still had concern that this may not fully protect the area from noise and the City may need to extend it further in the future. She commented that she would not want to delay the project by asking the residents about the existing fence.

City Engineer/Interim Public Works Director Westby replied that there would be some benefit to extending south and to put the angle on the end. He stated that when the property to the north develops, the City would look to the developer to build that as part of their project.

Chairperson Riley confirmed the consensus of the Committee with that direction.

City Engineer/Interim Public Works Director Westby identified the length the fence would run for clarity. He stated that the existing fence is 170 feet, and the proposed fence would be about 328 feet in length.

Chairperson Riley confirmed the consensus of the Committee to leave the existing fence in place.

Councilmember Woestehoff commented that he would still like the property owners to be informed of the project once it is approved and awarded by the City Council.

Chairperson Riley stated that this item does not need to come back to the Committee and should go forward to the City Council. It was the consensus of the Committee to place the case on the Consent Agenda.

City Engineer/Interim Public Works Director Westby noted that this will most likely go to the first or second Council meeting in January which would bring the contract award consideration back to the Council in March which would allow for spring construction.

5.02: Update on Plans for Wetland 114P Outlet

Civil Engineer IV Linton reviewed the staff report and stated that staff recommends bringing the project to the December 13, 2022 City Council meeting for authorization to advertise the project to receive quotes for the work.

Chairperson Riley asked Civil Engineer IV Linton asked for a brief description of the differences between NGVD29 and NAVD88.

Civil Engineer IV Linton replied that the NGVD29 data was established in 1929, using the technology available at that time. He stated that the NAVD88 started using GIS and GPS technology. He stated that the NAVD88 was developed using better technology with more data points. He stated that the difference in vertical elevations between the two is about four or five inches. He stated that staff is moving forward with the 858.1 elevation, using the NAVD88 data which will increase the water level in Wetland 114P. He stated that they will tighten up the plans and await the review of the DNR.

Motion by Councilmember Musgrove, seconded by Councilmember Woestehoff, to recommend the City Council authorize advertising for quotes for this project.

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

5.03: Consider Recommending City Council Authorization to Prepare Plans and Specifications for 2023 Pavement Management Program Projects

Assistant City Engineer Feriancek reviewed the staff report and recommendation from staff to recommend City Council authorization to prepare plans and specifications for proposed 2023 Improvement Projects #23-02, #23-05, #23-06, #23-07, and #23-10. He stated that this will allow staff to proceed with design and preparation of plans and specifications so bids can be advertised as early in 2023 as possible to obtain the best bid prices possible.

Councilmember Woestehoff referenced the pseudo basketball court in the south parking lot at Central Park and asked if that would be removed as part of Improvement Project #23-02, noting that court gets a lot of use.

Assistant City Engineer Feriancek replied that the south lot is not planned to be reconstructed as they would be working on the main lot on the north side. He stated that it is not currently planned to resurface that lot as it was not in the original scope of the project. He recognized that it could be a convenient time to do that, but that funding is limited and that the south lot would be a convenient staging area for contractors working on the project.

Chairperson Riley commented that it would seem odd not to do it at the same time.

Councilmember Woestehoff commented that the south lot is not in great shape and people often play basketball on that court. He stated that he would want to look at that as part of the project.

Councilmember Musgrove asked if the southern lot stalls would remain at a 90-degree angle versus the diagonal stalls. She stated that she also likes keeping the tree median to provide additional shade.

Assistant City Engineer Feriancek stated that using directional stalls and with the median, that would lose stalls and they would have to tweak the plans a little.

Councilmember Woestehoff asked if the end caps would be raised or just painted.

Assistant City Engineer Feriancek stated they are painted in that option rather than raised to better accommodate snowplowing if that were done, noting that lot is currently not plowed.

Councilmember Woestehoff stated that in that scenario he would prefer to keep the buffer of trees between the road and parking, although he recognized that would result in less parking stalls.

Councilmember Musgrove stated that she prefers the use of striping rather than a raised edge.

Chairperson Riley stated that he would be concerned with losing parking stalls as there are already complaints about a lack of parking. He stated that there are a few scenarios that actually increase parking.

Councilmember Musgrove noted the potential for additional parking to be made available through a shared parking agreement with PACT. She stated that people desire shaded areas for sunny days.

Councilmember Woestehoff agreed, noting that he likes the 90-degree stalls and removing the island. He asked if the center section with the trees would be raised.

Assistant City Engineer Feriancek replied that the intent would be that those would be lowered medians to take in storm water. He commented that they could consider a usable green area if preferred.

Councilmember Woestehoff stated that he does like the idea of stormwater management. He stated that he has driven by the park and noticed people parking on the road or in the field while there are still many stalls available in the lot, noting that people will park where they want to park. He stated that if they can make it more attractive to park in the lot, he would love that.

Chairperson Riley stated that he likes the improvements and would still like to maximize the number of stalls. He stated that he prefers the 90-degree parking scenario.

Councilmember Woestehoff agreed and noted that he would also like the south lot to be resurfaced.

Assistant City Engineer Feriancek stated that as part of the 161st geotechnical report they did soil borings and found an average of 2.5 inches of bituminous over a sand base in the north lot, therefore he would expect similar findings for the southern lot. He noted that staff could do additional investigation but noted that a typical mill and overlay would not be realistic.

Councilmember Woestehoff stated that he would support a full reconstruct of the south parking lot and perhaps adding a second set of basketball hoops as it is used a surprising amount.

Chairperson Riley stated that he would also support improving the southern lot at the same time.

Councilmember Woestehoff asked if there would opportunities to remove any of the pedestrian ramps on Improvement Project #23-06, 2023 MSA Overlay Improvements.

Assistant City Engineer Feriancek replied that generally the ramps are found at street crossings.

Councilmember Musgrove stated that MSA streets are nine-ton roads and asked what 161st is being built to.

Assistant City Engineer Feriancek replied that 161st Avenue would be built to the same level.

Assistant City Engineer Feriancek asked for input on whether the Committee would prefer a reclamation light or full depth reclamation for Improvement Project #23-10, Whispering Pines Estates Plat 3 Street Reconstructions.

Chairperson Riley commented that he would support the recommendation of staff noting that if it would be a good place to save money, he would support that or if staff feels the full depth reclamation is needed, he could also support that.

Councilmember Woestehoff agreed.

Chairperson Riley commented that it is good to see this set of streets being reconstructed.

Councilmember Woestehoff agreed noting he receives the most calls for improving these streets.

Assistant City Engineer Feriancek reviewed the proposed project schedules.

Councilmember Woestehoff asked for details about the proposed Ramsey HY-10/Ferret Street reconstruction project near Lawn Monster.

City Engineer/Interim Public Works Director Westby provided details on that project and stated that Bolton & Menk is preparing plans per EDA direction.

Motion by Councilmember Musgrove, seconded by Councilmember Woestehoff, to recommend City Council authorization to prepare plans and specifications for proposed 2023 Improvement Projects #23-02, #23-05, #23-06, #23-07, and #23-10.

Further discussion: Chairperson Riley recognized that the City is expanding its Pavement Management Program to improve more streets in the next several years and that is great to see.

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

City Engineer/Interim Public Works Director Westby asked and received confirmation that this case should go on the regular agenda when presented to the City Council for approval.

6. COMMITTEE / STAFF INPUT

6.01: Staff Updates on Improvement Projects, Studies, and Items of Interest

City Engineer/Interim Public Works Director Westby provided updates on current and proposed City, County and MnDOT improvement projects and studies, and on other items of interest to the Committee.

6.02: Review Future Topics Calendar

City Engineer/Interim Public Works Director Westby confirmed the consensus of the Committee to cancel the December meeting.


7. ADJOURNMENT

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

Motion carried.

The regular meeting of the Public Works Committee adjourned at 7:23 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Bruce Westby
City Engineer/Interim Public Works Director

Drafted by Amanda Staple
TimeSaver Off Site Secretarial, Inc.