



**City of East Bethel
Road Commission Agenda**

6:30 PM
Date: January 12, 2016
Location: City Hall
Room: City Council Chambers

	Item	
6:30 PM	1.0	Call to Order
6:31 PM	2.0	Adopt Agenda
6:32 PM	3.0	Approve Minutes – December 8, 2015
6:35 PM	4.0	Road Financial Information
6:45PM	5.0	2016 JPA Quantities
7:00 PM	6.0	Superstreet Intersection Recommendation
7:15 PM	7.0	Gravel Road Discussion
7:30 PM	8.0	Council Report and Other Business
7:45 PM	9.0	Adjourn

EAST BETHEL ROAD COMMISSION MEETING

December 8, 2015

The East Bethel Road Commission met at 6:30 pm at the East Bethel City Hall for the monthly meeting.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Al Thunberg Kathy Paavola Lori Pierson-Kolodzienski
 Jeff Jensen Dennis Murphy Daniel Nowack

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Roger Virta

ALSO PRESENT: Steve Voss, Mayor
 Tom Ronning, City Council Member
 Tim Harrington, City Council Member
 Brian Mundle, City Council Member
 Jack Davis, City Administrator
 Nate Ayshford, Public Works Manager

Adopt **Ms. Pierson-Kolodzienski moved and Ms. Paavola seconded to adopt**
Agenda **the agenda as submitted. Motion carried.**

Presentation from MnDOT and FHWA on Viking Blvd /TH65 Intersection Representatives from Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT) and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) presented and discussed possible improvements to the Viking Blvd/TH65 intersection. The need for improvements at this intersection is evident during rush hours and the associated delays required to clear the intersection. Currently, there are only three main roads going east to west from 35W to Hwy 169 – Interstate 694, Hwy 95, and Viking Blvd. With the planned future development in this area, this intersection will receive significantly more traffic movement.

One plan discussed was the “Superstreet” or “Reduced Conflict Intersection” design. Representatives presented and reviewed how this type of intersection works and how it allows for better traffic performance, along with safety benefits. This intersection design used in both North Carolina and San Antonio may fit the intersection needs at Viking Blvd./TH65, 181st/TH65, and 187th/TH65. A video of a North Carolina site and slides were shown. This type of intersection can either be unsignalized or signalized. Cost for unsignalized would be approximately \$1 million, with an additional cost for signalized. The representatives shared that funding resources (possibly 80/20) are available to help with costs whether it is a signalized or unsignalized intersection. If another city were to install the first signalized intersection before the City of East Bethel, Federal early deployment money

would go to that city. However, there are still other funding options available.

Based on the traffic flow through the Viking Blvd./TH65 intersection, a signalized intersection is recommended. Early evaluations indicate two (2) right turn lanes onto TH65, along with two (2) middle lanes for U-turn use may be best. A yellow arrow for right turns could be used during off peak times at this location. 181st and 187th are also candidates for this type of intersection. Superstreets can be installed a quarter mile apart. One large street could be installed at once, but that is not suggested.

If emergency vehicles need quicker access going east and west, an emergency vehicle only cross road could be included; other cities have included such roads. There was discussion on how this type of intersection will impact trucks and the need for acceleration onto TH65. Trucks entering off of 187th could benefit from a signalized intersection at Viking Blvd., due to spaced out pods of vehicle. Acceleration lanes were not encouraged.

Sheila Kauppi, MnDOT North Metro Engineer, stated public outreach and involvement from Bunker Blvd. north on the TH65 corridor will be necessary. She believes that the superstreet will sell itself once it is installed. At this time a study is still underway, however, if there is a true interest in the project, the next step would be cost estimating.

Approve Oct. 13, 2015 Mtg. Minutes **Ms. Paavola moved and Mr. Murphy seconded to approve the October 13, 2015 minutes with one correction on Page 1, change “Ms. Jensen to Mr.”. Motion carried.**

Roads Financial Information Mr. Ayshford reported that due to the warm start to the winter season, overtime has been down and that there is no need to purchase more road salt at this time; finances should be good for the remainder of 2015.

Bonde Private Road Evon Brownlee and Allan Bonde are requesting that their private driveway be classified as a private road in order to meet City Ordinance requirements to secure building permits. Because this is a shared driveway, it does not meet the City resolution of no building permits being issued on shared driveways. One property owner wants to sell 20 acres that will have a house built on it.

There is a DNR accepted easement of 66 ft., for which the DNR has no upkeep requirements. The property owners maintain the driveway themselves. If this is approved as a private road, the property owners will continue to be responsible for the maintenance of the road; the City would

not be responsible. Will there be a future issue with right of way? Not with the 66 ft. easement in place. If any property on the private road was to be developed in the future, all development planning steps will need to be taken. City staff does not want to set a precedence for private roads, however, this driveway has acted as a private road since the early 70s.

If the City were to consider the acceptance of the Bonde property, it is recommended through a Resolution by the City Council acknowledging the private road with the following conditions:

1. Provide the City with the names and addresses of all of the respective property owners and lien holders, including the DNR along with consent forms for the private drive establishment and location.
2. Legal description that describes the entire road and right of way proposed as a private drive.
3. Maintenance agreement draft addressing all road maintenance and snow removal responsibilities, payments and organizational framework for collection.
4. Resolution will stipulate that if the property owners ever want the City to take over the driveway it will need to be brought up to City standards.
5. Minimum road requirements to meet emergency vehicle requirements as deemed needed and necessary by the Fire Department Chief, including additional Class 5 or other acceptable material to improve the road surface and condition.

Mr. Jensen moved and Mr. Murphy seconded to recommend approval of the Bonde private road request with the stipulation that the five (5) above conditions be met, and that Condition #5 be revised to include the Fire Department Chief's approval of access on the private road. Motion carried.

Council
Report and
Other
Business

Mr. Ronning presented the recent tax levy information and a document showing how the City of East Bethel compares to other Anoka County cities.

The City Council passed a general levy at the last council meeting for \$4,109,300.00 with four (4) bonds: Sewer bond for \$180,000, 2013A Public Safety for \$128,000, 2015A for \$504,000, and 2014A for \$330,000. Total levy is \$5,251,300 at 1.5%.

The City Council approved an EDA levy for \$123,022 with a budget of the same.

Terry Allen, a city employee, was recognized by Resolution for his actions by helping an accident victim.

City staff revised Ordinance Chapter 34 Floods with regard to flood plains.

City Council passed an administrative subdivision request by Darrell Pearson to split 35.33 acres into two lots per Chapter 66, Article V of the City of East Bethel code.

Fee schedule for adoption came up for review.

City staff purchased a generator for approximately \$47,000 to use as back up during power outages for City Hall.

The City Council will try harder to acknowledge the actions and work of all commissioners.

In follow-up to previous minutes, Mr. Jensen voiced concerns and asked that the City Council delay road change decisions until safety issues are reviewed.

Roger Virta will be stepping down as a commissioner so there will be an opening on the Road Commission. Mr. Jensen's term expires in January.

Mr. Jensen and Ms. Paavola stated frustration with the City Council for not always listening to or leaning toward City staff direction. Staff was hired for their expertise in specific jobs/areas and in turn give good recommendations. "The Council needs to listen to staff."

Ms. Paavola stated Lincoln, Laurel, and Longfellow are great roads now and that the curves are much smoother.

Adjourn

Ms. Paavola moved and Ms. Pierson-Kolodzienski seconded to adjourn at 8:34 pm. Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,

Gail Gessner
Recording Secretary
12/11/15

**City of East Bethel
Balance Sheet
Fiscal Year 2015
12/31/15**

Fund Name	Street Construction - State Aid (402)	Street Capital Projects (406)
G xxx-10100 Cash	109,800.87	795,805.76
G xxx-10200 Petty Cash		
G xxx-10700 Taxes Receivable-Delinquent		
G xxx-12200 Special Assess Rec - Delinquent		
G xxx-12300 Special Assess Rec-Deferred		
G xxx-13300 Due from Other Entities (Loan Payable)		
G xxx-15500 Prepaid Expenditures		
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	109,800.87	795,805.76
G xxx-20200 Accounts Payable	30,380.01	4,201.06
G xxx-20400 Sales Tax Payable		
G xxx-20600 Contract Retainage	27,473.31	6,301.59
G xxx-20800 Due to MCES		
G xxx-20810 State Surcharges		
G xxx-20830 MCES Reserve Capacity Loan		
G xxx-21707 Dental Insurance		
G xxx-21710 Medical Cafeteria Exp		
G xxx-21711 Dependent Care Cafe Exp		
G xxx-21721 COBRA		
G xxx-21722 COBRA		
G xxx-22200 Deferred Revenues		
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		
Total Liabilities	57,853.32	10,502.65
Fund Balance		
G xxx-25300 Unreserved Fund Balance at 12/31/14	3,973.83	786,852.28
Excess of Revenues over Expenses (1/1/15 to 12/31/15)	47,973.72	(1,549.17)
Total Fund Balance	51,947.55	785,303.11
Total Liabilities and Fund Balance	109,800.87	795,805.76

City of East Bethel
Revenue / Expense Statement
Fiscal Year 2015
1/1/15 to 12/31/15

Account Description	1/1/15 to 12/31/15 Actual	FY 2015 Budget	YTD as a % of Budget
Street Project State Aid			
E 402-40200-302 Architect/Engineering Fees	182,258.41		N/A
E 402-40200-307 Professional Services Fees	100.00		N/A
E 402-40200-404 Street Maint Services	915,776.87		N/A
E 402-40200-510 Land	21,500.00		N/A
E 402-43121-302 Architect/Engineering Fees	58.44		N/A
E 402-43124-342 Legal Notices	99.98		N/A
	1,119,793.70	-	N/A
Street Project Non-State Aid			
E 406-40600-224 Street Maint Materials	4,441.20		
E 406-40600-302 Architect/Engineering Fees	1,250.40		N/A
E 406-40600-307 Professional Services Fees	55,410.09		N/A
E 406-40600-342 Legal Notices	199.01		N/A
E 406-40600-404 Street Maint Services	366,780.64		N/A
	428,081.34	-	N/A

City of East Bethel
Revenue / Expense Statement
Fiscal Year 2015
1/1/15 to 12/31/15

Account Description	1/1/15 to 12/31/15 Actual	FY 2015 Budget	YTD as a % of Budget
Public Works - Streets			
E 101-43220-101 Full-Time Employees Regular	263,647.65	270,600.00	97%
E 101-43220-102 Full-Time Employees Overtime	3,695.88	10,200.00	36%
E 101-43220-103 Part-Time Employees	3,978.75	6,000.00	66%
E 101-43220-105 Employee On Call/Standby Pay	9,170.98	3,100.00	296%
E 101-43220-107 Commissions and Boards	860.00	1,700.00	51%
E 101-43220-122 PERA-Coordinated Plan	20,721.40	20,300.00	102%
E 101-43220-125 FICA/Medicare	23,008.86	26,500.00	87%
E 101-43220-126 Deferred Compensation	7,716.67	7,500.00	103%
E 101-43220-131 Cafeteria Contribution	49,518.00	49,500.00	100%
E 101-43220-151 Worker s Comp Insurance Prem	19,871.74	24,500.00	81%
E 101-43220-201 Office Supplies	97.87	100.00	98%
E 101-43220-211 Cleaning Supplies	1,814.36	400.00	454%
E 101-43220-212 Motor Fuels	19,647.29	36,000.00	55%
E 101-43220-213 Lubricants and Additives	3,161.23	3,200.00	99%
E 101-43220-214 Clothing & Personal Equipment	1,381.25	3,000.00	46%
E 101-43220-215 Shop Supplies	1,319.36	1,500.00	88%
E 101-43220-216 Chemicals and Chem Products	-	200.00	0%
E 101-43220-217 Safety Supplies	1,808.70	1,800.00	100%
E 101-43220-218 Welding Supplies	557.91	1,200.00	46%
E 101-43220-219 General Operating Supplies	685.59	500.00	137%
E 101-43220-221 Motor Vehicles Parts	5,734.99	7,200.00	80%
E 101-43220-222 Tires	4,416.22	4,500.00	98%
E 101-43220-223 Bldg/Facility Repair Supplies	1,324.76	500.00	265%
E 101-43220-224 Street Maint Materials	29,906.29	73,500.00	41%
E 101-43220-226 Sign/Striping Repair Materials	3,789.65	7,000.00	54%
E 101-43220-229 Equipment Parts	9,759.74	9,600.00	102%
E 101-43220-230 Snowplow Cutting Edges	9,685.77	10,000.00	97%
E 101-43220-231 Small Tools and Minor Equip	5,424.44	2,600.00	209%
E 101-43220-306 Personnel/Labor Relations	299.65	400.00	75%
E 101-43220-307 Professional Services Fees	498.90	600.00	83%
E 101-43220-321 Telephone	2,782.20	2,900.00	96%
E 101-43220-341 Personnel Advertising	64.50	100.00	65%
E 101-43220-342 Legal Notices	-	100.00	0%
E 101-43220-381 Electric Utilities	16,461.56	20,000.00	82%
E 101-43220-382 Gas Utilities	3,784.52	7,000.00	54%
E 101-43220-385 Refuse Removal	6,374.27	3,200.00	199%
E 101-43220-388 Hazardous Waste Disposal	-	500.00	0%
E 101-43220-401 Motor Vehicle Services (Lic d)	21,665.01	8,200.00	264%
E 101-43220-402 Repairs/Maint Machinery/Equip	3,984.53	6,400.00	62%
E 101-43220-403 Bldgs/Facilities Repair/Maint	2,223.77	4,000.00	56%
E 101-43220-404 Street Maint Services	39,302.17	52,000.00	76%
E 101-43220-415 Other Equipment Rentals	765.00	-	N/A
E 101-43220-422 Auto/Misc Licensing Fees/Taxes	226.30	100.00	226%
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	475.00	-	N/A
	726,612.73	813,300.00	89%



City of East Bethel Road Commission Agenda Information

Date:

January 12, 2016

Agenda Item Number:

Item 5.0

Agenda Item:

2016 Joint Powers Agreement (JPA) Street Maintenance Projects

Requested Action:

Consider approving bid quantities for 2016 JPA Street Maintenance Projects as part of the North Metro Street Maintenance Program

Background Information:

The following projects were recommended to bid as part of the 2016 JPA Street Maintenance program. These projects have been identified in the 2016-2020 Street Capital Improvement Plan (CIP).

1. Crack-seal 50,000 LF as part of the annual street maintenance program.
2. 150,000 LF of striping to be determined.

The estimated budget for crack sealing and striping the above listed streets is \$45,320. These projects will be funded from the Street Capital Fund as identified in the 2016-2020 Capital Improvement Plan and the 2016 Street Maintenance Budget.

Attachments:

5.1) 2016-2020 Street Capital Improvement Plan

Fiscal Impact:

As noted above

Recommendation(s):

Staff recommends submittal of the quantities stated to be bid as part of the 2016 North Metro Street Maintenance Program.

Road Commission Action

Motion by: _____

Second by: _____

Vote Yes:_____

Vote No:_____

No Action Required:_____

**Street Capital Projects
2016-2020
Funding Analysis**

MUNICIPAL STATE AID FUND	Beginning Balance	Sources (Revenues)	Uses (Project Costs)	Ending Balance
2016 Beginning Balance	\$855,083			
Municipal State Aid Funding		\$603,199		\$1,458,282
HSIP Grant		\$500,000		\$1,958,282
Cooperative Agreement Grant		\$700,000		\$2,658,282
189th Ave/Taylor St Service Road (Phase I)			\$2,400,000	\$258,282
2016 Ending Balance				\$258,282
2017 Beginning Balance	\$258,282			
Municipal State Aid Funding		\$603,199		\$861,481
None			\$0	\$861,481
2017 Ending Balance				\$861,481
2018 Beginning Balance	\$861,481			
Municipal State Aid Funding		\$603,199		\$1,464,680
HSIP Grant		\$500,000		\$1,964,680
Cooperative Agreement Grant		\$200,000		\$2,164,680
Classic Commercial Park Service Road, South Section (Phase 2)			\$1,500,000	\$664,680
2018 Ending Balance				\$664,680
2019 Beginning Balance	\$664,680			
Municipal State Aid Funding		\$603,199		\$1,267,879
181st Ave Reconstruction			\$400,000	\$867,879
2019 Ending Balance				\$867,879
2020 Beginning Balance	\$867,879			
Municipal State Aid Funding		\$603,199		\$1,471,078
Cooperative Agreement Grant		\$300,000		\$1,771,078
East Side Service Road, South Section(Phase III)			\$1,900,000	-\$128,922
Davenport St Reconstruction			\$600,000	-\$728,922
2020 Ending Balance				-\$728,922
TOTAL MUNICIPAL STATE AID FUND SOURCES & USES		\$5,215,995	\$6,800,000	

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
2016-2020
Funding Analysis**

STREET CAPITAL FUND	Beginning Balance	Sources (Revenues)	Uses (Project Costs)	Ending Balance
2016 Beginning Balance	\$573,293			
Transfer from General Fund		\$425,000		\$998,293
Rendova St- Overlay			\$140,000	\$858,293
Okinawa and Tippecanoe-Overlay			\$225,000	\$633,293
209th, Austin, and 204th-Overlay			\$505,900	\$127,393
2016 Ending Balance				\$127,393
2017 Beginning Balance	\$127,393			
Transfer from General Fund		\$425,000		\$552,393
Sunny View Addition- Sealcoat			\$53,000	\$499,393
DeGardners Addition- Sealcoat			\$75,500	\$423,893
2017 Ending Balance				\$423,893
2018 Beginning Balance	\$423,893			
Transfer from General Fund		\$425,000		\$848,893
Hidden Haven West-sealcoat			\$180,000	\$668,893
Hidden Haven East-sealcoat			\$70,000	\$598,893
Cedar Brook Addition-sealcoat			\$90,000	\$508,893
2018 Ending Balance				\$508,893
2019 Beginning Balance	\$508,893			
Transfer from General Fund		\$425,000		\$933,893
181st Ave Reconstruction			\$300,000	\$633,893
2019 Ending Balance				\$633,893
2020 Beginning Balance	\$633,893			
Transfer from General Fund		\$425,000		\$1,058,893
University Ave Reconstruction			\$400,000	\$658,893
2020 Ending Balance				\$658,893
Total Street Capital Fund Sources and Uses		\$2,125,000	\$2,039,400	



City of East Bethel Road Commission Agenda Information

Date:

January 12, 2016

Agenda Item Number:

Item 6.0

Agenda Item:

Superstreet Intersection Recommendation

Requested Action:

Discussion item regarding the feasibility of a Superstreet intersection to be located at Viking Blvd and Highway 65

Background:

Representatives from MnDOT and the Federal Highway Administration gave a presentation and discussed possible improvements to the Viking Blvd/TH65 intersection at the December 8, 2015 Roads Commission meeting. This intersection is one of the worst on the Hwy 65 Corridor in terms of its efficiency to move both in-line and cross traffic during peak hours. Future development around and growth north of this intersection will generate additional traffic and require up-grades to improve and enhance the movement of the vehicle load at this location and along Hwy. 65.

Current traffic counts at this intersection average 25,000 to 35,000 VPD and the cross traffic count on Viking Boulevard is 6,100 on the east side of Hwy 65 and 6,500 VPD on the west side. While these are substantial numbers, there are four at-grade intersections on Hwy 65 in Blaine that have traffic counts exceeding 55,000 VPD and two that exceed 45,000 VPD. In Ham Lake there is one intersection that exceeds 55,000 VPD and two that exceed 45,000 VPD. Based on these volumes and higher volumes on cross streets, a separated grade intersection at Viking Boulevard and Hwy. 65 is not on MnDOT's priority ranking at this time.

In order to address the problems at this intersection, interim solutions are being considered that would improve the functionality until such time that warrants are met to justify a separated grade interchange. One plan that was discussed was the "Superstreet" or "Reduced Conflict Intersection" design (see attachments 1). This design has been used in other areas of the country and is an alternative under consideration for the Viking Blvd intersection.

While MnDOT seems to prefer the reduced conflict intersection design as the intermediate term solution to the problem at this intersection, the City is still seeking more information on this type of design on accessibility to businesses and its impact on total traffic flow. In addition, the City is of the opinion that any improvements to the Hwy65/Viking Boulevard Intersection must be

coordinated with and accompanied by complimentary improvements at 187th Lane and 181st Ave. to address the total problem in this segment of Hwy. 65.

The East Bethel City Council and local business and property owners attended the Roads Commission meeting. There were several questions and some skepticism relating to the proposal, but there was no opposition expressed during the meeting.

City Council and staff would like the Road Commission to provide comments and decide if further information is required on the concept of a Superstreet intersection at Viking Blvd and TH 65. As more specific plans become available, the Road Commission will have opportunities to provide comments and recommendations as well.

Attachments:

- 1) Basic Superstreet Concept
- 2) MnDOT Fact Sheet

Fiscal Impact: none at this time

Recommendation(s): Discussion item

Road Commission Action

Motion by: _____

Second by: _____

Vote Yes: _____

Vote No: _____

No Action Required:_____

Basic Superstreet Design



MnDOT Metro Signal Operations Background on Superstreets

(last updated 9-2-15)

Background

- Superstreets is a type of Alternative Signalized Intersection
- Naming of Alternative Signalized Intersections has been inconsistent across the country, but other types of Alternative Signalized Intersections include Continuous Flow Intersections (CFIs), Displaced Left Turns, and others
- Superstreet Signal Triplet is composed of 3 signals, although number of controllers is still unclear (2, 3, or 4)
- Superstreet signal triplet can be coordinated with other normal signals on corridor
- Having all Superstreet Signal Triplets in a corridor would allow for different cycle lengths in each direction
- Need wide enough medians
- Need enough space between signals for Triplet

Pros

- Increases capacity of signal to reduce delays, stops, fuel consumption
- Safer because of less conflict points

Cons

- Diversion out of way 24 hours a day, although right-turn and left-turn on reds allowed
- Public reaction to converting existing signal to Superstreet Triplet
- Additional cost compared to do nothing
- Over-capacity corridors with high-ADTs may still have long delays with Superstreets

Principal Arterial Intersection Conversion Study

- Develop vision for non-freeway Principal Arterial Corridors including TH 65
- Alternative Signalized Intersections such as Superstreets will be considered

TH 65 from Bunker Lake Blvd to 237th Ave Corridor Assessment

Positives for Alternative Signalized Intersections such as Superstreets

- Wide Medians and long distances between signals
- ADT ranges from 20 to 34,000
- Not a lot of pedestrians
- Volumes will grow on corridor especially if bottleneck at 109th is opened up

Short Term:

- Viking Blvd is biggest existing problem on corridor due to 1) extra wide median requiring extra clearance time, 2) split phase, 3) capacity on cross street

Long Term:

- Andover Blvd, Constance, Crosstown Blvd, Sims, 221st, 237th would work well as Superstreet Triplets
- Bunker Lake Blvd needs further analysis, but has potential for some sort of Alternative Signalized Intersection

AM Peak - SB Capacity (210 sec Cycle)

	Existing	Super Street	% Capacity Improvement
Viking	1900 48%	3050 76%	46%
Crosstown	2400 60%	3250 81%	26%
Constance <i>split phase</i>	2300 58%	3200 80%	31%
Andover	2650 66%	3200 80%	17%
Bunker	2300 58%	2750 69%	13%

SB Capacity

% of Roadway Capacity



City of East Bethel Road Commission Agenda Information

Date:

January 12, 2016

Agenda Item Number:

Item 7.0

Agenda Item:

Gravel Road Discussion

Requested Action:

Review the City of East Bethel Gravel Road Policy and discuss if any changes are needed

Background:

The City of East Bethel currently has 31 gravel roads totaling over 15 miles that are evenly distributed over the 48 square miles of the city. Currently, the cost to blacktop a road is assessed to the benefiting properties and is justified because of the property value increase. The cost for a lot on a blacktopped road is higher due to the increased building costs incurred by the developer to build the road which are also reflected in subsequent home values.

The blacktopping procedure can be initiated by petition from the benefiting properties or the City Council can initiate a road upgrade.

After the initial road construction costs are factored out, gravel roads and blacktop roads have annual maintenance costs that are fairly similar, however, the number of hours spent maintaining the roads is significantly higher for gravel roads. Also, gravel roads are highly affected by seasonal moisture and often times are in conditions well below asphalt road surfaces.

Staff would like to review the current blacktopping policy and see if it still meets the city's goals or if a policy to begin to reduce the number of gravel roads is more beneficial to the city.

Attachments:

- 1) Procedure for getting a gravel road blacktopped
- 2) Gravel Road Database

Fiscal Impact: Discussion item

Recommendation(s): None at this time

Road Commission Action

Motion by: _____

Second by: _____

Vote Yes: _____

Vote No: _____

No Action Required: _____



2241 221ST Avenue NE, East Bethel, MN 55011
(763) 367-7840 Fax (763) 434-9578
<http://ci.east-bethel.mn.us>

Procedure to Get Your Road Blacktopped

These are the steps to follow if you would like to have your street (city owned) blacktopped or resurfaced. If it is a private road and not a city maintained street, additional steps will be needed prior to the city doing the improvement.

1. Check to see if your neighbors want to have your street blacktopped and are willing to pay for it. (You may generate a mailing list to send to the residents from city hall records, but usually the residents will be more supportive for the project if you meet with them.) The residents and benefiting property owners will be responsible for paying for the improvement, and if there is not overwhelming support for the improvement, the city council generally will not move forward with the expense to start the process. If there are not already dedicated easements for street, utility and drainage purposes, generally easements must be dedicated by the property owners.
2. Usually people will not sign a petition or support an improvement if they have no idea what the costs may be so it is a good idea to have an estimate of the cost of the improvement to have it brought to city standards. The project usually includes both the base and bituminous. Nate Ayshford, Public Works Manager, may be able to give you a rough estimate and inform you if it could possibly be done as a shape and pave project. If there is an interest in your neighborhood to get your street blacktopped, then bring your written petition requesting to have a Shape and Pave project to the Roads Committee. If the Roads Committee and the City Council agree with the Public Works Manager that the project is viable as a **shape and pave with no engineering and may not be to current city standards**, the Public Works Manager shall advertise for bids, and upon receipt of bids for the project, the costs will be relayed to the person heading the petition. The costs are substantially less if it can be a shape and pave project without drainage improvements and engineering costs, but to do it as a shape and pave project, the entire estimated cost of the project must be prepaid prior to awarding any bid. The *residents* must collect their entire amount of the cost of the project without city assistance and prepay to the city prior to the bid being awarded. Usually bids are held no more than 30 days.
3. If the city engineer is involved, there are drainage improvements necessary, benefiting property owners do not want to prepay it or there are other complications, it will then **be a special assessment project and the costs will be higher than a shape and pave project. The following steps are for a Statute 429 process or special assessment project.** The costs would be put on the property owner's tax statement unless prepaid. Property owners will have a choice to prepay the cost as well as to have input into how many years they would like the special assessment (cost) spread on the tax rolls. Most street improvement projects are done under the special assessment method (429 process) below.

-over-

4. If there is an interest in your neighborhood to get your street improved with bituminous surfacing as a **Special Assessment project**, bring your written petition to the Roads Committee requesting to have the city engineer do a feasibility study for closer costs and preliminary design. The petition may state, “We, the benefiting property owners (names and addresses) are requesting the city to consider a bituminous improvement to (street name from where to where) and understand all costs will likely be borne by the benefiting property owners. We are asking that the city do a feasibility report to provide us with more information on the improvement and cost of the proposed improvement.” The petition is used only as a tool to show viable interest, and the City Council determines whether to move forward with the feasibility report. Usually if the support is shown on the petition, the Roads Committee will generally recommend to the city council to order a Feasibility Report (by the City Engineer). The cost of the Feasibility Report is borne by the project either currently or with a future improvement.
5. Upon receipt of the Feasibility Report from the City Engineer with estimated costs for the special assessment improvement project, the City Council would order the Public Improvement Hearing. Benefiting property owners would be given mailed and published notice (by the city) inviting them to come to the Public Hearing. Upon explanation of the feasibility report by the city engineer and providing estimated costs at the hearing, residents are provided with a question/answer period and generally asked if they are in favor of moving forward with the project. If there is a good majority, usually the city council will find the improvement necessary and direct the city engineer to do plans and specs and go out for bids.
6. Upon bids being received, the city would calculate the costs for benefiting property owners, provide a spreadsheet of estimated payments, and the Council would set the Special Assessment Improvement Hearing. Benefiting property owners would again be given mailed and published notice with the spreadsheet of proposed payments and interest rate included in the mailed notice. The Hearing would be held with input from the property owners, and if the residents are still in favor of moving forward with the project, Council would approve the levy of the special assessments, award the bids and proceed with the improvement.

The above is generally the procedure that is followed for a residential improvement and does not include all the details of a 429 procedure. However, the city council may initiate the improvement project (without a petition of interest) if there is a substantial need (whether a reconstruction, service road or other circumstances such as an MSA or other partially funded improvement). An example is the commercial project such as the Aberdeen project by Sims Road off Hwy. 65.

Petition for Local Improvement (Sample)

Name of Petition Leader

Date

Address

Phone where you may be reached on normal workday

To the Roads Committee and City Council of East Bethel, Minnesota:

We, the undersigned, owners of the real property abutting on _____
Street/Ave.

Within _____ or between the _____
Subdivision Name Street or Ave.

to _____ are hereby requesting to have our street improved by Class 5 and bituminous upgrade. We recognize all costs will be borne by the benefiting and/or abutting property owners. If we can have the city complete this project as a "Shape and Pave" project with all costs to be collected prior to an award of bids, this would be our preference. The estimated cost of the improvement by the Director of Public Works without benefit of borings or any other engineering is approximately \$_____; each owner's estimated share of the cost is assumed to be approximately \$_____. Following receipt of bids, affected property owners shall be informed of the amount that must be collected prior to bid award. This is subject to change based on estimated quantities in bid and an additional amount may need to be provided by the affected property owners.

If this project cannot reasonably be completed as a Shape and Pave project with no engineering as described under 1 and 2 above, we are requesting that the City Engineer provide a Feasibility Study to determine if the project is feasible and to provide estimated costs pursuant to Minnesota Statutes, Chapter 429 as a Special Assessment project (primarily summarized above from 3. to the bottom of second page).

The City Engineer shall include any necessary drainage improvements, organic soils removal or other improvements necessary to the project. We realize the cost will be higher than a Shape and Pave project, and a public hearing shall be held as required by law for the affected property owners to provide estimated costs prior to the bids being awarded and improvement moving forward. These preliminary costs shall be part of the improvement project.

Name of Benefiting Property Owner	Address or Property Description (PIN#)

Additional names and addresses on reverse side.



City of East Bethel Road Commission Agenda Information

Date:

January 12, 2016

Agenda Item Number:

Item 8.0

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, Ron Koller.

Attachments:

Fiscal Impact:

Recommendation(s):

Road Commission Action

Motion by: _____

Second by: _____

Vote Yes: _____

Vote No: _____

No Action Required: _____