

ROSEVILLE
REQUEST FOR COUNCIL ACTION

Date: 10/17/11
Item No.: 12.a

Department Approval



City Manager Approval



Item Description: Consideration of the County Road C-2 Connection

BACKGROUND

At the July 18, 2011 City Council meeting, the City Council received the County Road C-2 Traffic Study. This meeting was followed by a Public Hearing on August 8, 2011. At that meeting, a number of property owners from County Road C-2 and Josephine Road spoke regarding a possible connection of County Road C-2. Attached are the minutes from this meeting.

At the October 10, 2011 meeting, staff presented a range of the preliminary cost estimates for the construction of the County Road C-2 connection. The Council and public asked staff questions about the preliminary estimates. The majority of the questions were addressed at the meeting, What follows is the information that staff was asked about that required additional follow- up:

- The width of County Road C-2 on the east end is 32 feet. The width of County Road C-2 on the west end is 32 feet. The segment of County Road C-2 between Merrill Street and Fernwood Street is 36 feet wide.
- Signal costs: The traffic study indicated that it may be necessary, under year 2030 traffic conditions, to install an eastbound right turn lane and a traffic signal at the intersection of County Road C-2 and Lexington Avenue. Since Lexington Avenue is under County jurisdiction, the County would need to approve the installation of a streetlight at that location. No signal would be proposed unless the intersection met the criteria required for signal installation. The cost of the signal would be shared by the City and County based on the County's cost share policy and available funds. The cost for signal construction is estimated at \$350,000. The annual electricity cost for a signal is \$320.00. These are 2011 dollars.
- Pathway Cost: The estimates provided included the construction of an 8 foot wide bituminous pathway between Hamline Avenue and Griggs Street. In comparison, the estimated cost to construct the pathway as a 6 foot wide concrete sidewalk would be \$125,000.
- The removal of trees within City right of way- Staff has reviewed city code regarding tree removal in city right- of- way. The two sections of the code that could apply are in the Urban Forestry Management and the Tree Preservation ordinance; these are City Code section 706.08F1 and 1011.04F1 respectively. Both of these sections state that tree removal for the purposes of the construction of a public street is allowed. With any street construction project, staff plans the project to minimize tree removal. Also, street trees could be installed as a part of the project. The specific language of these sections:

“1011.04F. Allowable Tree Removal:

35 1. Pursuant to an approved tree preservation plan, significant trees may be destroyed
36 without any required replacement within the width of required easements for public
37 streets, utilities, and storm water ponding areas.”

38 “706.08 F. Areas Not Applicable: The provisions of subsection D above shall not apply to:

39 1. The removal of trees on public easements/rights of way, conducted by, or on behalf
40 of, a Federal, State, County, Municipal or other governmental agency in pursuance of
41 its lawful activities or functions in construction or improvements.”

- 42 • Edina Traffic Management Plan: Staff has reviewed the Edina Traffic Management Plan that
43 was referenced by a resident during public comment. It is very similar in scope to the Traffic
44 Management Plan that we are currently working on with the Public Works Environment and
45 Transportation Commission.

46 After the discussion of the preliminary costs, the City Council requested that this item be brought
47 back to the October 17, 2011 meeting for a Council decision. Staff sent out notices for this
48 meeting to over 300 property owners.

49 **POLICY OBJECTIVE**

50 County Road C-2 from Snelling Avenue to Victoria Street is a street on the City’s Municipal
51 State Aid (MSA) system. There is continuous right-of-way for the segment of County Road C-2
52 between Hamline Avenue and Lexington Avenue, however, there is a 175 foot long segment east
53 of Griggs Street and west of the cul- de- sac off Lexington Avenue that has never been
54 constructed.

55 City policy is to use MSA funds to fund construction work on MSA streets.

56 It is City of Roseville assessment policy to assess 25% of the cost to reconstruct a roadway to all
57 abutting property owners. The City pays for the remaining costs using other funding sources.
58 City of Roseville does not assess for pathways. The City’s assessment policy does not
59 specifically address the level of assessment for an area where there is a new street being
60 constructed to connect two existing streets. This would be a policy discussion for the City
61 Council.

62 In the case of MSA roads, the total assessable project cost is limited to a 7-ton, 32 foot wide
63 road. MSA routes are constructed to a 10-ton design, with a width sometimes exceeding 32 feet.
64 The difference in cost between a 7-ton, 32 foot wide road and a 10-ton, wider road, is not
65 included in the assessable costs.

66 The assessment is based on property frontage on the street being reconstructed.

67 **FINANCIAL IMPACTS**

68 What follows are preliminary cost estimates to construct the County Road C-2 connection. As
69 discussed in the traffic study, the crest vertical curve at Merrill Street does not meet 30-mph
70 design standards. There are two ways to mitigate this, the first is to install an all way stop sign at
71 Merrill Street, the second is to completely reconstruct the street in the area where the design
72 standards are not met (between Merrill Street and Griggs Street). Staff has developed two cost
73 estimates reflecting these scenarios. Scenario 1 is the installation of the stop sign and the
74 construction of a roadway connection between Griggs Street and the new Dunlap Street.
75 Scenario 2 is based off the proposed reconstruction shown in the County Road C-2 traffic study.

76 These preliminary estimates include all roadway construction, driveway removal and
77 replacement, boulevard restoration, tree removal and utility work necessary to complete the
78 proposed connection.

	Construction cost	Engineering	Total
County Road C-2 Scenario 1 (Connect Roadways between Griggs and Dunlap Street)	\$109,000	\$22,000	\$131,000
County Road C-2 Scenario 2 (Reconstruct road from Merrill Street to Dunlap Street)	\$569,000	\$114,000	\$683,000

79

80 The scenarios described above only address the roadway connection. Either scenario would
81 mitigate the design issue.

82 We have developed the following costs as add on costs to the above scenarios to take traffic
83 management, pedestrian safety, and aesthetics into account.

	Construction cost	Engineering	Total
County Road C-2- narrowing road to between Hamline and Merrill St	\$95,000	\$19,000	\$114,000
County Road C-2 (8' bituminous pathway, North Side, Hamline to Griggs)	\$91,000	\$18,000	\$109,000
Streetscape Cost	\$42,000	\$8,400	\$50,400

84

85 These are preliminary costs with a 20% contingency. Additional data collection would be
86 necessary to develop a feasibility report level cost for this project.

87 Moving ahead with the construction on this segment of County Road C-2 would need to be
88 programmed into the City's 5 year Street Capital Improvement Plan (CIP). This plan is
89 reviewed annually, and currently has MSA street segments identified for construction that will
90 spend our annual allocation. The City's MSA annual construction allocation is approximately
91 \$825,000/ year. These dollars are used to fund projects on City MSA Streets as well as the
92 City's cost share on County and State Projects. What follows is a summary of the projects
93 programmed over the next 5 years.

Project	Year	Est. Cost
MSA Mill & Overlay	Annually	\$300,000
Ramsey County- County Road B-2 (Fairview to Snelling)	2012	\$400,000
County Road D (Lexington to Victoria)- Reconstruction	2013	\$500,000
Ramsey County- Rice Street (County Rd C-2 to County Rd B-2)	2013	\$200,000
Victoria Street (County Road B to Larpenteur)- Reconstruction	2014	\$1,500,000
MnDOT- Lexington Avenue Bridge	2014	Unknown

94 The 5- year CIP has identified approximately \$4,400,000 in improvements. Our MSA
95 construction allocation for the next 5 years is estimated at \$4,125,000. The CIP costs identified
96 above are planning level estimates and do not take into account other funding sources.

97 **Reconstruction** projects would have a portion of the costs funded through assessments.

98 **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

99 At the August 8, 2011 public hearing, staff provided the following recommendation to the City
100 Council: The traffic studies that were conducted indicate that the County Road C-2 connection
101 is not necessary at this time. However, the City should preserve the ability to construct the
102 connection in the future, the right- of- way should remain public. This recommendation remains

103 unchanged.

104 If the City Council determines that the construction of the County Road C-2 connection should
105 move forward. Staff has the following recommendations:

- 106 • Since County Road C-2 is a MSA street, staff recommends that construction costs be
107 funded by MSA dollars.
- 108 • Construct Scenario 1, the connection between Griggs Street and Dunlap Street.
- 109 • Construct Scenario 2 between Merrill Street and Griggs Street when County Road C-2
110 between Hamline Avenue and Griggs Street is scheduled for major maintenance. Major
111 maintenance projects are driven by pavement condition. It is anticipate that this would be
112 in 2015.

113

114 If the City Council determines that the construction of the County Road C-2 connection should
115 not move forward, staff has the following recommendations:

- 116 • Preserve the ability to construct the connection in the future and not vacate the public
117 right- of- way.
- 118 • All way stop signs should be installed at Merrill Street and County Road C-2 to address
119 the sight line issues present at this intersection.

120 **REQUESTED COUNCIL ACTION**

121 Provide staff with a decision regarding the construction of the County Road C-2 connection.

122

Prepared by: Debra Bloom, City Engineer
Attachments A: Council meeting minutes- August 8, 2011

Department	Vendor	Item/Description	Amount
Recreation	Upper Cut Tree Service	Diseased and Hazardous Tree Removal	\$15,000.00

Roll Call

Ayes: McGehee; Pust; Johnson; Willmus; and Roe.

Nays: None.

e. Formally Authorize a Temporary Inter-fund Loan between TIF Districts

At the request of Councilmember Pust regarding whether this action was based on a change in law or practice, City Manager Malinen advised that it was a very recent law change.

Pust moved, Johnson seconded, adoption of Resolution No. 10917 (Attachment A) entitled, "Resolution Approving the Terms of Up to a \$500,000 Interfund Loan in Connection with Tax Increment Financing (Economic Development) District No. 19 (Applewood Pointe Senior Cooperative Housing Project).

Roll Call

Ayes: McGehee; Pust; Johnson; Willmus; and Roe.

Nays: None.

Pust moved, Johnson seconded, adoption of Resolution No. 10918 (Attachment B) entitled, "Resolution Approving the Terms of Up to a \$6,000,000 Interfund Loan in Connection with Tax Increment Financing District No. 17."

Roll Call

Ayes: McGehee; Pust; Johnson; Willmus; and Roe.

Nays: None.

8. Consider Items Removed from Consent

12. General Ordinances for Adoption

13. Presentations

a. Receive Public Comment on the Traffic Study and Discuss the County Road C-2 Traffic Study

Given the large number in attendance for this issue, and the potential number wishing to provide public comment, Mayor Roe reviewed the City Council's ground rules for public comment, and thanked all of those attending to voice their opinions. Mayor Roe advised that his natural bias was to make sure everyone was allowed to speak, no matter what they had to say; however, in the interest of time, he noted that the City Council Rules limited speakers to no more than five (5) minutes per speaker to allow everyone to be heard. Mayor Roe noted the suggestion of Councilmember Pust at a previous meeting that speaker representatives for larger groups be chosen to address the City Council to avoid repetition and to facilitate timely comments. Mayor Roe advised that, for those representing a larger group, he may be more lenient in the time limits; however, he asked speakers to be concise as possible in respect to everyone's time.

Mayor Roe reviewed the public speaking process, sign-up sheet, and available chairs for identifying speakers for the record. Mayor Roe advised that any written materials submitted as part of their public comments, would be copied and distributed to the City Council and public as available. Mayor Roe advised that any questions raised during public comment would be duly noted and responded to by staff and the City Council at the end of public comments to avoid interruptions.

Mayor Roe reminded citizens of the need for their continued courtesy and

respect of each other; and asked that conversations in the audience be refrained, as well as any interactions with those speaking. Mayor Roe reiterated his belief that everyone had a right to be heard; and that personal conversation or commentary is discouraging. Mayor Roe asked that all cell phones be put on vibrate or turned off; and that comments and/or questions be addressed directly to the Mayor and City Council.

Related to the numerous signs being displayed in the audience, Mayor Roe advised that they would be allowed as long as they were not disrupting anyone's view; and encouraged those nervous about public speaking to simply relax and make their comments in their own words. Mayor Roe advised that every attempt would be made to ensure that both sides were given time to speak and make their cases.

Mayor Roe opened the meeting for public comment on this issue at approximately 6:35 p.m.

Public Comment

A neighborhood petition dated June of 2011 supporting permanent closure of County Road C-2 at Griggs Street; and opposing changing County Road C-2 to a through street between Hamline and Lexington Avenue was presented as a bench handout, attached hereto and made a part hereof. The petition was based on safety concerns; lack of evidence indicating established east/west through-roads being at or near capacity; potential devaluation of properties on and adjacent to County Road C-2 should it become a through street; and cost to taxpayers for a project that is not necessary nor wanted.

David Miliotis, 1128 County Road C-2

Mr. Miliotis advised that he had been asked to speak as the representative of a large group supporting keeping C-2 closed. Mr. Miliotis thanked City staff and the Traffic Engineering Consultant firm, SRF, for their work to-date; and opined that the data gleaned from the recent traffic survey served to remove the emotions and results spoke for themselves.

Mr. Miliotis reviewed that data and current 2011 traffic as well as 2030 projections in the area; and the findings that at neither time do or will traffic volumes exceed capacity. Mr. Miliotis referenced the staff comments in the Request for Council Action (RCA) dated August 8, 2011, and supporting documents (Attachment A-Traffic Survey), and staff responses (Attachment B) to public questions to-date regarding the County Road C-2 Traffic Study. Mr. Miliotis opined that opening up County Road C-2 didn't make sense from a traffic volume, safety or financial perspective.

Mr. Miliotis opined that by keeping County Road C-2 closed, it underscored the fact that the collecting arteries were operating well-below their capacity and specifically addressed questions 49 and 50 in the staff responses related to regional traffic and who would potentially pay for connecting County Road C-2 as a thoroughfare for regional traffic. Mr. Miliotis noted that the City and State were already facing significant cuts in needed funding for other vital infrastructure and community needs; and opined that, beyond the data actually supporting the benefits for not connecting County Road C-2 based on safety and financial issues; there was an ethical consideration.

Mr. Miliotis opined that the residents of Josephine Road requesting this connection had a poor grasp of facts; and were based on myth rather than fact. Mr. Miliotis advised that comments that County Road C-2 was once a connecting road and should therefore be reconnected were false; and that it had actually never been connected. Mr. Miliotis advised that the width of County Road C-2 was not accurately portrayed, and that instead of being 66' wide, it was actually only 35' wide. While Josephine Road residents arguing that there had been an increased volume of traffic, Mr. Miliotis noted that there had only been an increase of 200 vehicle trips per day in the last six (6) years.

Mr. Miliotis noted the argument that there were not engineering reasons to not open County Road C-2, which had now been disputed with the traffic study.

Mr. Miliotis displayed a copy of a flyer received by area residents, encouraging them to sign the e-petition to open County Road C-2; and reviewed, in his opinion, the inane comments and rationale for opening County Road C-2 that it provided.

In conclusion, Mr. Miliotis opined that there was no factual evidence provided by those supporting connecting County Road C-2 through existing established neighborhoods; and that it would only serve to destroy those neighborhoods to accommodate a handful of self-serving citizens. Mr. Miliotis reviewed City Code defining a "cul-de-sac" indicating their purpose to provide a permanent termination of vehicular traffic. Mr. Miliotis expressed his personal astonishment at the lack of respect by other residents for his neighborhood; and provided a demographic overview of his neighbors of all ages and situations, as well as pedestrians and bicyclists using the roadways as well. Mr. Miliotis asked that the City Council completely overlook this entitlement request to open County Road C-2, noting the hours spent by him and his neighbors on this issue based on a misguided attempt to solve a problem that doesn't actually exist. In the strongest terms possible and on behalf of his neighbors, Mr. Miliotis asked that the City Council display stewardship of their neighborhoods to permanently close the cul-de-sac on County Road C-2 to avoid this issue coming up again in the future.

Stuart Shwiff, 1233 Josephine Road

A letter signed by Pam Newcome and Stuart Shwiff, dated July 15, 2011, as a cover to the petition from concerned citizens living or working in Roseville, believing that fully opening County Road C-2 would be in the best long-term interest of the greater Roseville community was provided as a bench handout, attached hereto and made a part hereof.

Mr. Shwiff advised that he was representing a large group of residents of Josephine Road, Lydia Avenue and adjacent side streets, 140 who had signed the petition to-date, to fully open County Road C-2 between Lincoln Drive and Victoria Street in Roseville. The petition included a statement that since County Road C-2 is funded as a state aid road, but not benefitting the broader community since it is not fully connected between Hamline and Lexington Avenues. The petition was based on there being no engineering reasons why County Road C-2 could not be opened; and supporting it being fully connected to provide an additional east/west collector road to share a portion of increased traffic levels projected for the area; and in the best interest of Roseville to more efficiently utilize existing roadways to more evenly distribute traffic versus overburdening a few streets and neighborhoods.

Mr. Shwiff advised that he had been privileged to serve on the City's 2030 Comprehensive Plan Transportation Committee; with goals and strategies of the Plan based on the foundation established by the *Imagine Roseville 2025* community visioning process and documents; and commitments of the City of Roseville to the Metropolitan Council's mandates. Mr. Shwiff referenced a portion of the Situation Analysis from the 2030 Comprehensive Plan's Transportation Section related to east/west routes in the community. Mr. Shwiff specifically referenced Goals 2, Policy 3.1 and Policy 3.2 of the *Imagine Roseville 2025* document; noting that opening County Road C-2 was exactly a solution that would occur. While recognizing the numerous positive revitalizations and revisions in this immediate area, including zoning changes to medium density and the upcoming Josephine Woods Development by Pulte Homes, Parks and Recreation Department renovation of Autumn Grove Park, and other neighborhood positives, Mr. Shwiff noted that those all aggregately incurred additional traffic. Mr. Shwiff further noted the Hamline Center and its current zoning for HDR and the entire Snelling corridor north of Highway 36; in

addition to retail shopping near the Byerly's mini-mall and projected development at Twin Lakes; including other development occurring north of Highway 36 in Roseville and the east side of Lexington Avenue that would further demand opening County Road C-2 to other neighborhood collectors to avoid compounding the traffic burdens for Josephine Road.

Mr. Shwiff opined that this issue went far beyond residents of Josephine Road, and was a wider Roseville and regional issue. Mr. Shwiff displayed a map showing the location of those signatures on the petition, and their locations throughout the community. Mr. Shwiff referenced an August 7, 2011 Star Tribune opinion poll, with responses to two (2) questions related to the County Road C-2 issue resulting in 32/4 and 32/7 respectively in support of opening County Road C-2.

Mr. Shwiff referenced projected vehicles projected between Hamline and Lexington Avenues; and asked that the citizens represented by this petition be treated equally and not be asked unfairly to carry this huge volume of traffic; but that it be shared equally today and in the future.

Jeannie LaPalm, 2891 Merrill Street

Mr. and Mrs. LaPalm were present with their children, representing the "Save C-2" organization; and Ms. LaPalm spoke on behalf of this, those present and those unable to attend, and in support of keeping County Road C-2 closed. In noting the presence of her children, Ms. LaPalm noted that the major concern was obviously one of safety for those children living in this neighborhood. Ms. LaPalm thanked the City Council for authorizing the traffic study, opining that it had been very informative and specifically addressed page 20 of the study related to the rolling terrain and short vertical curve, located just east of their property and deficiencies in design and the existing configuration not meeting design standards for 30 mph traffic. Ms. LaPalm noted that some residents were requesting that County Road C-2 be opened because it was a state aid road and therefore funds generated for that road were not being used; and to that end, she quoted a portion of the study as it addressed MnDOT's state aid manual for minimum vertical curve lengths at 90' with significant mitigation required from Merrill to Griggs to just meet that safety standard for a state aid road. Ms. LaPalm asked if such mitigated safety standards would include recessed roadway and sidewalks for their neighborhood; and asked that the City Council was prepared to address potential vehicular/pedestrian or vehicular/bicycle accidents and deficiencies if County Road C-2 was to be connected. Ms. LaPalm quoted comments of the City Attorney related to the City's limited liability with existing conditions and those that would be realized if County Road C-2 were opened up and design and deficiency mitigations along that stretch of road.

Ms. LaPalm noted that she lived on County Road C-2, that it was her yard; and with their active family she asked that the City's Parks and Recreation Department consider, if any state aid funds went toward County Road C-2, consider turning the vacated right-of-way on County Road C-2 into a dog park or a new play area for families in the immediate area. Ms. LaPalm respectfully asked that the focus not only be on the motorized traffic portion of the report that may overshadow the safety issue.

Mr. Chris LaPalm, 2891 Merrill Street

Mr. LaPalm opined that County Road C-2 between Merrill and Griggs was "not ready for prime time" and noted his delivery by e-mail to the City Council of a video showing the actual and realistic dangers at the intersection of Merrill and County Road C-2 with a blind approach from both the east and west; and visibility of oncoming traffic unavailable unless you were at the top of the hill. Mr. LaPalm opined that this created a huge safety issue, especially at their driveway due to the grade of the hill. Mr. LaPalm asked that the City Council take that into consideration when making their decision.

Morgan Kempton, 2891 Merrill Street (13 year old daughter – 8th grader)

Ms. Kempton, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. LaPalm, expressed her personal concern regarding potentially opening County Road C-2, particularly her concern for the safety of her brother and sisters and others in the neighborhood. Ms. Kempton commented on her personal review of the traffic study and potential traffic around her home if County Road C-2 were opened; preventing her brother and sisters from playing outside safely; as well as concerns for those walking or walking their dogs in the area. With school starting soon, Ms. Kempton noted that there would be more walkers and more school buses; and if County Road C-2 were opened, she questioned how traffic changes would impact County Road C-2 and how long the construction period would be that would also impact motorized traffic. Ms. Kempton advised that she didn't want to walk around a lot of construction work for a long time. Ms. Kempton advised that she and her family really appreciated their peaceful neighborhood and had many friends in the neighborhood that were like their extended family. Ms. Kempton asked that the City Council consider the viewpoints of someone her age, wanting to make a difference in her community, and believing that County Road C-2 should remain closed.

Dennis Dietzel, 2954 Hamline Avenue

As an avid biker and pedestrian along both County Road C-2 and Josephine Road, opined that, in all fairness, the perception that this was a broader community issue didn't necessarily ring true. While appreciating both routes for walking, and the amenity of County Road C-2's quiet access into the neighborhood around Griggs and Merrill, Mr. Dietzel opined that the neighborhood would be significantly changed if County Road C-2 was opened, and that it would impact the neighborhood negatively. Mr. Dietzel further opined that he didn't feel limited in his options for east/west access through the community; and asked that, if opening County Road C-2 was the decision of the City Council, that they give serious consideration to safely accommodating bicycles and pedestrians in that area.

Mr. Yi He, 1144 County Road C-2 (just east of Lexington) – developer/manager of online petition

Mr. He expressed his pride in living in a great and diverse neighborhood; and the continuing sense of neighborhood in resolving this issue. Mr. He reviewed the actual 137 signatures of the e-petition representing 80 households either on or across the street from lakes; with 60% outside the neighborhood. Mr. He opined that opening County Road C-2 provided a limited and disproportionate benefit for lake front homes.

Mr. He addressed the petition with 215 handwritten signatures from 150 households, 97% from the neighborhood and expressing major safety concerns at multiple intersections along County Road C-2, the costly construction to connect County Road C-2 and correct grade issues; and destruction of an established neighborhood, should it be connected. For those advocating connecting County Road C-2, Mr. He questioned if the statistics provided by Ms. Pam Newcome, with 60% outside the neighborhood, took into consideration safety issues, or simply based their responses on convenience.

Mr. He addressed several items he didn't think were addressed sufficiently in the traffic study, including turn actions onto roads (Lexington Avenue) with higher speed limits (40 mph) and difficulty with visibility and access from cross streets (left from County Road C-2 onto Lexington and Victoria and County Road C); and steep banks requiring reduced speed.

Irene Erickson, 1251 Josephine Road, very new resident (as of Saturday) to Roseville and former Shoreview resident commuting through Roseville

Ms. Erickson noted her long-time questioning why County Road C-2 was not open as an optional route rather than curving around other roadways; and opined that County Road C as a county road did not just exist for a single neighborhood.

Ms. Erickson further opined that, as the City considered further development in the community, and in this area particularly, this became a much broader issue than just the neighborhood, but for residents throughout the county. Ms. Erickson opined that she didn't see much reason to keep County Road C-2 closed; however, if there was going to be more traffic on the road, consideration of safety provisions for walking and parking should be given. Ms. Erickson encouraged the City Council to open County Road C-2 for the benefit of the region and those using roads beyond those two (2) neighborhoods.

R. J. Newcome, "Share C-2" group representative

Mr. Newcome advised that his group had attempted to say as upbeat as possible; and from his perspective their group had done so.

Mr. Newcome addressed safety comments brought forward by those wanting to keep County Road C-2 closed; noting that people needed to understand that anyone living on a collector road had to deal with those safety issues on a daily basis. Mr. Newcome referenced comments made tonight regarding the need to re-grade a section of the roadway versus comments made by SRF Engineer Vaughan at a previous meeting and mitigation options available. Mr. Newcome noted the many comments he'd heard, as well as his own surprise before moving into the neighborhood, as to why County Road C-2 was not connected.

With respect to Mr. He's comments related to voting on various petitions being circulated, Mr. Newcome advised that the "Share C-2" petition had 156 signatures at the present time; in addition to some written comments submitted previously and/or yet-to-be submitted to the City Council. Mr. Newcome reviewed the locations of interested signatories to the petition and their strong interest in seeing County Road C-2 opened, with over 60% of those signing not on Lydia Avenue or Josephine Road.

Mr. Newcome referenced Figure 12 from the traffic study, and specific question from his group to the SRF consultant on base traffic counts for County Road C-2 and those projected in 2030; seeking an explanation in the apparent 37% reduction from current to 2030 for keeping it closed or connecting it. Mr. Newcome noted that surrounding roads didn't have a corresponding drop projected for 2030; and opined that his group did not feel they had received a reasonable or sufficient answer yet. Mr. Newcome provided comparisons for other area roads and east/west connections and projected impacts for connecting or not connecting County Road C-2.

Mr. Newcome further referenced a question put forth by Councilmember Willmus at a previous meeting and discussions over the last few months between the City Engineer, City Council and Consulting Engineer from SRF; and state aid dollars being received for County Road C-2. Mr. Newcome opined that Ramsey County at one point, according to a recent map he'd obtained showing it as a collector road, apparently felt it necessary to have another east/west corridor; even though not done but Roseville continuing to receive dollars to support such a collector road.

Mr. Newcome referenced and displayed information on state aid roads taken from statutory definitions from MnDOT Rules, subpart 2 or 3; municipal state aid streets posted October 15, 2007; and statutory authority references: MS 161.082, 161.083, 162.02, 162.09, 162,.155; L 1983 c17

Mr. Newcome sought rationale in not receiving this funding for all these years; and opined that County Road C-2 should be open and should have been opened years ago. Mr. Newcome respectfully summarized the petition of his

group that, based on the mechanism for funding and definition of state aid roads, that designation should have also been addressed.

Suzanne Sancilio, 1221 West County Road C-2 (immediately west of Josephine Woods Development at bottom of hill)

Ms. Sancilio thanked the City Council for the opportunity to address costs for connecting County Road C-2 at Griggs Avenue. Ms. Sancilio opined that it may sound inexpensive to connect the road through laying of concrete and removal of a few trees to those signing the petitions to do so without having fully studied the traffic study. Ms. Sancilio noted that state aid funds could be designated for other city neighborhoods; and while the study didn't address specific dollar amounts, she noted that it did give the community a glimpse of tax dollar expenditures. Ms. Sancilio noted the impacts including destruction of Heritage Oaks in the way of a new section of roadway, construction costs for 175' of roadway where none currently existed, narrowing of the cul-de-sac, installation of traffic signals, street lights, bike lanes and sidewalks; all in order to be consistent with the Roseville Master Plan. If that additional cost wasn't enough, Ms. Sancilio noted the significant risk for motorists passing through and residents of County Road C-2 with the vertical hill. While not asked to design a road, Ms. Sancilio noted that the traffic research team had addressed potential options for mitigation that would be required.

Ms. Sancilio referenced Question #30 in the staff and City Attorney responses addressing City liability if County Road C-2 was connected; and need to mitigate design deficiencies if there was a connection. Ms. Sancilio opined that these could be considered additional costs as well. Ms. Sancilio noted additional costs in lowering the hill at County Road C-2 and moving it west; removal/replacement of the existing retaining wall at County Road C-2 by approximately one foot (1') during this extensive construction project; addition of three feet (3') of fill in low areas of County Road C-2 near Fernwood Avenue; and reconstruction of numerous driveways along County Road C-2, Josephine Woods, and Merrill, if not elsewhere. Ms. Sancilio noted additional costs for relocating or revising storm drainage, water main and other infrastructure in changing roadway profiles; costs to move the hill and flatten the slope; requiring many residents to re-grade and/or replace their driveways; and reconstruction of an established residential street and disruption of infrastructure.

Ms. Sancilio suggested that petitioners and casual observers should consider fully the hardship they would wreak on this neighborhood; and opined that this was not a simple project, nor was the City in any position to incur these costs; and urged that the City Council keep County Road C-2 closed.

Donna Miliotis, 1128 County Road C-2

Ms. Miliotis noted her advocacy in keeping County Road C-2 closed. Ms. Miliotis clarified some misconceptions presented from her perspective.

Ms. Miliotis clarified that County Road C-2 was not a county road and had not been one for over thirty (30) years; and that it did not extend over the boundaries of Roseville. Ms. Miliotis suggested that the City rename the road to avoid confusion. Ms. Miliotis reviewed and clarified Roseville roads and their status as MSA (Minnesota State Aid) funded road, at 25%. Ms. Miliotis quoted from the state aid manual, noting that traffic projections for the future continued to decrease; and noted that the levels of service are not currently, nor would they become deficient at County Road C-2 and Lexington, but were only projected to diminish slightly. Ms. Miliotis noted that the use of MSA funds required social, safety and environmental criteria to determine impacts of any project; and further noted that it was her understanding that Roseville's portion of MSA funds had been used for a number of years; and questioned how the City could even justify using those funds for a roadway not even wanted or needed.

Ms. Miliotis advised that she had been advised by City staff that, while zero dollars had been used to maintain County Road C-2 between Lexington and Hamline Avenues, at the same time, MSA funds had been used for the beautification of Josephine Road during its reconstruction, in addition to \$22,000 for private driveway work. Ms. Miliotis asked citizens to imagine costs adjusted for inflation for construction between Snelling Avenue and Victoria Street, to meet MSA design standards; with 25% of those costs assessable to homeowners on MSA roads.

Unless misunderstanding the situation, Ms. Miliotis questioned why Josephine Road residents got by without paying a dime; while if County Road C-2 was connected, those homeowners would pay 25% for actually deconstructing their own neighborhoods, in addition to paying 10)% for driveway reconstruction. Ms. Miliotis opined that this was not only unfair but completely outrageous. Ms. Miliotis stated that she could agree with Josephine Road residents on one point brought up by Mr. Shwiff in his letter to Mayor Roe and the City Council: that if County Road C-2 is not opened as part of the Josephine Woods development, it would only create stronger advocacy to keep it closed.

Joan Carrier, 1040 County Road C-2

Ms. Carrier advised that her main concerns were related to taxes and safety. While it may seem enticing to use MSA funds, Ms. Carrier asked if that sufficiently addressed capital improvement and budget needs versus actual resources, specifically those needed for the woefully underfunded park system and proposed fire station. Ms. Carrier asked how residents could be asked to pay for a roadway addition versus other more vital City needs and priorities.

Ms. Carrier, in her personal review of property tax data, opined that average property taxes along County C-2 had declined while Josephine Road resident taxes were increasing. Ms. Carrier suggested this could impact home values and those purchased on non-through streets, as well as impact sales of homes in the proposed Josephine Woods development as well.

Ms. Carrier further opined that the City Council was charged with responsible use of taxpayer money; while also having an obligation to protect neighborhoods and the quality of life of its residents. Ms. Carrier noted the apparent importance by individual Councilmembers for quality of life if their recent election campaigns and platforms were accurate. Ms. Carrier opined that people in Roseville should want to stay, not just drive through; and that Roseville should remain committed to attracting and retaining residents based on that quality of life, not to accommodate regional traffic needs through established neighborhoods.

Ms. Carrier noted impacts to the east side if County Road C-2 was opened; and opined that those residents were in solidarity with those residents on the west side. Ms. Carrier encouraged Councilmembers to personally drive all sections of County Road C-2 to review the situation themselves if they had not already done so.

Ms. Nilanjana Baneroi, 1303 W County Road C-2

Ms. Banerio, as an Indian immigrant now considering Minnesota to be her home - more specifically Roseville – encouraged the City Council to take a look at her neighbors, some having lived in Roseville for 50 years or more. Ms. Banerio proceeded to introduce some of those diverse neighbors in attendance, and expressed her passion for keeping County Road C-2 closed.

Gerry McDonald, 2857 Dellwood Avenue

Mr. McDonald advised that he had originally moved to Roseville for its livability and an environment as good as any in the state. Mr. McDonald opined that this issue was causing negative divisions and costing taxpayers' money; and

further opined that it needed to end. Mr. McDonald opined that there was a potential cost beyond actual road improvements, and that opening County Road C-2 would have many negative impacts. Mr. McDonald noted that one positive had been pointed out and asked that the City Council consider it by keeping County Road C-2 permanently closed and ending these frequent and unproductive discussions.

Marie Hammond, 1200 Josephine Road

Ms. Hammond addressed safety issues for her and other retirees on Josephine Road as well as families with young children. While everyone would like to live in a neighborhood without traffic, Ms. Hammond opined that it was not realistic. Ms. Hammond referenced living through reconstruction of Josephine Road and installation of new sidewalks making it safer for those going to the area beach. As a retired nurse, Ms. Hammond referenced the numerous times she'd provided first aid to bikers crossing traffic to get to the beach.

Ms. Hammond opined that residents of Josephine Road would like to be able to live in a neighborhood such as on County Road C-2; however, they were forced to encounter and deal with traffic all the time. Ms. Hammond opined that, when people stated that it was unfair for Josephine Road residents to request that County Road C-2 be opened, it was fairer to everyone in Roseville to have it opened.

Meggan Gardener, 1321 County Road C-2

Ms. Gardener, having move to Roseville about 18 months ago with her family, noted their desire to move from the Midway neighborhood of St. Paul to Roseville, after having looked at over forty (40) homes. While initially not interested in even looking at the home on County Road C-2 that they subsequently purchased, based solely on its connotation as a county road, Ms. Gardener advised that she finally agreed to look at it and it had resulted in a fantastic purchase for their family, once she had found that the road was actually closed. After extensive remodeling, Ms. Gardener advised that they had purchased the house knowing that County Road C-2 was closed, just as those residents on Josephine Road had purchase their homes with the full knowledge that it was a through street. Ms. Gardener asked that common sense be used by residents that when a neighborhood or street is no longer meeting their specific needs, they move elsewhere, similar to the decision made in full faith by their family in moving to Roseville.

Chuck Stokes, 2875 N Griggs Street

Ms. Stokes noted that the City Council had a monumental decision before them, and he didn't envy their having to make it; however, he expressed his trust and confidence in them making it. Mr. Stokes noted that City Council had asked for facts all along, and time to digest the data received from the consulting engineer. Mr. Stokes opined that the information provided in black and white noted that opening County Road C-2 would create a problem not currently existing; but that through keeping it closed, it would increase the pain for all over the next 15-20 years. Based on indications nationwide, Mr. Stokes opined that the figures were not accurate and most likely would be less than projected, for a variety of reasons, including changing transportation modes.

Mr. Stokes opined that creating a "mini freeway" was not the right way to go; and recognized the very special spot along County Road C-2, Fernwood Avenue, Merrill Street, and Josephine Road; creating a somewhat unique area compared to other spots in Roseville. Mr. Stokes noted that the sense of community in these neighborhoods had brought people together to fight a common cause in a positive way; and opined that is something the City Council should be proud of since they had set that tone and reacted accordingly throughout all the meetings related to this issue.

Mr. Stokes provided some anecdotal, and concluded that if nothing was done there would be no major problems; however if the road was opened, it could create a problem and impacts and unintended consequences not fully understood at this time.

Mr. Stokes opined that there was one in-depth issue not being addressed: that the overall problem of traffic is overall, not just in a particular neighborhood; speeding is a problem for and by all. Mr. Stokes opined that there had been no real attempt to-date to look at that overall Roseville problem and clamp down on what is actually creating and causing the issues. Mr. Stokes opined that if speeding problems were addressed and mitigated, most residents and the community overall would have fewer problems. Mr. Stokes suggested that the City Council look to "do no harm" and then address underlying problems faced by the broader community; and address unsafe conditions for children and other pedestrians due to excessive vehicular speeds.

Mr. Stokes opined that keeping County Road C-2 closed was the right thing to do; and that keeping the status quo could be good at times when positive change could not be demonstrated or significant improvements guaranteed.

Mike Rogers, 2875 Dellwood

As a resident since 1954, over 57 years, Mr. Rogers spoke in support for keeping County Road C-2 closed; and expressed his opposition to opening it.

Dave Rice, 1195 Josephine Road

Mr. Rice stated that he didn't want to bring up the numerous signs on City boulevards or the City not enforcing its ordinance and allowing it to continue.

Mr. Rice referenced an e-mail from Councilmember McGehee about closing Josephine Road as an alternative; and opined that he couldn't see closing another collector street, even though it would be a solution to keep traffic off Josephine Road, while diverting it elsewhere, such as to Woodhill in the vicinity of the playground; or potentially rerouting vital emergency vehicles away from Josephine Road that would impact the safety of Roseville residents. As a realtor, Mr. Rice opined that closing Josephine Road would be a positive for him and his business; however he noted that everyone's property was being devalued. Mr. Rice opined that residents moved to Roseville based on the integrity of the community and its great school system, in addition to a balanced tax base and overall good community. However, Mr. Rice cautioned that it was difficult to consider that there would not be hard feelings and a continuing "them" against "them" mentality if this issue continued without resolution. Mr. Rice stated that he would like to see slower traffic by disbursing through traffic.

Darrel LoCascio, 2933 Merrill Street

Mr. LoCascio addressed current shortcut routes for people accessing southbound Lexington Avenue or Hamline Avenue, often using Merrill Street, but sometimes taking a right on Josephine Road or Hamline Avenue. In accessing County Road C-2, Mr. LoCascio advised that they often took a right on Josephine Road, a left on Fernwood Avenue, and a right on Merrill Street, directly through a residential area, and right onto County Road C-2. Mr. LoCascio advised that his main concern, along with others, was one of safety; and opined that by opening County Road C-2, it would at least create a straight run. Mr. LoCascio addressed alignment and sight issues on Merrill; and provided several anecdotal stories related to those safety concerns, while none had involved pedestrians and vehicle accidents to-date. Mr. LoCascio noted further concern with additional cars from the Josephine Woods development also using these shortcuts. Mr. LoCascio opined that, in speaking or neighbors on Merrill Street, it would be sadly inappropriate if additional cars from that development area were allowed to go through residential streets when an east/west collector road was available.

Lars Eber, 1241 County Road C-2

Ms. Eber suggested a possible reason why County Road C-2 had not been originally connected; and provided pictorial evidence of eastbound traffic on Josephine Road at Lexington Avenue and the same view from the south from County Road C-2 and Lexington Avenue, identifying significant viewing differences and sight lines.

Jeff Strobeck, 1297 County Road C-2

With a brief exception, Mr. Strobeck advised that he and the previous generation of his family had lived in the same residence since 1957. Mr. Strobeck advocated for keeping County Road C-2 closed. Mr. Strobeck advised that, when his father had originally offered the family home for sale, his first criteria was that County Road C-2 was not going to be connected, which he'd been assured at that time by his father as a fact. Mr. Strobeck questioned if keeping it closed had not been a stipulation for the construction of Lexington Apartments on the south side of County Road C-2, a promise made by a previous City Council.

Regarding the traffic study, if County Road C-2 were connected, Mr. Strobeck opined that Josephine Road would realize a 25% reduction in traffic, while County Road C-2 would receive a 400% increase in traffic. Mr. Strobeck noted that this would impact County Road C-2 between Hamline and Lexington Avenues, but also Snelling and Victory; and opined that it would create additional liability with declining property values as well as creating safety issues. Mr. Strobeck opined that it would be a bad decision to open up County Road C-2.

Allen Carrier, 1040 W County Road C-2

Mr. Carrier spoke in support of keeping County Road C-2 closed. Mr. Carrier referenced his discussions with Fire Chief Tim O'Neill related to access for emergency vehicles to the neighborhood, and his assurance that there would be no difference in emergency vehicle responses to this area, whether County Road C-2 was open or closed; and the concurrence of Police Chief Rick Mathwig as well.

Derek Luhm, 1190 Josephine road

Mr. Luhm advised that he'd been asked to speak by his 13-year old son on his safety concerns in not being able to ride his bike. Mr. Luhm expressed assurance that the neighbors all still liked each other; however, he expressed concern in the need for addressing the ever-increasing foot traffic and better safety for pedestrians and bicyclists.

Mike Heffernan, 893 County Road C2 W

Mr. Heffernan questioned why the City spent money on a traffic study during this difficult economic time; and opined that he was unsure of the impacts of opening County Road C-2 based on the traffic study data. Mr. Heffernan suggested that more consideration be given to County Road E access rather than County Road C-2, since it was a county road and more easily accessible. Mr. Heffernan suggested another alternative may be access off Snelling Avenue to Hamline Center.

Mr. Heffernan spoke in support of not seeing County Road C-2 opened up.

Mayor Roe closed public comment on this issue at approximately 8:11 p.m.

Recess

Mayor Roe recessed the meeting at approximately 8:12 p.m. and reconvened at approximately 8:20 p.m.

City Engineer Debra Bloom

Mayor Roe asked Ms. Bloom to provide an explanation on different levels between previous traffic studies, the recent Pulte Homes traffic study, and this

traffic study as referenced.

Ms. Bloom advised that the 2030 Comprehensive Plan Update for the City of Roseville completed in 2008, provided data projecting 2030 traffic at 2,600 vehicles per day on Josephine Road. At the request of the community, and as authorized by the City Council, an update was sought from this most recent traffic study and answered on page 16 of the study. Ms. Bloom noted that the traffic model used is from 2010, and that the regional demand model had updated numbers. Ms. Bloom clarified that traffic is not proportional; and that the most recent information from the Metropolitan Council was used (new regional traffic model). Ms. Bloom noted that the change was not changed equivalently; but Josephine Road was less than projected. Ms. Bloom advised that this was a common finding, and had been experienced on Rice Street as well. Ms. Bloom noted that traffic modeling is a projecting using the best information available, the nature of forecasting.

Mayor Roe asked Ms. Bloom to address whether the City of Roseville was following established rules for MSA roads.

Ms. Bloom advised that one of the unique parts of the MSA rules and system is that non-existing routes could be designated as MSA roadways. Ms. Bloom noted that County Road C-2 was a state aid route from Snelling Avenue to Victoria Street; even though a portion of it was actually non-existing. Ms. Bloom clarified discrepancies in why the road was shown on the Ramsey County GIS system and not on MSA records, noting that there was an existing 60' right-of-way between Griggs and the cul-de-sac reserved for public improvements. Ms. Bloom advised that the City was looking at the existing right-of-way from Lexington to Hamline Avenues for additional pathway development as part of the Josephine Woods development project. Ms. Bloom reviewed other non-existent roadway segments that are designated MSA similar to this one, such as a segment of Twin Lakes Parkway. Ms. Bloom advised that it was common practice to draw dollars for those non-existing roads.

Mayor Roe asked Ms. Bloom to address the purpose of MSA road designations and funds.

Ms. Bloom advised that it was tied to future construction and dedicated funds for county state aid highways (CSAH's) and MSA funds received through the 30 cent gas tax dollars paid at the pump; with receipt of funds based on population and needs; as well as roadway cycles and annual updates provided to the state by the City.

Mayor Roe asked Ms. Bloom to address how a road became MSA designated.

Ms. Bloom advised that there were three (3) criteria to be considered for that designation: higher traffic volumes, not only a local road, and other criteria. Ms. Bloom advised that the City recommends roads for MSA designation based on established criteria, and the Commissioner of Transportation confirmed that designation.

Mayor Roe questioned if the City could designate portions, but no others.

Ms. Bloom responded affirmatively, as long as they met the criteria.

At the request of Councilmember Pust, Ms. Bloom advised that funds would be paid back if deemed applicable, or a portion thereof.

Councilmember Willmus questioned if there were currently utilities running through that area.

Ms. Bloom responded that sanitary sewer and a water main were located there from Hamline to Lexington Avenues.

Councilmember Johnson noted that individuals had brought up the inability to see approaching traffic from County Road C-2 from both the north and south on Lexington; and questioned if it was fair to assume that a traffic light could be considered for that intersection.

Ms. Bloom responded that a number of safety issues had been brought forward from this most recent study, and that staff was attempting to address them. Ms. Bloom advised that, regardless of the City Council's decision on County Road C-2, those sight line issues would be reviewed. Ms. Bloom noted that some would be simple, such as clearing trees, or considering a right turn lane; while others may be more complex, such as grading of the hill looking north at County Road C-2 and Lexington. Ms. Bloom advised that staff would determine if there was something physical that could be done before considering a signal, in an effort to be cost-effective. In considering whether the situation could be resolved by installing a signal, Ms. Bloom responded affirmatively; however, she cautioned that she didn't think the county would support a stop sign at that location.

Councilmember Johnson questioned the existence of an agreement with Lexington Apartments and contingencies that County Road C-2 couldn't be opened up.

Ms. Bloom advised that, upon hearing this statement brought forward at a previous meeting when the Pulte application had first come forward, she had personally researched such a document; , as well as wanting to ensure that all past City Council actions were in staff's, the public's and current City Council's possession. Ms. Bloom advised that her research had found nothing in writing or in the meeting minute records of any such document or contingency with Lexington Apartments to keep County Road C-2 closed. Ms. Bloom noted the existence of a 1988 memorandum when Lexington Apartments was first proposed, that County Road C-2 was intended for construction; however, based on significant opposition at that time, the plan was changed accordingly, and a subsequent failed action at a City Council meeting to vacate County Road C-2 on a 3/2 vote.

Mayor Roe questioned liability concerns related to road configuration and standard 30 mph construction; and the City's exposure to such liability.

City Attorney Mark Gaughan advised that City Attorney Caroline Beckman-Bell had previously submitted via e-mail to the City Council an actual opinion on how discretionary immunity may be invoked in this type of hypothetical situation; and the opinion that there would be no City liability for any accidents that may result from opening this area.

Mayor Roe sought clarification of liability even if a road was not built up to certain standards.

City Attorney Gaughan advised that it was at the discretion of the City Council where to build roads; and that the City's intent was not to intentionally hurt people.

Related to assessment questions and fairness to property owners, Ms. Bloom advised that the City Council had changed their Assessment Policy in 1991. Prior to that time, Ms. Bloom noted that residents on state aid roads were not assessed. However, Ms. Bloom advised that the policy had changed in 1991 to a blanket 25% assessment for all streets no matter their zoning designation. Ms. Bloom advised that it was staff's charge to cite current City Policy, which was currently at 25% for any road.

At the request of Councilmember Pust, Ms. Bloom clarified that residents on Josephine Road had not been assessed 25%, since the construction occurred prior to the 1991 change in the Assessment Policy.

Councilmember Willmus questioned, if County Road C-2 was opened, would it have to be re-graded to make it safe to navigate; or could other mitigation measures be used..

Ms. Bloom advised that stop sign installation at those grades would mitigate the concerns, as determined in her consultations with the traffic engineer.

Councilmember Johnson noted the mitigation concerns addressed by Ms. LaPalm on page 20 of the traffic study; and concerns about a 90' wide road.

Ms. Bloom clarified that the traffic consultant had been asked to provide an analysis of what issues would occur on County Road C-2 as discussed at previous City Council meetings and possible mitigation options. Ms. Bloom further clarified that the consultant had provided one (1) possible solution, even though many things had not been taken into consideration in that one (1) option, including road drainage, the hill, the vertical curve (not slope), and the high point. Ms. Bloom noted that the concern of Ms. LaPalm's was that the vertical curve would need to be 90' long, not 90' wide; from the beginning to the end of the curve 170; and 20 mph for visibility purposes.

At the request of Councilmember Johnson, Ms. Bloom further clarified that the minimum width required for an MSA road was 26' and 32' to accommodate parking.

Mayor Roe sought individual Councilmember comment related to direction to staff on this issue, or any additional information requests.

Councilmember Willmus noted that when the issue had last come before the City Council, he had asked Ms. Bloom for staff's recommendation on whether to open County Road C-2 or keep it closed; and staff's recommendation on whether to vacate the right-of-way.

Ms. Bloom provided staff's analysis and recommendation that remained similar to their recommendation when the Josephine Woods development project came forward: that any need to extend County Road C-2 was not currently apparent based on today's traffic and current levels of operation. Related to whether County Road C-2 should be vacated, Ms. Bloom advised that staff was not prepared to make that recommendation, based on the inability to clearly dictate what the future may hold. Ms. Bloom noted that there may be a future need for pedestrian connections and utilities, depending on redevelopment at Hamline and Woodhill; but that currently staff was not looking to vacate that 175'.

An unidentified member of the audience requested a definition and meaning of the term "vacating."

Mayor Roe responded and reviewed a situation when the City retains the right to use a strip of land for road right-of-way, or utilities; and continuing to retain that right. Mayor Roe noted that one option would be to vacate a right-of-way by returning the property back to adjacent property owners and giving up the City's right to build a road on it; or retaining a utility easement. Mayor Roe noted that by vacating the City's right to use the land for a future road, it would give up that right for good; and if not, the City could retain the right-of-way for potential use in the future.

Mayor Roe questioned Ms. Bloom as to staff's recommendation on whether to

continue designating County Road C-2 as an MSA road; and impacts to continuing to do so or not to do so.

Ms. Bloom responded that staff would need to research monetary impacts to the City in whether to continue designating it as an MSA road; advising that the portion could be undesignated. Ms. Bloom advised that state aid encouraged removal of non-existing road segments from the state system, and the City could consider doing so; however in the City's overall management of the state aid system, 25% of the City's total road miles could be designated, and sometimes segments of a road were designated as state aid roads. In the City's overall road grid system, Ms. Bloom advised that another segment would need to be identified to maximize the City's piece of the pie, since the City currently had approximately 1.5 miles of undesignated state aid roadway mileage, based on that 25% state allowance. Ms. Bloom noted that the current intent was to hold that undesignated portion in reserve for County Road B west of Cleveland Avenue, which Ramsey County would like to turn back to the City.

Mayor Roe questioned if that section of County Road C-2 east of Cleveland Avenue in the Twin Lakes Redevelopment Area was designated MSA>

Ms. Bloom responded that it was an MSA route in that location; but had been removed to facilitate Langton Lake Park, as well as due to road flooding and other problems, and thus removed from the state aid system.

Councilmember McGehee questioned if the road was not vacated, would the City still retain access that could be used for a playground or green area.

Ms. Bloom advised that a pathway was proposed as part of the Josephine Woods project; but noted that this was ultimately a City Council policy discussion and decision.

Mayor Roe advised that if a right-of-way was designated for future road purposes, it would be inappropriate to put a park on such a right-of-way, since other steps would then need to be taken.

Councilmember McGehee opined that using the right-of-way for green space or a park didn't preclude its future use as a road; and the use could be discontinued; and could be used now to enhance the neighborhood rather than underused.

In order to address comments he'd heard from the public during the recess, Councilmember Willmus clarified that some citizens were under the impression that the City Council would not be taking action on this issue tonight, and therefore had left the meeting already.

Mayor Roe advised that it was not his intent that any action would be taken tonight.

As part of her decision-making process, Councilmember Pust requested information from staff on a potential cost to construct this segment of County Road C-2.

Mayor Roe questioned the level of detail Councilmember Pust was requesting.

Councilmember Pust advised that she was only looking for a range, not such that would be detailed in a Request for Proposals (RFP) type of situation; but if this construction were to come forward as a priority at this time, staff's engineering estimate.

Councilmember Johnson opined that staff's recommendation to not vacate the

segment of County Road C-2 seemed somewhat of an ambiguous directive; suggesting more of the same. From his interpretation, Councilmember Johnson questioned whether fellow Councilmembers concurred.

Councilmember Pust opined that her interpretation was that staff was not willing to say or believed that County Road C-2 be opened now; however, they were not confident that it wouldn't be needed in the future, thus they were not recommending permanently vacating the right-of-way.

Mayor Roe questioned Ms. Bloom on her projected availability for the additional information requested.

Ms. Bloom advised that she would consult with Public Works Director Duane Schultz to determine current workloads and a time when the additional information would be available. Ms. Bloom advised that staff would include this updated timeframe on the City's website for public awareness.

Councilmember McGehee questioned if Councilmember Pust's request for costs at this time was a sufficient use of staff's time in creating additional work for them to cost this out at this time, if staff's recommendation was to not open County Road C-2 at this time, and to not vacate the right-of-way.

Councilmember Pust opined that, if the City Council determined to move forward in the future, the figures provided by staff at this time wouldn't mean much.

Councilmember Pust, with all due respect to staff, stated that she didn't always follow staff's recommendation; and reiterated her request for cost estimates if t County Road C-2 was opened at this time and a formal vote was proposed at this time.

Councilmember McGehee questioned if Councilmember Pust needed those costs to vote accordingly; with Councilmember Pust responding affirmatively.

In hearing no other dissenting support of Councilmember Pust's request; Mayor Roe directed staff to proceed by letting the City Council know their projected timeframe to provide this information; and to also keep the public informed during the process.

Mayor Roe thanked the public for their interest and attendance; and while recognizing that the City Council could not make every resident happy; he assured citizens that the City Council would do their best.

Councilmember Pust opined that this was the most people she'd ever seen come out for a particular issue in her seven (7) years of service on the City Council; and while there were strongly divergent views, she commended residents and neighbors for their respectful presentations and comments. Councilmember Pust opined that it served as a fine example of democracy as well as an example to future generations.

Recess

Mayor Roe recessed the meeting at approximately 8:50 pm and reconvened at approximately 8:51 pm.

b. Receive Public Comment and Continue Discussion on the 2012/2013 Recommended Budget

Mayor Roe advised that it was the intent of this item to continue discussion on 2012/2013 budget, beginning with a brief presentation by City Manager Malinen summarizing his memorandum to the City Council distributed today; followed by a Q and A period between the City Council and staff.

A Memorandum via e-mail dated August 4, 2011 from City Manager Bill Malinen related to Market Value Homestead Credit (MVHC) and proposed 2012