

City of East Bethel Road Commission Agenda

6:00 PM

Date: June 10, 2014

Location: City Hall



Item

- | | | |
|---------|-----|----------------------------------------------------------|
| 6:00 PM | 1.0 | Call to Order |
| 6:01 PM | 2.0 | Adopt Agenda |
| 6:02 PM | 3.0 | Approve Minutes – May 13, 2014 |
| 6:10 PM | 4.0 | Road Financial Information & Roads Capital Funds Summary |
| 6:15 PM | 5.0 | Roads CIP |
| 6:25 PM | 6.0 | Roads Tour |
| 7:50 PM | 7.0 | Council Report and Other Business |
| 8:05 PM | 8.0 | Adjourn |

EAST BETHEL ROAD COMMISSION MEETING

May 13, 2014

The East Bethel Road Commission met on May 13, 2014 at 6:30 P.M at the East Bethel City Hall for their regular monthly meeting.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Lori Pierson-Kolodzienski Deny Murphy Kathy Paavola
Roger Virta Al Thunberg

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Jeff Jensen

ALSO PRESENT: Jack Davis, City Administrator
Tim Harrington, City Council Member

Adopt Agenda Pierson-Kolodzienski motioned to adopt the agenda as submitted. Thunberg seconded; all in favor, motion carries unanimously.

Davis stated there are three City Council persons in the audience. Councilperson Moegerle is present regarding an agenda item. Ronning is here as an interested person and will not participate in the discussion.

Approve –
April 8, 2014
Meeting
Minutes

Virta had a change on page 5, he said it would be the second paragraph, seventh sentence, going along with that the sewer and water to fund this. This would be Roads Capital to fund this.

Virta said also farther on down the page, last paragraph, Virta said we have to write a check out in a month. We have to be careful that we keep pushing money; we don't keep pushing money at something.

Virta motioned to approve the minutes with the changes. Murphy seconded; all in favor, motion carries unanimously.

Roads
Financial
Information

If there are any questions, Davis will answer them. Virta asked how we are doing financially, are we on budget. Davis said overall we are right on budget.

Discussion of
TH 65 Access
with MnDOT

Paul Jung and Gayle Gedstad, North Metro Area Engineers with the Minnesota Department of Transportation were in attendance to discuss access possibilities and locations along TH 65 near the municipal service area. Some options that could be discussed include traffic signals, right in/right outs, J-turns, and acceleration lanes.

Along with these possible improvements, different funding sources can be examined including municipal agreement funding.

These persons will discuss the options in the area we are looking at improvements.

The areas we are talking about are 187th Lane; this is the entrance to East Bethel Theater. The traffic count on Hwy 65 is 28,000-30,000 vehicles at this location. There will be

extensive development in this area. Ideally the City would like to see a signalized intersection.

Gedstad stated that Hwy 65 is probably evolving into a freeway at some time. It will be a long ways out, not in our lifetime. The funding is always an issue. We don't want to happen what we have learned on Hwy 10 in Anoka and Ramsey. They have signals at odd locations. If we put a signal in at 187th it would follow what happened in Anoka and Ramsey and there would not be impetus to put in front or backage road. You have put money towards the back/frontage roads and close access to Hwy 65 and also medians. MnDOT supports that. Down in Ham Lake, they have added frontage and backage roads. MnDOT has funding to encourage that.

We were disappointed to see that there was funding for backage road south of 221st and we are really puzzled why you wouldn't build such a thing. You don't get a signal, unless traffic warrants. Even if you had the traffic, we would tell you to get the backage road built. If you put in a signal, it is impossible to get rid of it. We just encourage you, if it is not too late to resurrect that, we don't know if it is too late on that one or not. The frontage road is what encourages to developers. Thunberg said are you talking the one south of 221st. The reason we didn't care for that is we wanted to build roads where we have the sewer and water area, than in that area. Again it isn't our decision, it is the Councils. Davis said the principal reason it was abandoned was because the metro office approved the project in its entirety and state office later ruled that they would only fund a portion of the project with the Cooperative Agreement Grant. The state office also stated that if we wanted the total funding we would have secure agreements from the property owners that they would abandon any attempts to have access on Hwy 65. That is why we decided to discontinue the project but we do have the right of way. We want to take this money now and concentrate investments in the southern part of the City.

Virta said with the new development, it has done two things. It has created a safety hazard. We have large trucks coming out onto Hwy 65 and it is dangerous. Gedstad said 187th? Virta said yes, we have additional car traffic. We have Aggressive Hydraulics down there. One of the things that drove the request was for us, while we go through the planning process is to address the safety issue at 187th. That was the context for the discussion. Maybe we can put a traffic light there and if that isn't a good solution, we could look at other options. Murphy stated that numbers don't tell the whole story. It only shows three accidents. If you drive that area daily, you take your life in your hands. Gedstad said the crash numbers are from what? Murphy stated they were from the East Bethel Fire Department.

Davis said regarding the Johnson Street project, we do wish to express our interest in the project. The difference in opinion came from the State office. Thunberg said we do agree backage and frontage roads are the way to go. Virta said through numerous people coming through here, we want to protect the frontage. We want to develop the frontage and backage. Gedstad said what is on the screen is the next hot button issue for you guys. Thunberg said don't you want stoplights one mile apart. Gedstad said two miles is optimal. Is there a plan to get 187th connected to the cross streets? Davis said yes, a plan to go to Jackson Street and also down to 181st. The plan to extend Buchanan to the south is very expensive and he is not sure if it could ever be done. We have also looked at a right in and right out only.

Virta said what are the issues if we were to consider extending a frontage. The ideal situation would be to put in a frontage road that would go all the way down from 221st to 181st. The problem we have north of 187th is really wet and is under water now. . We have never talked about a frontage road to connect down to the next light. Davis said the issue with going south is we have a trailer court there and it backs up to a wet area. The 80-acres north of 187th are all wetlands. We have several possibilities for extensions on both sides, but they would not connect the east to west roads.

Thunberg said how have the J turns worked down in Ham Lake. Gedstad said they have been successful, and no crashes. The lights tend to gap the traffic. That helps a little bit. Nationwide that type of intersection is growing like dandelions, because it is reasonably priced and a safety improvement. MnDOT has quite a few on the books, such as Hwy 169 down by Shakopee and Belle Plain and Hwy 52 by Rochester is also another area getting them. Federal Hwy Administration really likes them. They are hoping MnDOT considers more of them.

Davis asked Gedstad to explain what a J turn is. Gedstad said there are different names, are we familiar with Hwy 169 and Hwy 65. It eliminates the left turns at the main intersections. You cannot turn left north or southbound. It eliminates the problems in the median. Once you eliminate the through movements and the left turns, it cleans it up. If you use to be west bound on Hwy 169, you would go left through the intersection and then you turn right and you head back south.

Davis said how would the J turn work at commercial and high traffic intersections. Are they conducive to attracting development or are they an obstacle to development? Gedstad said he doesn't know the answer, but he would think that anything that makes it safer is probably good. Murphy asked it is less expensive than what? Gayle said an interchange. 187th will never warrant a signal, it stops 40,000 cars once a day. It favors just a few people. It is a tremendous waste of resources, lights, gas, brakes, etc. Virta said it seems to him a signal would not happen; yet how do we improve the traffic flow in that area. It seems to him this is a way to improve what is going on. Gedstad said we could send you some information on it; it is a Reduce Conflict Intersection or R Cuts. There are different names. They use to be called Michigan lefts. Davis said are there any other types of innovative types of solutions you are using. Gedstad said a round about wouldn't work. If you have twenty million we could consider an interchange. Davis said is there an interchange planned for Hwy 65 and 22. Gedstad said someone else could answer that question.

Gedstad said 109th will be next in line for an interchange. Wayne Norris is the expert on this item. Planning has been lead by Anoka County in conjunction with Blaine and Ham Lake. The priority order would be due to volume and congestion problems are most intense in Blaine. Locations such as 109th are the first priorities for interchanges. Unfortunately there is not funding for interchanges. This will be sometime before they are constructed in the future for Ham Lake and East Bethel.

Gedstad said that a study that was done by Hakinson/Anderson that identified service roads. MnDOT looks at this and says it is great. You have a plan for frontage and backage roads. That would be our first choice. Ham Lake on the east side of Hwy 65 north of Bunker is a good example. MnDOT funded some of the frontage roads. There was seed money to get them interested. Even if you are not closing any accesses on Hwy

65 any sort of frontage or backage roads, we find favor in that. We probably put some funding towards it. Funding is always hard to come by. It is good to build it while you can. Davis said is there any possibility for acceleration and deceleration lanes on 65 from existing streets. It would increase the safety. Gedstad said we would have to consider it on a case-by-case basis. The ten-foot shoulder is a godsend, people use it for acceleration, passing, and hwy crews have a place to park their trucks. The wide shoulders are the safest things. When you drive on Hwy 65, you won't find any official acceleration lane. Thunberg said Cemstone has an inside acceleration lane. Davis said on Hwy 169 you would find them in numerous places. Gedstad said we monitor all the minor crashes and try to see how and why it happens. To see if we can do anything with signally, lighting, icing, or what we can do to improve safety. Murphy stated you need a deceleration lane. Gedstad said you have plenty of room. Maybe 1000 or 1,500 feet. It will depend on the situation. We want to make sure we don't make it worse than it is. Gedstad asked who would pay for this. The first question will be are there crashes there. The intersections that are more dangerous get funded first.

Harrington said what about 185th. How would MnDOT be to another intersection? Gedstad said not very. Audience member asked about 181st, will there be a light. Gedstad said it doesn't show it. Which is why I said if you built what is in this plan, then you could plop the interchange in where they are on the map. Davis said there could be a street connection from 187 to 189th to Jackson. On the east side, according to the plan, there would be a backage road and a service road up to County Road 22.

Gedstad said the project that got declined, why was there a decision to apply for the funding there. Davis said the Johnson Street project had the opportunity to initially get full funding. MnDOT changed the ruling on what was eligible after the project was approved. Unless we got agreements from the property owners that would never request access off of Hwy 65 we would have to come up with more local funds. Gedstad asked if it would be all or none. Davis said we would have had to come up with \$165,000. Davis said there is a project on the East Side and 184th could possibly be closed. We will have to do water and sewer on it but we have no way to fund the utilities.

Gedstad asked if this area could have been connected up to County Road 22 with the money from MnDOT. He is just curious. Could you connect to 189th? You couldn't close 189th. If you connected 187th to 189th. Davis said this is a commercial industrial area that needs the access. Gedstad said businesses rely on it. Thunberg said the frontage road project was originally needed south of 221st because the stoplight wasn't being put in until 2015. The intersection got moved up a few years and it changed the needs for the service roads. Davis said Anoka County helped accelerate that project. Gedstad said we are 100% sure that the money for that other project is gone, and there is no possibility the monies could be used anywhere else. Davis said we are trying to look for other projects; we have turned the money back and notified them we won't be using the money. Gedstad said in the future let Paul know and he won't let the money go away. Virta said does MnDOT want to have a J turn in this intersection. Did I hear you say how much you will pay? Gedstad said we are speaking out of turn and can draw up plans, on what if one was built how would things be routed. That is the next step. Virta said it is a good plan. Gedstad said it really helps if you are continuing to work on a long-range plan. Virta said he thinks of a frontage/backage road, as running parallel to Hwy 65. He has problems with routing traffic to Jackson Street and putting a lot of traffic on to residential street. Anything that relieves traffic off of Hwy 65 would qualify. The worst example was 494

in Bloomington. 30% of the traffic on 494 was local traffic. Once American Boulevard was built and the north side was 77th. Those were the relievers we can see that right away on traffic. They are parallel relievers. You go down to Lowe's and Walmart. Ulysses street is a reliever off of Hwy 65 in Blaine. Lowe's was in place. And Walmart comes along, and Walmart has 5,000 in and 5,000 out every day. That was proposed with a new driveway onto Hwy 65. In this case, all the access is from Ulysses. The review took two minutes. The backage road is handling that traffic. The streets coming out to Hwy 65 control the traffic.

Gedstad said he would encourage everyone to take a look at the plan. Davis said it is part of the comprehensive plan.

Paul said major construction would be closure of southbound Hwy 65 would be closed in Fridley and Spring Lake Park. Any concerns please call me.

2015-2019
Capital
Improvement
Planning

Requested Action: Approve the final draft for the Municipal State Aid and Street Capital improvement plans

Background:

The Roads Commission prepares a Capital Improvement Plan annually which updates projected projects, evaluates priorities and establishes funding for these works for the coming year and for each of the subsequent years for a five year period. This plan is presented to City Council for their approval and use for preparing the coming year's budget.

Attached is the updated draft 2015-2019 Roads CIP. We will discuss those projects that are listed for 2015 and determine if they need to stay in their current funding year or be rearranged to reflect any changes in our roads priorities. Other projects can be added and existing ones can be deleted if there is a need for restructuring the schedule.

Staff is seeking input from the Road Commission on which projects to prioritize and add to the MSA Capital Improvement Plan and the Roads Capital Improvement Plan for the next 5 years.

Possible items up for addition to the MSA CIP include;

1. 189th Ave (or other access to Classic/Sauter Commercial Park)
2. East Side Service Road (approx \$2,170,000 with only \$785,160 eligible for MSA funding)
3. Davenport Street from 209th up to and including 213th Ave (3/4 mile approx \$550,000)
4. 181st Ave from TH 65 to Jackson St(3/4 mile with the cooperation of Ham Lake approx \$800,00)
5. University Ave from Sims road to 221st Ave (1 mile with the cooperation of Oak Grove approx \$900,000)
6. Klondike Dr (Gravel 1 3/4 mile approx \$1,500,000-\$2,000,000)

Attachments:

- 6.1) Updated Draft 2015-2019 MSA and Street Capital CIP
- 6.2) 189th Ave Plans
- 6.3) Cost Estimate for 189th Ave

6.4) 2013 Traffic Counts

Under the MSA, balance of \$500,000 in 2015. Originally we had projected we would be borrowed out against these funds. But due to the deletion of the Johnson project and the delay on the Coon Lake Beach project, we were able to utilize another \$1,000,000 in revenues. In 2015, there is a project listed, it would be 189th Avenue. It would be improvements for the access. We have had two incidents in the past year when the intersection was closed. This problem will only intensify in nature. There is development also in the area on the vacant parcels. It is very important we achieve another access in and out. This is probably the one that is most logical. It will be easy to implement and will give us the most bang for the buck. They are not very receptive into adding another access point to Hwy 65. The best option appears to be connecting this area with 189th and Jackson. Traffic count on Jackson Street is about 1,000 vehicles per day. Most of the traffic coming out of here will go back up to County Road 22. The road is designed for high traffic flow. Most of the homes are set back from the street. This is a secondary means for access. In 2016, the proposed MSA project would be Davenport Street, this is behind Flex Fitness. The 2017 would be 181st. In 2018, the proposed project would be University. Half of this street would be in Oak Grove. They would be able to participate in 2018. In 2019 there is not a proposal, but it would be dependent on what we do in the next four years.

Thunberg has a question on the sheets; the funding doesn't seem to add up. We show five years of transfer from general fund. We come up with \$2.9. It would only be \$2.195. Seven years would add up to \$2.9. In 2015, you have \$921,000 balance, the projects add up to \$1,795. We end up with a balance of \$295,000. The addition and subtraction doesn't add up. Davis said we know that simple math that it doesn't add up on the Okinawa. Thunberg said \$716, ended up with \$781. If we look at all this, our numbers are way off. Davis said you are correct there. Taking that into consideration, he is not sure how we make a recommendation. Also if you look at the MSA and the revenues being \$557, that adds up to \$2 million. Yet there is only \$2.29. Davis said we could table this to the next meeting. We won't be presenting Council the budget until the July meeting. Thunberg said we could have some discussion on 189th project. Roger doesn't like the idea of dumping traffic onto Jackson. This is where City Council has to make the decision. There is more value to the City as a whole. Yet it will have a negative effect. This is the right thing to do. Pierson-Kolodzienski said wasn't Jackson reconstructed to have more traffic. Davis said it is an arterial street. If Hwy 65 were closed it would be directed to Jackson street. You can travel almost 6 miles on Jackson Street. It is the only north south street other than Hwy 65. Thunberg said could we go north with this road up to County Road 22. Davis said we could take the road from here and then goes north to County Road 22 and would increase the road length by 1,300 feet, and there would be more rights of way needing to be purchased and also a bridge. Thunberg asked about an entrance permit onto County Road 22. Davis said it would probably be ok with it matching up with Viking Preserve. The other option for getting in out of here are much more difficult. We looked at extending 185th and a right in and right out. MnDOT said they wouldn't be in a favor of it. Ultimately it would be great if we could come out of to the south. If we could go south that would be great, but would be expensive and a lot of traffic coming out here would go to an uncontrolled intersection. We could possibly design this, or restrict truck traffic. We could regulate Jackson street truck traffic. The amount of traffic that is on Jackson street right now is about 1,000 a day. Traffic would be in two concentrated periods.

Pierson-Kolodzienski said she did hear them correctly that they would help fund. Davis said yes, we could possibly get funding from MnDOT for this project. Pierson-Kolodzienski said she would possibly go north out of there every day. It is hard to get across the southbound lane. It is a nightmare. This situation here is only going to get worse. We haven't seen the worst of it yet. Virta said the discussion we had last month, we will have to extend the sewer and water as well. We have numbers in here that we talk about the extension. What is the total cost? It is \$1.3 million one of my concerns is where would that money come from. One of the points, that Nate made is we could borrow against the Road Capital fund. Is that true? Does it make sense to do one and not the other? Davis said if we did this road, we would want to do the water extension. We would not want to come back and tear up the road. We have sewer service that terminates at points that wouldn't require extensions at this time. We would shift the road off center of the right of way to accommodate any future sewer needs. The cost of the water extension is going to be \$194,000. The total road cost is \$1.3 million. Where will the money come from? Davis said we could borrow from the roads funds. We are going to apply for a grant to decommission the plant. Those funds then could be reallocated to this project. Under that scenario we could do the project and not borrow against any other accounts. Virta said it is so bad that area is so restricted. It is inconceivable that the development is there. Seriously, we have 35/30 houses there; we have good 10/15/20 houses on Jackson and County Road 22. He is not sure they know what is coming. Maybe he is wrong, maybe they don't care. Now we are going to have side dumpers on there. There will be theater traffic and side dumpers. He doesn't like being in the position to make a decision. All we do is recommend, City Council decides. It speaks to the poor decision-making that puts us in this place. Pierson-Kolodzienski said Jackson is a thru street and that is what they are created for.

Pierson-Kolodzienski motioned to table. Paavola seconded; all in favor, motion carries unanimously.

Retaining Wall
at 553
Lakeshore Dr

Requested Action:

Consider proposing a recommendation to City Council concerning safety improvements at the intersection of Forest Road and Lakeshore Drive

Background:

The City Council entered into an easement agreement with Roger Schoer, 553 Lakeshore Drive, on October 1, 1986 for the purpose of allowing a portion of a sewage disposal system and a retaining wall appurtenant to the system to remain within City Right of Way on the conditions, summarized as follows, that:

- The Owner indemnify and hold the City harmless from any damage to property or injury
- The Owner agrees that the City shall not be responsible for any damage to these improvements in the Right of Way
- The agreement shall terminate upon the termination of the useful life of the Owner's sewage disposal system

See Attachment # 4 for details of the entire agreement

As a result of the approval of Mr. Schoer's easement in 1986, a retaining wall that is approximately 3'-6" high and backfill was allowed to remain on City Right of Way to accommodate a portion of the drain field for the septic system. The wall limits the view.

Mr. Schoer has since sold the property with Michael McClane being the owner of record from circa 1989 to 2012. Heidi Moegerle and Gary Otremba purchased the property in 2013. The current owners pulled a demolition permit for the structure on this site and have removed most of the interior finish of the home including the plumbing. The title report for the property has been reviewed by the City Attorney and there, apparently, is no recorded declaration or restrictive covenant that came out of the former council decision, at least none which were located as being recorded.

As part of Michael McClane's efforts to sell this property, a septic system compliance inspection report was required as a condition of sale. The report identified that the system was non-compliant due to failure to meet soil separation requirements of the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency for properties in the Shoreland Overlay District.

Per City Ordinance Section 74-30, *A failing ISTS shall be upgraded, replaced or its use discontinued within ten months.* The date of the compliance inspection was October 13, 2011 and the septic system has since been disconnected from the residence at 553 Lakeshore Drive. As such this has been interpreted that termination of the useful life of system has concluded and the easement has expired.

This is important, as there have been complaints concerning site lines at the intersection of Forest Road and Lakeshore Drive. This is a three way stop but vehicles that stop on Forest Road to turn east or west on to Lakeshore Drive have limited site distance due to the wooden retaining wall which obstructs the view of traffic proceeding in an easterly direction on Lakeshore. The wooden retaining wall is part of the sewage disposal system that is referenced above and further described in the Attachment #4. There have been no reported accidents at this intersection in the past 2-½ years.

If the easement agreement is no longer in force due to the termination of the useful life of the system, this raises the question of who is responsible for the removal of the retaining wall and material that was placed on City Right of Way. The City Attorney has opined that the "property owner has effectively abandoned the septic system by demolition of the house. The septic system and retaining wall on city ROW should be removed by the property owner. The septic system now abandoned on the private property of the owner should be properly closed and abandoned as required by code".

The Roads Commission is requested to consider the following:

- Is this an intersection that poses a safety issue and needs improvements; and
- If the intersection is deemed to be a hazard due to site distance concerns, then the Roads Commission should consider a recommendation to City Council as to a solution(s) to the issue.

Attached is preliminary site sketch that identifies a grading plan necessary to improve the site distance at this intersection and a preliminary estimate of probable costs.

Recommendation(s):

Staff is requesting a recommendation from the Roads Commission to City Council as it relates to intersection safety at this location.

The proposed grading plan would be a 3 to 1 slope. It would make the intersection safer.

Heidi Moegerle - 179 Forrest Road. She wanted to say a couple of things, the fact is, and

as of 6:00 p.m. the house has not been demolished. This has such a long history. At the point before the bank came to us to ask us to buy it. There was a suggestion if the City would like to purchase it. The city took hands off. The property has issues with the retaining wall. This might be a planning issue. We are trying to decide a couple things. We want to use the house as storage and want to have green space. There is a lot of water that comes down Forrest and that is a park's issues. There is an ordinance that came in 2004 that the site line shall never be above the grade of the road. This road is grand fathered in. Does the grading need to be resolved? Will Roads commission recommend a change for the intersection? We would be glad to add our property to a rain garden at the intersection. If you have a concern about changing the site lines, then we can go home. We can put a rain garden at that point, so run off won't go into the lake.

Paavola knows the history quite well. When the house went up, it made things easier for others to build out and put in retaining walls up. It is not a good thing with the plows. Getting to the rain garden thing, she knows that the Coon Lake Improvement Association is working on the water flow, and to get so there isn't so much into the lake. They are talking about something like that. Moegerle said she spoke to Jamie Schurbon about that. Paavola said that would be of great value. Moegerle said it all adds up. It is kind of Parks and Roads. It is so many layers deep. Davis put it well, there are sticking points. They are working arbitrarily.

Paavola said her feeling on the road and safety.... you might see a big vehicle, the kids that ride on the road with their bicycle, they are there and you don't see them. They don't stop. That is dangerous. Moegerle said not everyone stops at that stop sign. It may not matter to you, the stop sign there is held in place by the retaining wall. It is so narrow. What we noticed last year, we noticed people park their fishing boat trailers there. Paavola said she has seen it. There are many concerns. Moegerle said we wanted to hear from you. Thunberg said he drove by it, to know what we are talking about it. The safety point of view, the wall does create a safety hazard. Especially for bicycles and pedestrian. It limits your view. If this were a bush, Nate would have removed the bushes. The retaining wall should be removed. Paavola said she agreed. Moegerle said you can remove the retaining wall but the soil is still there. Thunberg said the soil and the retaining wall would need to be removed. Moegerle said we would want to put in a rain garden, and then I should talk to Parks. What happens next?

Davis said the rain garden would be a Roads commission issue, because it would be in right of way, and would require maintenance. Pierson-Kolodzienski agreed there would be maintenance, by the third year; you then have to burn them. It is a controlled burn, you need to hire the people to come in and do that. You do replace the plants. There is maintenance and cost to the City. Moegerle said she has talked to Jamie about that. They pick up the trash by the lake and also have wild flowers there. She intends to be an active participant. We need to talk to Jamie about that.

Murphy asked if street maintenance is different if the wall is removed versus a rain garden. Davis said the snow could be stored in the rain garden. The wall is about five feet away from the pavement. Moegerle said the salt could filter through the rain garden. Davis said he is looking at it from the maintenance and budget standpoint. Murphy said we don't have accident information that says it is a problem. If people blow through it. If it would ease up maintenance. The agreement has run out. We should have the wall removed. Davis said what you see here is a sketch of a site plan to regrade the right of

way and adjoining property at the intersection. This grading plan would not provide enough area for a rain garden. The house portion would be torn down, and then it would have to go back here and require more earth work. That would increase the site distance. This grading plan wouldn't be sufficient for a rain garden. Murphy asked if the structure was going. Moegerle said the septic system has been disconnected and has not been wet for two years. We do have a demolition permit. We want to wait to find out if we change the perimeter of the house. We don't want to get out of the grandfathering, whether ordinances update or not. These changes won't happen for two of three years. There is a big tree on the north side, and we have gotten rid of all the black locust. We are certainly amendable. We wanted to take off the cabin portion, but we can't. We want to work with the City for what works best with the community.

Thunberg asked how wide the City right of way is. Davis said it is 50 feet, but there is a claim by the community center that they own the property to the center of the street. The plats vary. If a full-scale survey were done down there none of the houses may be on their lots.

Virta asked what is the cost for this? Davis said for the grading sketch that is what the engineer estimates the cost is. Virta said the cost would be \$5,000. Pierson-Kolodzienski said that doesn't seem out of line. Virta said he went down there today. He took some pictures. It does affect the site lines. It seems to him that cost is minimal. Davis said the cost is an FYI. We are not asking for approval of the monies. The Roads Commission needs to consider the safety. Paavola said most of us are in agreement that the wall needs to be taken down.

Virta said do you need a recommendation for City Council. Davis said it is a discussion item, but if you want to make a formal recommendation. Davis said you should consider this intersection and one that should be addressed, as far as a solution; we can leave that up to City Council. Unless you have a proposed solution which you wish to offer. Davis said at a minimum the wall would be removed, and a 3 to 1 grade would be created.

Paavola made a recommendation for at 553 Lakeshore Drive and Forest to have the retaining wall removed and the work the resident is proposing, to move forward with that due to it being a safety issue. Virta seconded; all in favor, motion carries unanimously.

Council Report Harrington said road restrictions came off last week. He put in a call to the County to see what the time frame on 221st and East Bethel Boulevard. When he gets an answer back, he will email you all.

Davis said we might want have City Council to send a resolution to the County. They had an issue where there were four tires busted on 237th Avenue. The deputies actually called the Hwy Department to get them out to repair. That is a problem they have all over. Some of these streets we have here. Jill was telling me about East Bethel Boulevard and 68 as you go down to Ham Lake needs work. He will be proposing the City Council send a resolution to accelerate their repairs. We had discussed trading some roads with the County. The Roads Commission would be providing some upgrades. Taking over County Roads that aren't maintained. It is rather embarrassing to have people drive through the mind field to get to City Hall. We could talk with the County on this. Murphy said people talk to him when is East Bethel going to do something about the road,

the perception is out there. Davis said we could add that to the next agenda. We could look at what could be exchanged. We could see what their appetite for discussing this is. Davis said they did work a couple Saturdays. Murphy said what swings more weight, residents contacting them or the Council. Davis said he thinks both. He would like to have something on record. Sometimes the squeaky wheel gets the grease. Thunberg asked where to call. Davis said on the phone or online. Either way would be beneficial. He is sure they know about the problem, but we should make sure they don't forget about it.

Paavola asked if we have any prospects for the Road Commission. Davis we have one gentleman that was interested in Parks and we will find out if he would be interested.

Thunberg asked if the development west of Hwy 65 would still be happening. Davis said yes, the developer ran into problems with the Army Corp. When he ran into problems, he will bring in material from other jobs to keep his job down. But it will probably be next year before there is activity. Murphy said at one time he was ready to go. The Corps of Engineers became involve and said it would take a year to go through the process. As a result he scaled back the project and proceed for the less restrictive permit.

Adjourn

Pierson-Kolodzienski motioned for adjournment. Thunberg seconded; all in favor, motion carries. Meeting was adjourned at 8:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Jill Anderson
Recording Secretary

City of East Bethel
Revenue / Expense Statement
Fiscal Year 2014
1/1/14 to 5/31/14

Account Description	Actual - 5/31/14	FY 2014 Budget	YTD as a % of Budget
Public Works - Streets			
E 101-43220-101 Full-Time Employees Regular	93,197.61	261,600.00	36%
E 101-43220-102 Full-Time Employees Overtime	10,571.41	10,000.00	106%
E 101-43220-103 Part-Time Employees	-	5,900.00	0%
E 101-43220-105 Employee On Call/Standby Pay	-	3,100.00	0%
E 101-43220-107 Commissions and Boards	-	1,700.00	0%
E 101-43220-122 PERA-Coordinated Plan	7,523.11	19,000.00	40%
E 101-43220-125 FICA/Medicare	8,698.94	25,800.00	34%
E 101-43220-126 Deferred Compensation	2,970.28	7,400.00	40%
E 101-43220-131 Cafeteria Contribution	20,522.06	49,500.00	41%
E 101-43220-151 Worker s Comp Insurance Prem	17,989.66	24,500.00	73%
E 101-43220-201 Office Supplies	79.41	150.00	53%
E 101-43220-211 Cleaning Supplies	519.86	400.00	130%
E 101-43220-212 Motor Fuels	16,505.81	33,000.00	50%
E 101-43220-213 Lubricants and Additives	1,811.89	3,200.00	57%
E 101-43220-214 Clothing & Personal Equipment	679.23	3,000.00	23%
E 101-43220-215 Shop Supplies	558.07	1,500.00	37%
E 101-43220-216 Chemicals and Chem Products	-	200.00	0%
E 101-43220-217 Safety Supplies	514.95	1,800.00	29%
E 101-43220-218 Welding Supplies	582.78	1,200.00	49%
E 101-43220-219 General Operating Supplies	25.04	500.00	5%
E 101-43220-221 Motor Vehicles Parts	4,189.14	7,200.00	58%
E 101-43220-222 Tires	1,256.46	4,500.00	28%
E 101-43220-223 Bldg/Facility Repair Supplies	556.13	500.00	111%
E 101-43220-224 Street Maint Materials	25,734.29	68,400.00	38%
E 101-43220-226 Sign/Striping Repair Materials	859.83	8,000.00	11%
E 101-43220-229 Equipment Parts	6,114.75	9,600.00	64%
E 101-43220-231 Small Tools and Minor Equip	573.02	2,600.00	22%
E 101-43220-306 Personnel/Labor Relations	106.67	400.00	27%
E 101-43220-307 Professional Services Fees	140.00	600.00	23%
E 101-43220-321 Telephone	1,153.36	2,900.00	40%
E 101-43220-341 Personnel Advertising	-	100.00	0%
E 101-43220-342 Legal Notices	61.50	150.00	41%
E 101-43220-381 Electric Utilities	4,712.03	19,000.00	25%
E 101-43220-382 Gas Utilities	5,418.67	10,000.00	54%
E 101-43220-385 Refuse Removal	444.58	3,200.00	14%
E 101-43220-388 Hazardous Waste Disposal	-	500.00	0%
E 101-43220-401 Motor Vehicle Services (Lic d)	7,599.09	8,200.00	93%
E 101-43220-402 Repairs/Maint Machinery/Equip	1,275.00	6,400.00	20%
E 101-43220-403 Bldgs/Facilities Repair/Maint	4,108.89	4,500.00	91%
E 101-43220-404 Street Maint Services	-	52,000.00	0%
E 101-43220-408 Information System Services	-	600.00	0%
E 101-43220-422 Auto/Misc Licensing Fees/Taxes	227.00	100.00	227%
E 101-43220-431 Equipment Replacement Chgs	125,000.00	125,000.00	100%
E 101-43220-433 Dues and Subscriptions	-	100.00	0%
E 101-43220-434 Conferences/Meetings	20.00	-	N/A
	<u>372,300.52</u>	<u>788,000.00</u>	<u>47%</u>

**City of East Bethel
Balance Sheet
Fiscal Year 2014
5/31/14**

Fund Name	Street Construction - State Aid (402)	Street Capital Projects (406)
G xxx-10100 Cash	47,627.11	1,149,848.39
G xxx-10200 Petty Cash		
G xxx-10700 Taxes Receivable-Delinquent		
G xxx-12200 Special Assess Rec - Delinquent		658.38
G xxx-12300 Special Assess Rec-Deferred		
G xxx-13100 Due from Other Funds		
G xxx-13200 Due from Other Governments		
G xxx-13300 Due from Other Entities (Loan Payable)		
G xxx-16100 Land		
G xxx-16200 Building		
G xxx-16210 Depreciation		
G xxx-16300 Improvements		
G xxx-16310 Depreciation		
G xxx-16400 Machinery		
G xxx-16410 Depreciation		
Total Assets	47,627.11	1,150,506.77
G xxx-20400 Sales Tax Payable		
G xxx-20600 Contract Retainage		10,795.64
G xxx-20700 Due to other funds		
G xxx-20810 State Surcharges		
G xxx-21706 Medical		
G xxx-21707 Dental		
G xxx-21710 Medical Cafeteria Exp		
G xxx-21711 Dependent Care Cafe Exp		
G xxx-21712 Medical Cafe Reimb CY		
G xxx-21714 Dependant Care Reimb		
G xxx-21716 Disability / Life		
G xxx-21719 Union Dues		
G xxx-21721 COBRA (Anderson)		
G xxx-21722 COBRA (Pierce)		
G xxx-21724 COBRA (Warren)		
G xxx-22200 Deferred Revenues		658.38
G xxx-22500 Bonds Payable Current		
G xxx-23110 Bonds Payable Non Current		
G xxx-21500 Accrued Interest Payable		
G xxx-23200 Bond Premium		
G xxx-23900 Compensated Absences Payable		
G xxx-24500 Escrow	11,622.59	
Total Liabilities	11,622.59	11,454.02
Fund Balance		
G xxx-25300 Unreserved Fund Balance at 12/31/13	(400,023.04)	713,818.72
Excess of Revenues over Expenses (1/1/14 to 5/31/14)	436,027.56	425,234.03
Total Fund Balance	36,004.52	1,139,052.75
Total Liabilities and Fund Balance	47,627.11	1,150,506.77

City of East Bethel
Revenue / Expense Statement
Fiscal Year 2014
1/1/14 to 5/31/14

	Account Description	Actual - 5/31/14	FY 2014 Budget	YTD as a % of Budget
Street Project State Aid				
	E 402-40200-302 Architect/Engineering Fees	5,411.33	-	N/A
	E 402-40200-404 Street Maint Services	-	-	N/A
	E 402-40326-302 Architect/Engineering Fees	-	-	N/A
	E 402-40326-307 Professional Services Fees	-	-	N/A
	E 402-40326-530 Improvements Other Than Bldgs	-	-	N/A
	E 402-43121-302 Architect/Engineering Fees	-	-	N/A
	E 402-43125-302 Architect/Engineering Fees	1,938.17	-	N/A
	E 402-43125-510 Land	-	-	N/A
		7,349.50	-	N/A
Street Project Non-State Aid				
	E 406-40600-302 Architect/Engineering Fees	-	-	N/A
	E 406-40600-307 Professional Services Fees	-	-	N/A
	E 406-40600-342 Legal Notices	-	-	N/A
	E 406-40600-404 Street Maint Services	-	-	N/A
	E 406-40600-530 Improvements Other Than Bldgs	-	-	N/A
		-	-	N/A



City of East Bethel Road Commission Agenda Information

Date:

June 10, 2014

Agenda Item Number:

Item 5.0

Agenda Item:

2015-2019 Capital Improvement Planning

Requested Action: Approve the final draft for the Municipal State Aid and Street Capital improvement plans

Background:

The Roads Commission prepares a Capital Improvement Plan annually which updates projected projects, evaluates priorities and establishes funding for these works for the coming year and for each of the subsequent years for a five year period. This plan is presented to City Council for their approval and use for preparing the coming year's budget.

Attached is the updated draft 2015-2019 Roads CIP. We will discuss those projects that are listed for 2015 and determine if they need to stay in their current funding year or be rearranged to reflect any changes in our roads priorities. Other projects can be added and existing ones can be deleted if there is a need for restructuring the schedule.

Staff is seeking input from the Road Commission on which projects to prioritize and add to the MSA Capital Improvement Plan and the Roads Capital Improvement Plan for the next 5 years.

Possible items up for addition to the MSA CIP include;

1. 189th Ave (or other access to Classic/Sauter Commercial Park)
2. East Side Service Road (approx \$2,170,000 with only \$785,160 eligible for MSA funding)
3. Davenport Street from 209th up to and including 213th Ave (3/4 mile approx \$550,000)
4. 181st Ave from TH 65 to Jackson St (3/4 mile with the cooperation of Ham Lake approx \$800,00)
5. University Ave from Sims road to 221st Ave (1 mile with the cooperation of Oak Grove approx \$900,000)
6. Klondike Dr (Gravel 1 3/4 mile approx \$1,500,000-\$2,000,000)

Attachments:

5.1) Updated Draft 2015-2019 MSA and Street Capital CIP

Fiscal Impact: As noted above

Recommendation(s):

Road Commission Action

Motion by: _____

Second by: _____

Vote Yes: _____

Vote No: _____

No Action Required: _____

**Street Capital Projects
2015-2019
Funding Analysis**

MUNICIPAL STATE AID FUND	Beginning Balance	Sources (Revenues)	Uses (Project Costs)	Ending Balance
2015 Beginning Balance	\$288,257			\$288,257
Municipal State Aid Funding		\$557,291		\$845,548
189th Ave			\$1,000,000	-\$154,452
2015 Ending Balance				-\$154,452
2016 Beginning Balance	-\$154,452			-\$154,452
Municipal State Aid Funding		\$557,291		\$402,839
Davenport St Reconstruction			\$550,000	-\$147,161
2016 Ending Balance				-\$147,161
2017 Beginning Balance	-\$147,161			-\$147,161
Municipal State Aid Funding		\$557,291		\$410,130
181st Ave Reconstruction			\$400,000	\$10,130
2017 Ending Balance				\$10,130
2018 Beginning Balance	\$10,130			\$10,130
Municipal State Aid Funding		\$557,291		\$567,421
University Ave Reconstruction			\$450,000	\$117,421
2018 Ending Balance				\$117,421
2019 Beginning Balance	\$117,421			\$117,421
Municipal State Aid Funding		\$557,291		\$674,712
Projects TBD			\$0	\$674,712
2019 Ending Balance	\$674,712			
TOTAL MUNICIPAL STATE AID FUND SOURCES & USES		\$2,786,455	\$2,400,000	

Note: MSA Funding can be "Advanced Funded" to met certain requirements. The City can advance fund up to 4 times the construction allotment or \$3,000,000 whichever is less

A negative balance is not an indication of too many projects. It simply means the City has anticipated numerous projects and can fund this within the regulations identified by MnDOT.

**Street Capital Projects
2015-2019
Funding Analysis**

STREET CAPITAL FUND	Beginning Balance	Sources (Revenues)	Uses (Project Costs)	Ending Balance
2015 Beginning Balance	\$741,186			
Transfer from General Fund		\$425,000		\$1,166,186
225th Ave-Sealcoat			\$23,000	\$1,143,186
222nd Ave-Sealcoat			\$7,000	\$1,136,186
226th LN-Sealcoat			\$20,000	\$1,116,186
London St- Sealcoat			\$25,000	\$1,077,686
221st Ave-Sealcoat			\$35,000	\$1,042,686
Wake St- Sealcoat			\$15,000	\$1,027,686
Waconia Circle and Staples St-Sealcoat			\$110,000	\$917,686
Isanti St-Overlay			\$56,400	\$861,286
Rochester St-Overlay			\$140,000	\$721,286
7th St Overlay			\$140,000	\$581,286
Leyte St-Overlay			\$85,000	\$496,286
2015 Ending Balance				\$496,286
2016 Beginning Balance	\$496,286			
Transfer from General Fund		\$425,000		\$921,286
Rendova St- Overlay			\$140,000	\$781,286
Okinawa and Tippecanoe-Overlay			\$225,000	\$556,286
209th, Austin, and 204th-Overlay			\$505,900	\$50,386
2016 Ending Balance				\$50,386
2017 Beginning Balance	\$50,386			
Transfer from General Fund		\$425,000		\$475,386
Sunny View Addition- Sealcoat			\$53,000	\$422,386
DeGardners Addition- Sealcoat			\$75,500	\$346,886
2017 Ending Balance				\$346,886
2018 Beginning Balance	\$346,886			
Transfer from General Fund		\$425,000		\$771,886
Hidden Haven West-sealcoat			\$180,000	\$591,886
Hidden Haven East-sealcoat			\$70,000	\$521,886
Cedar Brook Addition-sealcoat			\$90,000	\$431,886
2018 Ending Balance				\$431,886
2019 Beginning Balance	\$431,886			
Transfer from General Fund		\$425,000		\$856,886
Projects TBD			\$0	\$856,886
2019 Ending Balance				\$856,886
Total Street Capital Fund Sources and Uses		\$2,125,000	\$2,009,300	



City of East Bethel Road Commission Agenda Information

Date:

June 10, 2014

Agenda Item Number:

Item 6.0

Agenda Item:

Roads Tour

Requested Action:

Informational Item

Background Information:

The Roads Commission has scheduled a tour of current and potential road projects in the City of East Bethel for the June meeting. The tour will depart City Hall at 6:00 p.m. and will visit the following streets and projects:

- Whispering Aspen Development (2013/2014 overlay and partial reconstruction)
- 2014 Chip seal project locations
- University Ave (future MSA project)
- Davenport (future MSA project)
- Jackson St and 189th AVE/Commercial Park (future MSA project)
- 181st Ave (future MSA project)
- Lincoln and Lakeshore Drive (2014 MSA project)
- Coon Lake Beach Neighborhood (2012 overlay)
- Klondike Dr

Fiscal Impact:

Recommendation(s):

Road Commission Action

Motion by: _____

Second by: _____

Vote Yes: _____

Vote No: _____

No Action Required: _____



City of East Bethel Road Commission Agenda Information

Date:

June 10, 2014

Agenda Item Number:

Item 7.0

Agenda Item:

Council Report and Other Business

Requested Action:

Informational Item

Background:

Staff and the Roads Commission will discuss current issues facing the City Council with the City Council liaison, Tim Harrington.

Attachments:

Fiscal Impact:

Recommendation(s):

Road Commission Action

Motion by: _____

Second by: _____

Vote Yes: _____

Vote No: _____

No Action Required: _____