

City Council  
Date: June 17, 2008  
REGULAR  
Item:  
MOTION

ITEM: Receive comments from the park commission on the possible lift station locations in Reid Park for the I-94 to 30th Street Infrastructure Project, and select a preferred lift station site.

SUBMITTED BY: Jack Griffin, City Engineer

REVIEWED BY: Susan Hoyt, City Administrator  
Mike Bouthilet, Public Works Superintendent  
Carol Kriegler, Project Assistant  
Ryan Stempski, Assistant City Engineer

SUMMARY AND ACTION REQUESTED: The city council is being asked to receive park commission comments on the possible lift station locations in Reid Park, Site No. 1 and Site No. 2. Staff is further requesting that the city council select a preferred lift station location for the project, among three sites, -Site No. 1, Site No. 2, and Site No. 3, which will allow the design work on the project to be finalized.

~~On May 6, 2008, the city council received a detailed presentation in regards to three alternate lift station locations best suited for a cost effective sanitary sewer system, with two of the proposed sites located in Reid Park. The city council directed staff to share the presentation with the park commission and request written park commission comments for the two proposed sites in Reid Park (Site No. 1 and Site No. 2).~~

~~At the end of a presentation on the three lift station options, the city council directed the staff to ask the park commission for comments about the proposed locations, specifically those in Reid Park. On May 19, 2008, staff made the presentation to the parks commission. The chair of the park commission was asked to consolidate the commission's comments, to be included as a report to the city council. Please refer to the attached report dated June 9 from the park commission. The commissions The park commission comments were consolidated by the chair and are provided in Attachment 1XX. The commission's comments demonstrate a preference for Site No. 3 to avoid the use of park land for non-park purpose, both for this project and to avoid precedence for future projects.~~

~~Site No. 2 is the most desirable of the three sites from an engineering/public works perspective.~~

*ADDITIONAL INFORMATION:*

*Preliminary engineering work has identified three potential lift station locations in the vicinity of Reid Park. These locations were presented to the city council on May 6, 2008, and to the park commission on May 19, 2008. The locations selected and reviewed at this time provide a cost effective sanitary sewer system for both the initial capital costs and on-going operational costs; and provide the most functional and flexible trunk sewer system for servicing both new development and existing homes and businesses in the Village area.*

*The alternative sites were selected after reviewing the general topography of the sewer service area as defined in the Lake Elmo Comprehensive Plan; generally locating the lift stations in the lowest topographic region to maximize the lift station service area. The area around the southern part of Reid Park provides the lowest topography, is City-owned, and is adjacent to the project corridor. The three sites identified for consideration were presented to both the city council and park commission:*

- Site Alternative No. 1: In the southwest corner of Reid Park; access from 30th Street,*
- Site Alternative No. 2: In the southeast corner of Reid Park: access from 30th Street, and*
- Site Alternative No. 3: In a City-owned parcel adjacent to the southeast corner of Reid Park. This site would require easement acquisition to accommodate the sewer pipe and the access driveway. Also, soil borings, a wetland delineation, and additional engineering work will be required to verify the feasibility of this site.*

*RECOMMENDATION*  
*ASSESSMENT OF THE SITES*

*-All three sites are being presented for consideration and are potentially feasible options.*

*Site No. 1 is the lowest initial cost option and provides the most functional sanitary sewer system.*

~~Site No. 2 is very similar to Site No. 1 in functionality at slightly higher costs. Site No. 2 has protected screening and provides easy access and is away from the active recreation area.~~

~~Site No. 3 requires the city to obtain a fairly significant road and utility easement and will add another \$175,000 to the project construction costs. This represents a 40% cost increase for the lift station facility. and presents will cost approximately \$ XXXX, which is X % of the total project cost. It is easier to get equipment in and out of the site. Additional cost must also be expended for the easement negotiations and additional engineering site assessment work. Site No. 3 may require condemnation proceedings if the necessary easement cannot be successfully negotiated. In additThe site provides additional access and maintenance challenges for public works ion,From the information provided, the public works superintendent recommended Site No. 2. The public work perspective was focused on two primary concerns: 1) daily access to each site with the equipment necessary to maintain a lift station and 2) the proximity to the recreational facilities within Reid Park. Based on these items, the public works department recommended Site No. 2 over Site No. 1 to keep the facility in a location with natural vegetative screening and further away from the active park facilities. Site No. 2 is preferred over Site No. 3 to keep the access road shorter to enhance access (snow plowing, entrance road maintenance even during snow events, etc.); and reduce both initial cost and maintenance costs. With Site No. 3, the "grassed" access road would not be a feasible option. Site No. 3 does not use city park land for a non-park use facility.~~

~~From an engineering perspective, Site No. 2 is also the preferred option. All three sites are being presented for consideration and are potentially feasible options. Site No. 1 is the lowest initial cost option and provides the most functional sanitary sewer system. Site No. 2 is very similar to Site No. 1 in functionality at slightly higher costs. Site No. 2 is preferred over Site No. 1 for reasons expressed by the public works superintendent. Site No. 2 is preferred over Site No. 3 due to the requirement to obtain a fairly significant road and utility easement, and lower initial and future project costs. Site No. 3 may require condemnation proceedings for the easement acquisition if the necessary easements cannot be successfully negotiated.~~

~~The parks commission recommends Site No. 3 to avoid the use of park land for non-park purpose, both for this project and to avoid precedence for future projects (see attached park commission comments).~~

~~Motion for consideration:~~

~~RECOMMENDATION~~

~~Motion for consideration:~~

~~Site #2 is the most desirable of the three sites from an engineering/public works perspective.~~

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

Move to select Site No. 2, or Site No. 3 for the location of the I-94 to 30th Street Infrastructure Project lift station:

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Font: Bold

SUGGESTED ORDER OF BUSINESS:

Introduction	Susan Hoyt, City Administrator
Report by staff or other presenter	Jack Griffin, City Engineer
Questions from city council members to the presenter	Mayor and council members

~~The mayor will facilitate this by asking each individual councilmember for one question allowing for a response to the individual question then move onto the next council member in the sequence until all questions are completed. No council member shall take more than 3 minutes to ask a question. (Also called round robin.) (For example, C-1 asks question 1 and gets answer - C-2 asks question 2 and gets answer and so on.)~~

Questions/comments from the public to the city council (a maximum of three minutes per question/statement)	Mayor facilitates
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------

<u>Call for a motion</u>	<u>Mayor and Councilmembers</u>
--------------------------	---------------------------------

~~Call for a motion~~

~~This is to get a motion on the table for discussion and is actually required under Roberts Rules of Order. This action is not an indication that the motion on the table is the motion that will be approved in the current form. It is purely for discussion purposes.~~

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.3"

Discussion among city council members (See round robin process above)	Mayor and council members
--------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------

Action by the city council	City council
----------------------------	--------------

ATTACHMENTS:

- 1. 1. Park Commission Report dated June 9, 2008
- 1. 2. Map of Location of proposed sites

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering