

REPORT / RECOMMENDATION



To: Edina Transportation Commission
From: Wayne D. Houle, PE, Director of Engineering
Date: October 16, 2012
Subject: 2013 Neighborhood Reconstruction Projects

Agenda Item #: VI. F.

Action	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Information	<input type="checkbox"/>

Action Requested:

Review and comment on the 2013 Neighborhood Reconstruction Projects.

Information / Background:

At the September 20 ETC meeting you received feasibility studies for the 2013 Neighborhood Reconstruction Projects, which included:

- Mendolssohn Neighborhood
- Normandale Neighborhood
- Braemar Hills, St. Patricks Lane, and Gleason Circle Neighborhood
- Lake Edina Neighborhood

Please bring the above feasibility studies to the meeting. Comments received at the time of this writing along with staff answers are attached to this report. Staff and consultant for these projects will provide a short presentation on each project, prior to discussion on each project.

The public hearings for these projects will be scheduled for a special City Council meeting to be held on December 11.

ATTACHMENTS:

- Comments from Commissioner Janovy

From Commissioner Janovy, email dated October 15, 2012:

Responses shown in red.

Wayne,

As requested, below are comments on the draft feasibility studies. I will review for bike/ped/traffic later (additional info requested below would be helpful) and send to you before the ETC meeting if there is time. **Great comments, thank you for sending them ahead of time.**

Please let me know if you have any questions. Thanks.

Jennifer

Comments relating to feasibility studies in general

New section on applying draft Living Streets framework and sustainability project evaluation is a good addition. **Staff will be refining these analyses for future feasibility studies. We have started the discussion with the EEC.**

Focus of ETC is on transportation. As such, I'm not sure we have, or have the time, to develop a focus on water/sewer, water quality, and sustainability issues. These aspects of feasibility studies could be referred to the EEC for review and comment. **The EEC was made aware of the neighborhood projects and the sustainability review that we have initiated for these projects. I am not sure if the actual reports have been routed to the EEC for comments. Staff has routed the feasibility studies to Police Chief, Fire Chief, BETF, Director of Parks and Recreation, Director of Public Works, and Edina Schools for comments and has not received any comments as of this writing. Let me know if there are other entities that we should be routing these studies to.**

Street lighting should have a separate section and evaluation criteria better developed. Street lighting may be adequate to "delineate intersections" but is that the only reason for street lighting? **With the future Living Street Policy and PACS funding this section will be refined for future studies.**

1035.03, Subd. 3 makes it a nuisance to discharge sump pump water onto streets. Some residents in project areas have sump pumps that discharge into the street. Survey asks if they are "willing" to connect to the storm sewer. Is it really optional? In other words, are residents allowed to continue a nuisance? How are the costs for making the storm sewer connections to sump pumps allocated? **Once a storm sewer system is available for sump pump discharge, the homeowner is made aware of it and what their responsibility is to connect to the sump pump. If a homeowner does not want to connect they then need to reroute their discharge so that it does not directly discharge onto the right-of-way. Since the sump pump drain is considered private property we do not make this connection for the property owner – the property owner needs to pull a permit so that they connect correctly per building code.**

It would help to have a section on landscaping, trees, retaining walls, boulders, decorative pavement, pet containment systems, irrigation systems, etc. in the ROW and the policy related to removing and replacing these explained. Some things are not allowed in the ROW. If they need to be moved/removed or repaired/replaced as a result of the project, who pays? Is the cost allocated to the individual homeowner or to the entire project area? If pet containment or irrigation systems need to be moved/replaced/repared is the cost allocated to individual homeowner or to the entire project? **We are updating the construction brochure that covers these items. The cost of irrigation and pet containment system repairs are currently included in the special assessment costs - spread throughout the project. I agree that a section in the policy and or updated City code would be good.**

Along with speed/volume and crash data, the following info would be helpful for evaluating the transportation/traffic issues in the project area:

- Clearer sidewalk map from comp plan and location of existing and/or proposed sidewalks, paths and trails **The maps that are in Appendix G are from the Comprehensive Plan – although a great idea, we do not have these on larger maps.**
- Clearer bike facility map from comp plan and location of existing and/or proposed bike facilities **We will have an updated bike facility map on the dais for the meeting.**
- All traffic safety questions/complaints/requests from past # years from project area **We will pull these together and email them prior to the meeting.**
- % of vehicles traveling over 25 mph **We will pull these together and email them prior to the meeting.**
- Location and type of traffic controls **We will pull these together and email them prior to the meeting.**
- Location and type of street lighting **We will pull these together and email them prior to the meeting.**
- Parking—location of parking restrictions if any **We will pull these together and email them prior to the meeting.**

Consider deleting the following statement. It can be included in the staff report. **This will be considered.**

The proposed improvements acknowledge many of the comments and concerns raised by residents throughout the information gathering process while still maintaining the desired minimum standards of the engineering and public works staff.

Residents were told at the August 8, 2012 meeting that sidewalks were unlikely. Instead, residents should be advised about the process, which includes ETC review and recommendation. Last year, residents were told sidewalks were not likely and ETC recommended sidewalks for two projects. The Council approved a sidewalk in one of these projects. Residents were not happy that a sidewalk had been approved when they had been told earlier there would be no sidewalk. Fully informing residents about the review and decision-making process can help avoid this in the future. ETC review and comment should be added to the project schedule and discussed at the open houses. **I agree that we should inform every one of the review process.**

Last year we did inform the residents of this additional review. I'm not sure why our communications staff took this out of the schedule.

It would be helpful to have Finance review the REUs for adherence to policy and accuracy. This is a function of the Engineering department. Normandale Neighborhood feasibility study indicates 7 City of Edina REUs, but there are only 5 City of Edina REUs on the preliminary assessment role. There should be a total of 7 REU's per Drawing 4, the preliminary assessment roll will be corrected to reflect this.

Basis for calculating St. Patrick's REUs is not explained. Policy says .8 REUs per 1000 sq. ft. of gross floor area. We will expand this section to include an explanation.

Braemar Hills is divided into three assessment areas. What is the policy (or what are the criteria) for dividing a project area into more than one assessment area? These are actually three separate projects that are pulled together in one feasibility study. Any one of the three can stand alone if the City Council chooses to not go forward with the project. It is difficult to have one special assessment cost given the noncontiguous neighborhoods and different lot sizes.

The "Communications Tools" slide in the "Informational Meeting" presentation says: "Become a neighborhood captain to help facilitate project communication." If someone volunteers, what is the process? What are the responsibilities? We need to develop these specific duties / responsibilities with our communications staff. I will see if we can have a draft of that prior to the meeting.

It would help if feasibility studies came clipped and 3-hole punched so they can easily be put in a 3-ring binder. Stapled pages easily tear off. Good input, we will look into this for next year's projects. I'm hoping that this information will be distributed electronically in the future.

Attachments common to all feasibility studies can be provided only once. The studies have been prepared so that a property owner from a project would have all attachments if they are given or download the feasibility study for their neighborhood.