

**INVER GROVE HEIGHTS CITY COUNCIL MEETING
MONDAY, MAY 12, 2025 - 6:00 P.M. - 8150 BARBARA AVENUE**

1. CALL TO ORDER:

The City Council of Inver Grove Heights met in regular session on Monday, May 12, 2025, in person. Mayor Dietrich called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

2. ROLL CALL:

Present In-Person: Mayor Dietrich; Council Members: Gliva, Murphy, T’Kach, and Scales.

Staff In Attendance: City Administrator Wilson, City Clerk Kiernan, City Attorney Nason, Police Chief Chiodo, Commander Otis, Commander Hauglund, Parks & Recreation Director Lares, Public Works Director Connolly, City Engineer Merchlewicz, Graduate Civil Engineer English, Assistant Engineer Ray, Code Compliance Officer Rainey, and Communications Manager Looze

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

Motion to and approve as published by Murphy; second by Gliva.

Ayes: 5

Nays: 0 Motion carried.

4. PRESENTATIONS:

A. National Police Week Proclamation

Mayor Dietrich proclaimed that May 15, 2025, be recognized as Peace Officers Memorial Day, and the week of May 11 through May 17, 2025, be recognized as Police Week in Inver Grove Heights; and

B. Police Swearing In

Chief Chiodo introduced new civilian and sworn personnel, along with a newly promoted Patrol Sergeant, noting their alignment with the department’s values of respect, integrity, service, and excellence. She emphasized their diverse skills and perspectives will enhance the department’s mission. Chief Chiodo also expressed gratitude to the families of public safety staff, recognizing their vital support in enabling officers to serve with dedication and courage.

Personnel Recognized:

- Lucy Herr joins as a new record specialist, bringing experience in systems analysis, administration, and law enforcement support. She lives in Stillwater with her husband, Chang, and is inspired by their children and grandson.
- Jacque Englund joins as a new record specialist, coming from the St. Paul Police Department, where he held various support roles, mainly in the records unit. He holds an associate’s degree in liberal arts from St. Paul College and has also worked in fitness and management roles at athletic centers.
- Sergeant Ryan Rose, promoted on February 11, 2025, has served since 2015, primarily on night patrol. He is a firearms and use of force instructor and has received the Medal of Valor and a Lifesaving Award. As the department’s first canine officer, he helped establish the K9 unit and currently works with his partner, Chase. His son, Landon, had the honor of pinning him during the ceremony.

New Police Officers Sworn In:

- Officer James Makres, Badge 3635, originally from Richfield and a Minnetonka High School graduate, holds an Associate of Arts degree from Normandale Community College. He has served in the Minnesota National Guard since 2019 with the 257th Military Police Company. He is engaged to his fiancée, Aurea, and enjoys archery and wrestling. His father, Pete, had the honor of pinning him during the ceremony.
- Officer Anthony Keeton, Badge 3650, originally from California, holds a degree in criminal justice management and served five years as a military police officer, including a deployment to Iraq. He later spent nine years with the California Highway Patrol before moving to Minnesota. A dedicated public servant since age 18, he and his wife Amber have four children. His wife, Amber, had the honor of pinning him during the ceremony.
- Officer Gio Adamski, Badge 3623, originally from Bird Island, Minnesota, holds a bachelor's degree in criminal justice from Winona State University and currently serves in the Minnesota National Guard. He enjoys the outdoors and recently completed cold weather survival training in Norway. His girlfriend, Elena, had the honor of pinning him during the ceremony.
- Officer Philip Pouchak, Badge 3627, from St. Anthony Village, holds a degree in human resource development from the University of Minnesota and law enforcement certificates from Century College and Hennepin Tech. He previously served as an Anoka County park ranger and enjoys shooting sports, sailing, and gaming. His father, Mike, had the honor of pinning him during the ceremony.

Mayor Dietrich administered the oath of office to the newly sworn officers.

Chief Chiodo thanked the Mayor, Council Members, and community for their support and patience. She reaffirmed the department's commitment to delivering excellent public safety service and invited everyone to a reception in the police training room.

C. National Public Works Week Proclamation

Mayor Dietrich read that May 18 through May 24, 2025, shall be recognized as Public Works Week in Inver Grove Heights.

5. **CONSENT AGENDA:**

- A. Approval of Minutes of the February 10, 2025, City Council Meeting
- B. Approval of Minutes of the February 24, 2025, City Council Meeting
- C. Approval of Disbursements, **Resolution 2025-103**
- D. Personnel Actions
- E. Resolution Accepting a Grant to the Police Department from the Minnesota Chiefs of Police Foundation and Amending 2025 Budget, **Resolution 2025-104**
- F. Resolution Appointing Members to the Citizen Focus Group on Stormwater Utility Rates, **Resolution 2025-105**
- G. Amended Compliance Agreement with the MN Department of Health for City Project No. 2023-03 - Water Treatment Plant Rehabilitation Improvements, **Resolution 2025-106**
- H. Resolution Ordering the Vacant Building at 3095 65th Street East to be Secured, **Resolution 2025-107**
- I. Approval of Additional Rubbish Hauler Licenses

Motion to approve Consent Agenda Items A - I by Murphy; second by Gliva.**Ayes: 5****Nays: 0 Motion carried.****6. PUBLIC HEARINGS:****A. Additional License Renewals for Massage Therapy Businesses and Individual Massage Therapists**

City Clerk Kiernan presented additional license renewals for massage therapy businesses and individual massage therapists. She explained that City code requires both the business and the individual therapist to be licensed. Two business licenses, for Back to Center Massage and Universal Massage and Bodywork, were recommended for renewal. Two individual licenses, for Julie Olson and Jody Jackson, were also recommended. Staff recommended to open the public hearing to receive any testimony, close the hearing, and proceed with a motion to approve the recommended license renewals.

Mayor Dietrich opened the Public Hearing. There were no public comments.

Motion to close the Public Hearing by Murphy, second by Gliva.**Ayes: 5****Nays: 0 Motion carried.****Motion to approve Massage Therapy Businesses and Individual Massage Therapists by T’Kach, second by Scales.****Ayes: 5****Nays: 0 Motion carried.****B. New Massage Therapy Business License - OyeSpa**

Clerk Kiernan presented a new massage therapy business license application for OyeSpa, LLC, located at 7741 Amana Trail. Staff reviewed the application and found it to be complete, with no basis for denial. The applicant was informed that any massage therapists hired must obtain a City license prior to providing services. Staff recommended to open the public hearing to receive testimony, close the hearing, and proceed with a motion to approve the new business license for OyeSpa, LLC.

Mayor Dietrich opened the Public Hearing. There were no public comments.

Motion to close the Public Hearing by Gliva, second by Scales.**Ayes: 5****Nays: 0 Motion carried.****Motion to approve Massage Therapy Business for OyeSpa LLC by Gliva, second by Scales.****Ayes: 3****Nays: 2 (Murphy, T’Kach) Motion carried.****C. New Body Art License - Hilda's Artistry LLC**

Clerk Kiernan presented a request for a new body art license for Hilda’s Artistry LLC; a new business located at 5786 Blackshire Path. This establishment replaces MN Beauty Studies LLC, which had closed its previous location at 5300 Robert Trail, Suite 400. The new business is owned by the same individual, Hilda Ortiz Vega. Staff reviewed the application and confirmed that it was complete and met all qualifications. The application was also approved by the police department. Staff

recommended to open the public hearing, close the hearing, and proceed with a motion to approve the new body art license for Hilda's Artistry LLC.

Mayor Dietrich opened the Public Hearing. There were no public comments.

Motion to close the Public Hearing by T'Kach, second by Gliva.

Ayes: 5

Nays: 0 Motion carried.

Motion to approve a New Body Art License - Hilda's Artistry LLC by Scales, second by T'Kach.

Ayes: 5

Nays: 0 Motion carried.

D. Public Hearings and Resolutions Ordering Projects for 2026 Pavement Management Initiative, City Project Nos. 2026-09D through 2026-09L, Resolution 2025-108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, & 118

City Engineer Merchlewicz, introduced the 2026 Pavement Management Initiative (PMI) Public Improvement Hearings and listed the nine street rehabilitation projects proposed, including 52nd Street East, Angus Avenue Area, Alta Avenue Area, Audrey Avenue Area, Upper 55th Street (from Blaine to Cahill) and 57th Street, South and North Blackberry Trail Areas, the 85th Street, College Trail, and Birch Boulevard Areas, and the Alameda Area.

Staff will present the findings of the 2026 PMI North and South Feasibility Reports and stand for questions from the Council. The Council will then vote to accept the Feasibility Reports. Following acceptance, staff will present each of the nine proposed projects individually during separate public hearings. For each project, the Council will open, hold, and close the public hearing, after which staff will respond to any Council questions. The Council will then vote to authorize improvements for each project area.

A Feasibility Report is a decision-making tool that begins by assessing existing conditions and identifying current issues contributing to the need for improvement. It then outlines the rehabilitation needs and evaluates the technical feasibility of correcting the issues, including whether the improvement can be physically built. This assessment is conducted at a high level and does not include detailed final design, which will only be completed if the City Council orders the improvement to proceed following a public hearing. The report also estimates project costs and identifies potential funding sources. It assesses the benefits of the improvement, including public benefits to infrastructure and private benefits to property owners. Required by State Statute 429, the Feasibility Report informs decision-makers and ensures the City Council has the necessary information to determine if the proposed improvement is necessary, cost-effective, and feasible.

The PMI was initiated by the City Council to assess potential infrastructure improvements. On August 12, 2024, the Council formally ordered Feasibility Reports for two designated study areas. The consulting firm SEH was awarded both areas and tasked with conducting a scoping-level design to evaluate and inform the Council about the potential project scope and estimated costs. Following the completion of this preliminary work, the Council scheduled the Improvement Hearing.

For the 2026 PMI, City staff implemented a more extensive public outreach effort to ensure greater community involvement, especially given that reconstruction areas are often intrusive but also present opportunities to address longstanding issues. To gather additional feedback and provide information, multiple open houses were held, including events on September 12, 2024, and February 13, 2025, focused on the South Blackberry Trail Area and the Audrey Avenue/58th Street Area, as well as a final open house on April 24, 2025, covering all project areas.

2026 PMI Project Summaries:

- **52nd Street East (2026-09D):** Full-depth reclamation (FDR) of the asphalt pavement and underlying base material with spot curb and gutter replacements; sidewalk, storm, sanitary, and watermain improvements; and coordination with MnDOT for ROW configuration.
- **Angus Avenue Area (2026-09E):** Full-depth reclamation of the asphalt pavement and underlying base material with spot curb and gutter replacements; storm sewer replacements, sanitary sewer and watermain casting adjustments on Angus Avenue, 56th Street, and Annette Avenue; and the addition of an "L" turnaround on the west end of 56th Street.
- **Alta Avenue Area (2026-09F):** Full-depth reclamation of the asphalt pavement and underlying base material with spot curb and gutter replacements; storm sewer replacements, and watermain casting adjustments on Alta Avenue and 54th Street East; and improvements to MnDOT Loop Detectors at the intersection of 54th Street East and South Robert Trail.
- **Audrey Avenue Area (2026-09G):** Full reconstruction of asphalt pavement and curb and gutter on Audrey Avenue and 58th Court; the addition of storm sewer on the south side of 58th Court and west side of Audrey Avenue to outlet into a new water quality BMP on the southwest corner of Audrey Avenue and Upper 55th Street; and full replacement of sanitary sewer and watermain.
- **Upper 55th Street (from Blaine Avenue to Cahill Avenue) & 57th Street (2026-09H):** Full-depth reclamation of the asphalt pavement and underlying base material with spot curb and gutter replacements; storm sewer replacements, and spot sanitary sewer and watermain casting adjustments from Blaine Avenue to Cahill Avenue; full reconstruction of the 8' asphalt trail on the north side of Upper 55th Street from Blaine Avenue to Cahill Avenue, including ADA improvements and pedestrian ramps; full reconstruction of the asphalt pavement and curb and gutter on 57th Street from Cahill Avenue to Carmen Avenue; New watermain (South St. Paul utility); and spot replacement of concrete sidewalk and pedestrian ramps on the north and south sides of Upper 55th Street.
- **South Blackberry Trail Area (2026-09I):** Full reconstruction of the asphalt pavement with the addition of curb and gutter on Blackberry Trail (from Upper 55th Street south to cul-de-sac) and Blackberry Bridge Path; additional storm sewer to accommodate drainage issues; improvements to the existing sanitary lift station located near 5906 Blackberry Bridge Path; and removal and/or abandonment of storm sewer structures and pipes located outside the roadway right-of-way & easements.
- **North Blackberry Trail Area (2026-09J):** Full-depth reclamation of the asphalt pavement and underlying base material with spot curb and gutter replacements on Blackberry Trail from Upper 55th Street north to dead end; mill & overlay of the asphalt pavement on Brent Avenue and Bristol Path; and storm, sanitary, and watermain casting adjustments on Blackberry Trail, Brent Avenue, and Bristol Path.
- **85th Street, College Trail Area, Birch Boulevard Area (2026-09K):** Full-depth reclamation and spot curb and gutter replacements with utility casting adjustments on Birch Boulevard, Birch Court, and Campbell Avenue; partial reconstruction of the asphalt pavement and underlying base material with partial curb and gutter replacements, storm, sanitary, and water main adjustments on remaining streets; spot sidewalk replacements and ADA

improvements to the concrete sidewalk on Brewster Avenue, 85th Street, Bechtel Avenue, and College Trail; and retrofit a water quality filtration component of the existing ponds south of 85th Street between Brewster Avenue and Bechtel Court, and south of Brooks Boulevard between Bechtel Avenue and Cahill Avenue.

- **Alameda Trail Area (2026-09L):** Full-depth reclamation of the asphalt pavement and underlying base material with spot curb and gutter replacements, and storm casting adjustments on Alameda Avenue (north and south of Cliff Road (CSAH 32)), Alameda Path, Alameda Court, 114th Street West, and Alexandria Court.

The estimated total cost for the 2026 PMI across all project areas (2026-09D through 2026-09L) is \$20,100,022. This includes \$18,698,748 in assessable improvements, broken down as follows: street improvements (\$15,725,886), storm sewer (\$2,468,889), and sidewalk and trail improvements (\$503,973). Non-assessable improvements include sanitary sewer (\$754,409) and watermain improvements (\$646,865). The most expensive project is 2026-09K at \$4,847,562, followed by 2026-09H at \$4,096,820 and 2026-09I at \$3,898,741. The least costly project is 2026-09F at \$558,175. Cost distribution varies across projects based on the specific scope of work, which includes pavement reconstruction, utility enhancements, and pedestrian infrastructure upgrades.

The 2026 PMI projects are funded through a variety of sources, with allocations tailored to the specific infrastructure needs of each project area. The primary funding categories include PMP Local Streets, Storm Water Capital, Sewer Capital, Water Capital, MSAS Eligible, South St. Paul, and Special Assessments. These sources are distributed across nine project areas labeled 2026-09D through 2026-09L.

Project 2026-09D is funded by \$436,734 from PMP Local Streets, \$98,241 from Storm Water Capital, and \$387,513 from Special Assessments. Project 2026-09E receives \$495,668 from PMP Local Streets, \$27,231 from Storm Water Capital, and \$228,255 from Special Assessments. Project 2026-09F has four funding sources: \$210,925 from PMP Local Streets, \$38,914 from Storm Water Capital, \$2,978 from Water Capital, and \$305,358 from Special Assessments.

Project 2026-09G utilizes a broader mix of funding, with \$613,524 from PMP Local Streets, \$297,540 from Storm Water Capital, \$235,483 from Sewer Capital, \$366,330 from Water Capital, and \$273,056 from Special Assessments. Project 2026-09H includes \$428,043 from Storm Water Capital, \$28,204 from Sewer Capital, \$34,471 from Water Capital, \$1,766,459 MSAS Eligible Funds, \$519,132 from South St. Paul, and \$1,320,511 from Special Assessments.

Project 2026-09I is one of the most extensively funded, drawing \$1,832,144 from PMP Local Streets, \$678,730 from Storm Water Capital, \$456,530 from Sewer Capital, \$25,306 from Water Capital, and \$906,031 from Special Assessments. Project 2026-09J is comparatively smaller in scope, receiving \$182,912 from PMP Local Streets, \$4,149 from Storm Water Capital, \$11,751 from Sewer Capital, and \$460,318 from Special Assessments.

Project 2026-09K receives the largest allocation from PMP Local Streets at \$2,254,520, along with \$78,162 from Storm Water Capital, \$34,192 from Sewer Capital, \$15,043 from Water Capital, and \$2,465,645 from Special Assessments. Finally, Project 2026-09L is supported by \$1,265,160 from PMP Local Streets, \$6,698 from Storm Water Capital, and \$1,308,161 from Special Assessments.

In total, across all project areas, funding includes \$7,291,587 from PMP Local Streets, \$1,657,708 from Storm Water Capital, \$754,409 from Sewer Capital, \$455,879 from Water Capital, \$1,766,459 MSAS Eligible, \$519,132 from South St. Paul, and \$7,654,848 from Special Assessments.

The project schedule includes three public Feasibility Open Houses held on September 12, 2024, February 13, 2025, and April 24, 2025. The Council will hold a public hearing tonight to receive the Feasibility Report, order the project, and authorize final design, which will take place from June 2025 through January 2026. Final plans and specifications will be approved on January 26, 2026, followed by a bid opening on March 2, 2026, and expected construction authorization on March 9, 2026-April 13, 2026, pending MnDOT approval for project area 2026-09H. A construction open house will be held in April 2026, with construction scheduled for spring through fall 2026. Assessment proceedings begin with a hearing scheduled on September 14, 2026, an open house on September 24, 2026, and the final City Council assessment hearing during a City Council meeting on October 12, 2026.

The Assessment Policy outlines how costs are distributed based on project type and the total amount assessed. Assessment percentages vary by improvement type: new improvements are assessed at 100%, mill and overlay at 80%, partial reconstruction or FDR at 55%, and full reconstruction at 35%. Maintenance activities like crack sealing, seal coating, and patching are not assessed. The term length for repayment depends on the total assessment amount: 1 year for assessments under \$1,000, 5 years for amounts under \$5,000, 10 years for amounts under \$10,000, and 15 years for assessments of \$10,000 or more.

The Pavement Management Citizen Task Force aims to enhance the City's entire pavement system by prioritizing cost-effective methods that extend pavement life rather than emphasizing premium individual projects. The approach focuses on aligning infrastructure needs with rehabilitation strategies through asset management, identifying project candidates via the Capital Improvement Planning (CIP) process, providing 18 to 24 months of advance notice for upcoming projects, and removing political influence from the PMI.

Funding for the PMI comes from several sources, including the Local Streets Fund (Fund 440), Water Capital Fund (Fund 511), Sewer Capital Fund (Fund 521), and Storm Water Capital Fund (Fund 531). Additional funding includes special assessments, Municipal State Aid Funds, and contributions from adjacent cities such as South St. Paul.

Each of the nine projects was described in detail, including project background, pavement conditions, existing infrastructure, proposed improvements, assessment maps, cost breakdowns, and funding sources. The process for public hearings was explained, covering how input is received, hearings are opened and closed, and the Council adopts resolutions to authorize the preparation of final plans and specifications. Assessment rates were identified by unit type or frontage, with all assessments subject to terms and interest to be set at a future hearing.

The Feasibility Report recommends that City Project Nos. 2026-09D through 2026-09L are feasible, necessary, cost-effective, and beneficial to the properties within the project areas. Staff advises the Council to receive and accept the Feasibility Reports as presented.

Council Member T'Kach asked for clarification on the City's goal of completing six to seven miles of roadway each year and requested confirmation on how many miles are being completed annually.

Engineer Merchlewicz stated that he did not have the exact number readily available and would need time to look it up. He estimated it to be approximately 7.2 miles but could not confirm the figure.

Motion to approve Resolution 2025-108 Accepting Feasibility Report for 2026 PMI Projects North 2026-09D, E, F, G, H, I, and J by Murphy, second by Gliva.

Ayes: 5

Nays: 0 Motion carried.

Motion to approve Resolution 2025-109 Accepting Feasibility Report for 2026 PMI Projects South 2025-09K & L by Murphy, second by Gliva.**Ayes: 5****Nays: 0 Motion carried.****Project 2026-09D (52nd Street E)**

Project 2026-09D, involves full-depth reclamation of 52nd Street East, from Babcock Trail to the cul-de-sac on the west end.

The street, built in 1985 and seal coated in 2007, has a 6 to 8-inch pavement structure and a low PCI, justifying the FDR approach. A sidewalk will be added from Babcock Trail to Greystone Drive, as identified during the Babcock Trail Multi-Use Path Design as a deficiency. The segment contains no sanitary or water utilities, and the storm sewer, dating to the 1980s, requires minor structure replacements at the curb.

The existing conditions on 52nd Street East, including the west cul-de-sac and the area near 1658, reveal significant pavement issues, with extensive cracking and patching.

The assessment area includes high-density residential (apartments and condominiums), single-family homes, one City-owned parcel, and several MnDOT-owned parcels.

The total project cost is \$922,488, with \$387,513 funded through assessments (55%) and \$534,975 by the City through the Pavement Management, Local Streets, and Stormwater Capital Funds. Assessment rates are \$9,027 per single-family residential unit, \$1,282 per multi-family residential (condo) unit, and \$129.23 per front foot for multi-family residential (apartment). Assessment terms and interest rates will be set during the assessment hearing in accordance with City policy.

Mayor Dietrich reminded the public that a project like this involves six stages: initiation, feasibility, final design, bidding, construction, and completion. She emphasized that the current focus is on the feasibility stage and encouraged all questions to remain within that scope as the project has not yet reached the final design phase.

Mayor Dietrich asked if there were any public comments to enter into the record.

Clerk Kiernan replied that none had been received.

Mayor Dietrich opened the Public Hearing, and no public comments were received regarding this project.

Motion to close the Public Hearing for Project 2026-09D (52nd Street East) by T'Kach, second by Gliva.**Ayes: 5****Nays: 0 Motion carried.****Motion to approve Resolution 2025-110 Ordering Improvement and Authorizing Preparation of Plans and Specification for City Project 2026-09D (52nd Street East) by Gliva, second by Scales.****Ayes: 5****Nays: 0 Motion carried.****Project 2026-09E (Angus Avenue Area)**

Project No. 2026-09E, the Angus Avenue area project, includes Angus Avenue, 56th Street, and Annette Avenue.

The recommended improvement is FDR due to pavement deterioration, including cracking, rutting, and potholes. Angus/57th was constructed in the 1970s and Annette in the 1980s. The project includes a proposed L-shaped turnaround at the west end of 56th Street to accommodate refuse and emergency vehicle access. Spot curb and storm sewer structure replacements will be made as needed. Utility work will consist only of surface adjustments due to pavement rehabilitation.

The existing conditions, including the west cul-de-sac and the Angus and 56th intersection, shows signs of pavement wear and deterioration. The surface has visible defects such as cracking or potholes, reflecting the need for maintenance or improvement.

The assessment area includes single-family residential properties, a City park, and several larger lots that have indirect access.

The total project cost is \$751,154, with \$228,255 funded through assessments (55%), and \$522,899 by the City through the Pavement Management, Local Streets, and Stormwater Capital Funds. Assessment rates are \$8,951 per single-family residential unit. Assessment terms and interest rates will be set during the assessment hearing in accordance with City policy.

Mayor Dietrich asked if there were any public comments to enter into the record.

Clerk Kiernan replied that none had been received.

Mayor Dietrich opened the Public Hearing, and no public comments were received regarding this project.

Motion to close the Public Hearing for Project 2026-09E (Angus Avenue Area) by Scales, second by Murphy.

Ayes: 5

Nays: 0 Motion carried.

Council Member T'Kach asked whether there was any public feedback on the hammerhead turnaround included in the project.

Engineer Merchlewicz reported that there was no significant public feedback, other than a question about whether a vehicle could navigate the turnaround. He confirmed that a properly sized vehicle can make the turn, as staff had previously assured residents.

Motion to approve Resolution 2025-111 Ordering Improvement and Authorizing Preparation of Plans and Specification for City Project 2026-09E (Angus Avenue Area) by Murphy, second by Scales.

Ayes: 5

Nays: 0 Motion carried.

Project 2026-09F (Alta Avenue Area)

Project No. 2026-09F, Alta Avenue area, includes Alta Avenue and 54th Street, located north of Upper 55th Street and east of South Robert Trail.

The recommended improvement is FDR due to low to mid PCI ratings. Streets were originally constructed in 1972, with 55th Street constructed in 1985. Utility work includes adding a water main

gate valve at the north driveway on 54th Street. Only surface adjustments are needed for the pavement rehabilitation, including spot storm sewer modifications along the curb and roadway.

The existing conditions on Alta Avenue, including areas near apartments and the intersection at 54th, shows significant cracking and deterioration, with a PCI ranging from 46 to 58 and an average of 56.

The assessment area identifies high-density residential to the east and commercial parcels to the west.

The total project cost is \$558,175, with \$305,358 funded through assessments (55%), and \$252,817 by the City through the Pavement Management, Local Streets, Stormwater Capital, and Water Capital Funds. Assessment rates are \$0.25 per lot square foot for both commercial and multi-family residential (apartment). Assessment terms and interest rates will be set during the assessment hearing in accordance with City policy.

Council Member T'Kach asked why the assessment method for multi-family residential and apartment properties in this project is based on per lot square foot, rather than frontage feet as used in previous projects.

Engineer Merchlewicz explained that commercial properties are typically assessed by square footage to reflect property use. Since multifamily residential in this project is grouped with commercial, the same method was applied for consistency within the project area.

Council Member T'Kach asked if other multi-family residential properties in previous projects were assessed by linear foot.

Engineer Merchlewicz confirmed that multi-family residential properties in the previous project were assessed by linear foot. He explained that the earlier project, likely 52nd Street, did not include commercial properties, so the assessment was structured differently. In that case, the linear footage was separated out, and the remaining assessments for single-family homes and condominiums were divided by unit. He said different methods are used to balance assessments depending on the property types involved, and this was the method applied for the current project.

Director Connolly explained that an area-based assessment is more appropriate for this project because some properties consist of multiple parcels under single ownership and shared use. The City's policy allows this method when properties function as a single development, ensuring consistent assessments. He added that a future project on Upper 55th will use both area and frontage methods due to its mix of property types. Commercial properties with shared access and limited frontage are better assessed by area to ensure all parcels are appropriately included.

Mayor Dietrich asked if there were any public comments to enter into the record.

Clerk Kiernan replied that none had been received.

Mayor Dietrich opened the Public Hearing, and no public comments were received regarding this project.

Motion to close the Public Hearing for Project 2026-09F (Alta Avenue Area) by Gliva, second by T'Kach.

Ayes: 5

Nays: 0 Motion carried.

Motion to approve Resolution 2025-112 Ordering Improvement and Authorizing Preparation of Plans and Specification for City Project 2026-09F (Alta Avenue Area) by Scales, second by Gliva.**Ayes: 5****Nays: 0 Motion carried.****Project 2026-09G (Audrey Avenue Area)**

Project No. 2026-09G, Audrey Avenue area, includes Audrey Avenue and 58th Court.

The streets were originally constructed in the 1970s. The reconstruction will include the addition of storm sewer and utility work. The existing watermain, made of CIP, is in fair condition but is recommended for replacement due to the planned replacement of the sanitary sewer throughout the project area. The sanitary sewer, currently VCP, is in poor condition and full replacement is recommended. There is no existing storm sewer infrastructure. Existing drainage currently flows east to the end of 58th Court, into a swale, and then north along Audrey Avenue. The new storm sewer system will collect water and direct it via pipe to Upper 55th Street.

The proposed typical reconstructed street section will be 13 feet from centerline to gutter, for a total width of 26 feet. The existing surmountable curb and gutter may be upgraded to a barrier or vertical face curb to improve water flow through the gutter line and enhance capture through curb backs and graded inlets at catch basins.

The existing conditions in the Audrey Avenue area, including 58th Court near 1775 and Audrey Avenue near 5715, indicate mid-level quality, with a PCI ranging from 46 to 58 and averaging 57. Drainage concerns are also noted in the 58th Court East area.

The assessment area includes both residential and one City-owned parcel.

The total project cost is \$1,785,933, with \$273,056 funded through assessments (55%), and \$1,512,877 by the City through the Pavement Management, Local Streets, Stormwater Capital, Sewer Capital and Water Capital Funds. Assessment rates are \$16,062 per single-family residential unit. The capped assessment is calculated as 4% of the average property value. According to policy, the assessment amount is \$24,379. Assessment terms and interest rates will be determined during the assessment hearing in accordance with City policy.

Mayor Dietrich asked if there were any public comments to enter into the record.

Clerk Kiernan replied that one had been received from the following resident.

Dale Beckmann, a resident at 1855 58th Court East.

Motion to accept 1 comment into the public record by T’Kach, second by Gliva.**Ayes: 5****Nays: 0 Motion carried.**

Mayor Dietrich opened the Public Hearing, during which the following comments were received about this project.

Dale Beckmann, 1855 58th Court East, requested the project be tabled, citing concerns that the feasibility study did not fully address ongoing backyard drainage issues. He recommended expanding the scope beyond street improvements and raised constructability concerns, including access and emergency service impacts.

Tim Dalzell, 1823 58th Ct E, asked that this project not go forward without addressing the backyard drainage issues.

Phil Prokopowicz, 1850 58th Ct E expressed strong support for the project and appreciation for recent City collaboration. He cited decades of personal drainage maintenance and repeated past requests for a storm sewer system. He supported tabling the item to allow further review of unresolved backyard drainage issues.

Tracy Mulcahy, 1810 58th Court East, appreciated the project team's transparency and responsiveness. She emphasized the need for the project to fully address long-standing drainage issues, noting the neighborhood lacks standard storm infrastructure. She also raised concern about the \$16,000 assessment, suggesting a project delay could ease the financial burden on residents with limited incomes.

Motion to close the Public Hearing for Project 2026-09G (Audrey Avenue Area) by T’Kach, second by Scales.

Ayes: 5

Nays: 0 Motion carried.

Mayor Dietrich asked whether the stormwater, storm drains, and drainage issues raised would be addressed during the final design phase or if any work on those concerns had already been completed.

Engineer Merchlewicz responded that, to date, the project has considered drainage impacts generally related to the roadway, but not within private backyards, as those are typically viewed as private issues. He explained that the City evaluated a connection from the Salem Hills Elementary drainage system through adjacent properties into the public system to help address issues on the east side, which is expected to reduce wet conditions. On the west side, drainage concerns appear to originate from hillside runoff, and the City does not plan to install public infrastructure in private yards. However, residents may regrade or install their own systems, and the City is open to allowing connections from private backyard structures or drain tile to the public system where feasible.

Mayor Dietrich referenced a question raised about a manhole cover and concerns related to a 40 to 50-foot-wide area potentially affecting access for public safety vehicles.

Engineer Merchlewicz explained that access concerns, including those affecting emergency vehicles, are addressed during final design. In areas with deep excavations, the City ensures constant access, especially for residents with special needs. Coordination with contractors is built into project specifications, and trench boxes are typically used to minimize impacts and avoid excavation beyond the City’s right-of-way.

Council Member Murphy asked whether the proposed pipe connection to the elementary school’s drainage system would be developed further in the detailed design phase or if it is currently being pursued.

Engineer Merchlewicz explained that the pipe connection would be further developed during final design. It will require coordination with the school and adjacent homeowners where the pipe would pass between properties. He noted that budget contingency has been included to support this work.

Council Member T’Kach asked if, upon approval of the project, staff would continue working with residents on feasibility and project details to address stormwater issues as effectively as possible without entering private backyards.

Engineer Merchlewicz stated that as the project moves into final design, coordination with residents will continue, especially given the invasive nature of reconstruction areas. He emphasized that efforts would go beyond the curb lines and include further discussions with residents regarding specific concerns, such as roadway profile changes. He also noted that the team would evaluate curb design options, aiming for appropriate solutions within the roadway right-of-way.

Motion to approve Resolution 2025-113 Ordering Improvement and Authorizing Preparation of Plans and Specification for City Project 2026-09G (Audrey Avenue Area) by T’Kach, second by Gliva.

Ayes: 5

Nays: 0 Motion carried.

Project 2026-09H (Upper 55th St from Blaine Avenue to Cahill Avenue & 57th Street)

Project 2026-09H runs from Blaine Avenue to Cahill, and from Cahill to Carmen.

Upper 55th Street has a poor PCI, making FDR necessary. On 57th Street, full reconstruction is required due to the South St. Paul water main replacement. Utility work includes only surface adjustments necessary due to pavement rehabilitation for the FDR area, water main replacement in the South St. Paul area, and leaving the sanitary sewer unchanged. Storm sewer work will include spot adjustments along the curb and roadway in the FDR area, with full storm sewer replacement as necessary in the 57th Street reconstruction area.

The existing conditions on Upper 55th Street, west of Blackberry Trail and at Upper 55th and 9th Avenue, show pavement in poor condition, with a PCI ranging from 22 to 68, and an average of 37.

The assessment area includes a mix of commercial businesses, high-density residential, and single-family homes.

The total project cost is divided into two areas. For the Upper 55th Street FDR, the total project cost is \$2,752,435, with \$1,184,738 funded through assessments (55%), and \$1,567,697 by the City through the Municipal State Aid, Stormwater Capital, Sewer Capital and Water Capital Funds. The preliminary assessment rate is \$169.13 per front foot for all assessable parcels. Assessment terms and interest rates will be set during the assessment hearing in accordance with City policy.

For the 57th Street Reconstruction, the total project cost is \$825,253, with \$135,773 funded through assessments (35%), and \$689,480 by the City through the Municipal State Aid, Stormwater Capital, and Sewer Capital Funds. South St. Paul’s participation is \$519,132. Commercial properties have a capped assessment rate of \$1 per square foot of lot area. Assessment terms and interest rates will be determined during the assessment hearing in accordance with City policy.

Mayor Dietrich asked if there were any public comments to enter into the record.

Clerk Kiernan replied that none had been received.

Mayor Dietrich opened the Public Hearing, and no public comments were received regarding this project.

Motion to close the Public Hearing for Project 2026-09H (Upper 55th Street from Blaine Avenue to Cahill Avenue & 57th Street) by Scales, second by Murphy.

Ayes: 5

Nays: 0 Motion carried.

Motion to approve Resolution 2025-114 Ordering Improvement and Authorizing Preparation of Plans and Specification for City Project 2026-09H (Upper 55th Street from Blaine Avenue to Cahill Avenue & 57th Street) by Gliva, second by Murphy.

Ayes: 5

Nays: 0 Motion carried.

Project 2026-09I (South Blackberry Trail Area)

Project 2026-09I includes the segment of roadway between Blackberry Trail and Blackberry Bridge Path, located south of Upper 55th Street.

The streets in the project area were originally constructed in the 1980s with varying pavement depths between 2 and 6 inches. There have been several petitions dating back to the early 1990s requesting the addition of curb and gutter. Maintenance activities have included pavement patching, crack sealing and seal coat in 2004 and 2005, respectively. Due to the inconsistent pavement structure, a full reconstruction is now necessary to establish a uniform and consistent roadway. The plan is to utilize the existing 25-foot width while incorporating surmountable curb, gutter, and storm improvements.

The DIP watermain is in good condition with no recent breaks, requiring only adjustments. For the sanitary sewer, a lift station replacement was previously scheduled in the CIP for 2027 but has been included in this project to optimize costs and minimize future roadway impacts.

The storm sewer system consists of a rural section with outlets draining into backyards or through lots, which has caused erosion issues. The proposed solution is to install a full in-street storm sewer system to better control runoff and flows. Due to limited space for off-road treatment, the project will incorporate sediment control structures and address erosion in backyard drainage areas.

The planned section features a 12½-foot width to the gutter line, using either surmountable or barrier curbs depending on property slopes to manage water runoff. Road slopes may be subtly adjusted for drainage, with visible catchment points along the edges.

The existing conditions along Blackberry Trail South show a PCI ranging from a low of 16 to a high of 49, with an average of 40, indicating generally poor pavement quality. Specific locations include areas near 5887 Blackberry Bridge Path and 5845 Blackberry Trail.

Several properties along Blackberry Trail South are facing significant erosion problems, particularly near the side yard of 5875 Blackberry Bridge Path and the rear yard of 5890 Blackberry Trail. To mitigate erosion at the roadway's edge, residents have placed large wash stone, though erosion remains a concern. The area also features a bituminous swale equipped with a drop inlet to help manage runoff.

Additional drainage infrastructure includes shallow swales paired with driveway culverts. However, some non-standard inlets in the area are already showing signs of erosion and structural issues, further highlighting the need for improvements.

The assessment area shows a City pond, and a business park located at the north end of the project area, with the remaining properties consist of single-family residences.

The total project cost is \$3,898,741, with \$906,031 funded through assessments (35%), and \$2,992,710 by the City through the Pavement Management, Local Streets, Stormwater Capital, Sewer Capital and Water Capital Funds. Assessment rates are \$1,694 for office condominium units and \$24,580 for single family residential units. The capped assessment is calculated at 4% of the

average property value. According to policy, the assessment amount is \$31,290. Assessment terms and interest rates will be set during the assessment hearing in accordance with City policy.

Council Member Scales noted that this is clearly a complex project and expects extensive communication throughout the detailed design period. He asked staff to explain how the process of working with residents unfolds, especially when residents have implemented their own erosion control measures that may be impacted by planned changes like installing surmountable curbs.

Engineer Merchlewicz explained that during final design, the City will engage residents through multiple meetings to discuss property-specific needs and impacts. He emphasized that design coordination is far from complete and that if the project moves forward, six to nine more months of detailed work will be needed to address property-specific concerns and infrastructure impacts.

Mayor Dietrich asked if there were any public comments to be received into the record.

Clerk Kiernan replied that the following emails had been received.

Alexander Coletta, 5892 Blackberry Bridge Path
Melvyn Leach, 5905 Blackberry Bridge Path
Chris Maley & Erin Stream, 5904 Blackberry Trail
Sara Scovil, 5885 Blackberry Trail
Gary & Cheryl Keindl, 5880 Blackberry Trail & 5875 Blackberry Bridge Path
Al Ambrose, 5995 Blackberry Trail
Michael and Kathy Wise, 5834 Blackberry Trail
Dave & Deede Jacobsen, 5950 Blackberry Trail
Sue Grimes, 5906 Blackberry Bridge Path.
Jaime & Jessica Roberts, 5955 Blackberry Trail
Karen and Jack Laboria, 5890 Blackberry Trail
Channorak & Brad Cummings, 5835 Blackberry Trail
Tina Isaac, 5912 Blackberry Bridge Trail

Mayor Dietrich opened the Public Hearing, during which the following comments were received about this project.

Gary Keindl, 5880 Blackberry Trail, opposed the project, describing it as excessive, costly, and unnecessary. He believes that Forest Haven, as a distinctive semi-rural neighborhood, should maintain its rural road design. While he supports resurfacing the road and potentially adding gutter and curb improvements, he considers the current proposal too disruptive and urges the exploration of a lower-cost, less invasive alternative.

John Ackleson, 5920 Blackberry Bridge Path, opposed the project, calling it too expensive and partly unnecessary, particularly regarding the storm sewer. He argued that natural drainage to the lake makes some of the proposed work redundant and expressed concerns that have not been adequately addressed.

Chris Maley, 5904 Blackberry Trail, opposed the project due to lack of clear justification, transparency, and consideration of alternatives. She criticized dismissive treatment of resident feedback and objected to realigning Blackberry Bridge Path, which would cause tree removal, property damage, and high costs without practical benefits. She urged the City to pause the project and collaborate with residents on a more cost-effective and environmentally responsible solution.

Rosalyn Miller, 5824 Blackberry Trail, opposed the current project design as excessive, supporting only road repaving and curbing to improve drainage. She objected to raising yard elevations, removing healthy trees, eliminating a culvert that has never carried water, and adding a new catch

basin where no water issues exist. She urged the City to reject the plan and work individually with homeowners to find reasonable solutions.

Kenton Miller, 5824 Blackberry Trail, opposed the project's current design, supporting only road repaving and curbing. He objected to raising embankments, removing a culvert that has never carried water, installed new sump basins, and damaged mature trees and privacy. He called for scaling back the project to avoid unnecessary costs and preserve the neighborhood's wooded character and wildlife.

Erin Stream, 5904 Blackberry Trail, opposed the current project, citing technical difficulties, high costs, and insufficient community input. She objected to relocating Blackberry Bridge Path because of unstable terrain and urged the City to keep improvements within existing road alignments, provide clearer justification, explore less invasive alternatives, and delay the decision until the Feasibility Report is finalized.

Bud (Glen) Grimes, 5906 Blackberry Bridge Path, expressed concern about transparency in the project, highlighting that the feasibility study mentions three parcels needing temporary easements but does not identify them or account for potential damages to landscaping, trees, or fences. He also flagged the lack of details regarding the reconstruction of the sanitary sewer lift station near his property. He argued that, according to City policy, a special benefit analysis by an independent appraiser should have been conducted because the proposed assessments may exceed the value of benefits to residents. He noted that the current project assessments are estimated to be two and a half to three times higher than those for a similar nearby project, raising significant alarm among residents.

Donna Isaac, 5926 Blackberry Bridge Path, favored maintaining the rural character of the area with minimal or no curbing. She questioned whether an environmental impact statement had been obtained from the DNR or the Watershed District, given Oak Bush Lake's protected status, and expressed support for other residents' concerns about preserving the environment and neighborhood character.

Cheryl Keindl, 5880 Blackberry Trail and owns the lot at 5875 Blackberry Trail, opposed endorsing the current project due to significant process concerns, stating residents were not surveyed about their specific needs and were instead given vague plans despite a defined cost estimate. She noted the feasibility study was lengthy and only became available shortly before the meeting, containing maps and details that should have been shared earlier. She emphasized the need for City staff to work individually with homeowners to address unique property impacts, erosion, and drainage issues.

Kelly Kayser, 1953 59th Court East and a former member of the Citizen Task Force for Pavement Management, commended the City for its improved transparency compared to a decade ago and described past challenges with random and underfunded road planning. She acknowledged frustrations over lengthy project timelines but encouraged residents to stay engaged to ensure their needs are addressed. She cautioned that delaying projects would only increase costs, regardless of whether a rural or partial road design is pursued and urged balancing neighborhood concerns with the City's broader infrastructure priorities.

Jacob Cotner, 5895 Blackberry Trail South, questioned the plan to fill in ditches and raise the road level, warning that without existing ditches or catch basins, stormwater would rush downhill into neighboring yards and driveways. He expressed confusion about the project's purpose and concern that the new drainage system would be ineffective.

Mayor Dietrich asked Engineer Merchlewicz if he wanted to address the questions raised about storm sewer concerns.

Engineer Merchlewicz explained that a storm sewer system was chosen over a rural road design because the existing rural system fails to properly drain water below the road subgrade, risking frost damage and road failure. He said curb and gutter are necessary to consistently direct water into controlled systems, avoiding erosion and future maintenance issues for residents. He emphasized that the storm sewer design aims to prevent water from entering driveways or homes by collecting and conveying runoff safely to discharge points, ensuring controlled drainage and reducing erosion risks.

Mayor Dietrich asked Engineer Merchlewicz to respond to concerns about the lack of clear justification for the project, noting that while the road's condition index is likely a significant factor, she wanted Engineer Merchlewicz to explain any other reasons why this project was included in the CIP and why it is being proposed at this time.

Engineer Merchlewicz explained that the project was included in the CIP based on factors such as pavement condition, the year the road was built, how it integrates into the broader system, and the need to group projects by mileage and cost for efficiency.

Mayor Dietrich asked Director Connolly if he wanted to add any remarks.

Director Connolly confirmed that roads are selected for the CIP based on factors like age, pavement condition, time since the last project, and balancing total mileage each year, aiming for about six to seven miles annually. This project was included because of low pavement condition ratings, its status as an outlier compared to already completed adjacent neighborhoods, and a history of resident complaints about storm sewer and pavement issues. He also noted that needed maintenance on a nearby lift station contributed to the timing. While the project could be delayed, he cautioned that costs would likely increase the longer it is postponed, and the project has remained in the same timeline since it was first placed in the CIP.

Mayor Dietrich acknowledged that Director Connolly had addressed project costs and confirmed that a special benefit was included in this project, asking if that was correct. Mayor Dietrich also noted questions about tree removal, a large retaining wall, and an environmental impact statement, and clarified that these issues are typically not part of the feasibility study at this stage, asking if that was correct as well.

Engineer Merchlewicz explained that the City does not maintain retaining walls and will investigate alternative solutions, such as lowering the road or adjusting its alignment instead of keeping it centered entirely within the right-of-way. He noted that while the existing road could remain as is, shifting it by five or ten feet might be beneficial, but such decisions will be made during the final design phase. He clarified that this is a reconstruction project for an existing road, not a completely new roadway.

He further stated that the City has never proposed, nor does it plan to propose, building a retaining wall. He explained that filling in ditches may be necessary to direct water into the gutter system and prevent standing water on private property. He emphasized that installing curb and gutter requires a storm sewer to safely carry runoff away, as allowing water to overflow or flood the roadway would create hazardous conditions. He assured that the curb and gutter system would be properly designed to manage drainage effectively.

Mayor Dietrich inquired about the removal of the culvert and the work on the lift station, asking what those elements would entail and whether they are included in the current process or would be addressed in a later phase.

Engineer Merchlewicz stated that decisions about the culvert will be addressed in the future design phase, as details on how the road ties into surrounding areas are not yet finalized. He explained the goal is to capture and manage water or sediment behind the curb without expanding construction beyond the existing right-of-way. Regarding the lift station, he said it will remain within the right-of-way, possibly shifted slightly to allow construction of a new station offline for a smooth transition, but there are no plans to relocate it outside the current right-of-way.

Mayor Dietrich asked for clarification regarding the claim that the feasibility study is outdated.

Engineer Merchlewicz stated that he had no comment on the matter and was unsure what it pertained to.

Council Member T'Kach noted that residents feel unheard despite attending meetings and open houses. She explained that approving projects gives staff time and resources to work through details. She asked staff to explain what steps will follow over the next six months if the project is approved, and how residents' concerns will be addressed.

Engineer Merchlewicz stated that the City will continue working with residents to balance project impacts with proper solutions. He emphasized ongoing dialogue to address problem areas, while noting that engineering judgment may sometimes override specific resident preferences. He explained that input from earlier open houses helped shape feasible plans for final design. He assured that there is no intent to significantly alter the neighborhood or remove many trees and promised continued public outreach and transparency to avoid surprises as the project progresses.

Mayor Dietrich thanked Engineer Merchlewicz for providing the calendar that outlined the project timelines.

Director Connolly emphasized that while the City seeks resident input and aims for transparency, projects cannot be tailored to every individual preference because they must follow engineering standards and protect the City from liability. He stressed the need to balance individual concerns with the broader public interest and acknowledged that not everyone will agree with every design decision.

Council Member T'Kach acknowledged ongoing issues and uncertainty about whether all concerns were addressed. She explained that approving the resolution would move the project into final design, during which staff intends to balance community desires with engineering, DNR, and watershed standards. She emphasized that if residents remain dissatisfied after final design, the Council retains the authority to reject the project. She urged residents to let the process continue so staff can try to address concerns and assured that the Council will evaluate whether the final project reasonably reflects community input.

Motion to close the Public Hearing for Project 2026-09I (South Blackberry Trail Area) by T'Kach, second by Gliva.

Ayes: 5

Nays: 0 Motion carried.

Motion to approve Resolution 2025-115 Ordering Improvement and Authorizing Preparation of Plans and Specification for City Project 2026-09I (South Blackberry Trail Area) by T'Kach, second by Murphy.

Ayes: 5

Nays: 0 Motion carried.

Project 2026-09J (North Blackberry Trail Area)

Project 2026-09J includes Blackberry Trail from Upper 55th Street to the northern cul-de-sac, as well as Brent Avenue and Bristol Path.

The streets in the project area were originally constructed in 1997 and 2005 and received a seal coat application in 2015 and 2021. Blackberry Trail North is planned for FDR, while Brent Avenue and Bristol Path will receive mill and overlay. Some spot roadway reconstruction will also be needed to address areas of settlement. No significant sanitary sewer or watermain improvements are planned beyond surface adjustments required for the road work. For storm sewer infrastructure, only minor adjustments are anticipated as part of the roadway rehabilitation.

The assessment map shows Blackberry Trail North bordered by apartment buildings and high-density residential areas on the east side.

The total project cost is divided into two areas. For the Blackberry North Area FDR, the total project cost is \$230,342, with \$126,688 funded through assessments (55%), and \$103,654 by the City through the Pavement Management Local Streets Fund. The preliminary assessment rate is \$37.09 per front foot for all assessable parcels. Assessment terms and interest rates will be set during the assessment hearing in accordance with City policy.

For the Blackberry North Area Mill and Overlay, the total project cost is \$428,788, with \$333,630 funded through assessments (80%), and \$95,158 by the City through the Pavement Management, Local Streets, Stormwater Capital, and Water Capital Funds. The preliminary assessment rate is \$59.57 per front foot for all assessable parcels. Assessment terms and interest rates will be set during the assessment hearing in accordance with City policy.

The existing conditions on Blackberry Trail North show a consistent PCI of 45 across all measured segments, indicating uniform pavement conditions throughout the area, including near the apartments and at the north cul-de-sac.

On Blackberry Trail North, the PCI varies significantly, with values ranging from a low of 29 to a high of 70 and an average PCI of 51. This indicates that pavement conditions along Brent Avenue and Bristol Path range from poor to fair, with some areas needing more substantial rehabilitation than others.

Mayor Dietrich asked if there were any public comments to enter into the record.

Clerk Kiernan replied that none had been received.

Mayor Dietrich opened the Public Hearing, and no public comments were received regarding this project.

Motion to close the Public Hearing for Project 2026-09J (North Blackberry Trail Area) by Scales, second by Gliva.

Ayes: 5

Nays: 0 Motion carried.

Motion to approve Resolution 2025-116 Ordering Improvement and Authorizing Preparation of Plans and Specification for City Project 2026-09J (North Blackberry Trail Area) by Gliva, second by Scales.

Ayes: 5

Nays: 0 Motion carried.

Project 2026-09K (85th Street Area, College Trail Area, Birch Boulevard Area)

Project 2026-09K covers both sides of Cahill Avenue and includes the streets Brewster, Bechtel, Birch, Campbell, College Trail, Casey, Carson, and 87th Street on the west side.

The project background involves streets constructed in the 1990s that received a seal coat in the mid-2000s. Areas designated for partial reconstruction will have pavement replaced and one foot of subbase (sand) added, while the remaining material below will be left in place. Other areas will receive FDR due to low PCI. No sanitary or watermain work is planned for this project area except for adjustments needed because of roadway work. The storm sewer was installed in several phases during the 1990s, with cleaning and replacement recommended in the Birch and Campbell area, and filtration benches will be added to existing ponds due to limited options.

The existing conditions in the 85th and Brewster area, including Bechtel Avenue, are rough, with patches and defects. The PCI ranges from 21 to 41, with an average of 35, indicating poor overall conditions.

The College Trail area, including locations near the bridge crossing and College Trail & Casey Court, has pavement in fair to poor condition, with a PCI ranging from 22 to 47 and an average of 42.

87th Street has uniformly poor pavement conditions, with a PCI consistently at 41 in both directions (facing west and east), indicating the roadway needs rehabilitation.

The assessment area mainly consists of City-owned and single-family residential properties, with a townhome development situated on the west end near 87th Street.

The total project cost is \$4,847,562, with \$2,465,645 funded through assessments (55%), and \$2,381,917 by the City through the Pavement Management, Local Streets, Stormwater Capital, Sewer Capital and Water Capital Funds. The preliminary assessment rate is \$4,132 per townhome unit, and \$10,838 per single family residential unit. Assessment terms and interest rates will be set during the assessment hearing in accordance with City policy.

Mayor Dietrich asked if there were any public comments to enter into the record.

Clerk Kiernan replied that none had been received.

Mayor Dietrich opened the Public Hearing, during which the following comments were received about this project.

Sean Haarstad a resident at 8435 Bryce Court supports the project but expresses concern about how long the upgrades will last, noting that while many projects being discussed are 40 to 50 years old, this area is approaching 30 years.

Liz Evensen a resident at 3064 85th Street East, a 20-year Orchard Meadows resident and board member, voiced concerns about transparency and difficulty getting project information from the City, despite multiple calls. She highlighted financial worries for residents, especially retirees and young families wanting to stay in their homes. Liz noted the neighborhood streets are 28 years old but failing sooner than the promised 50 years due to poor construction. She urged better communication, accountability, and quality guarantees for future work, emphasizing that residents want to be heard and have recourse if issues arise.

Mayor Dietrich noted that residents can review the City's five-year Capital Improvement Plan at www.ighmn.gov/payments to stay informed and engage with the City about upcoming projects well in advance.

Steve Heasley a resident at 8580 Bechtel Avenue expressed concern about how corner lots might be assessed higher due to having more street frontage. They noted seeing single-family assessments listed as \$10,000 per home, while other assessments were calculated per square foot, and asked how the assessments for corner lots would be determined.

Motion to close the Public Hearing for Project 2026-09K (85th Street Area, College Trail Area, Birch Blvd Area) by T’Kach, second by Gliva.

Ayes: 5

Nays: 0 Motion carried.

Mayor Dietrich asked about the expected lifespan of the proposed improvements for the neighborhood in the feasibility study.

Engineer Merchlewicz explained that the new pavement structure in the neighborhood is designed for a 50-year lifespan, though around every 25 years, a less invasive mill and overlay will likely be needed to address surface wear from oxidation and traffic. Overall, some form of maintenance is expected about every 25 years.

Mayor Dietrich asked for an explanation of how assessments are calculated, specifically whether they are based on square footage and if corner lots are assessed double due to having more street frontage.

Engineer Merchlewicz explained that the City uses a per-unit assessment for residential areas rather than calculating assessments by square footage or frontage. This approach is considered fairer, ensuring that corner lots, cul-de-sac lots, and mid-block lots are all assessed equally since all properties use the roads similarly.

Motion to approve Resolution 2025-117 Ordering Improvement and Authorizing Preparation of Plans and Specification for City Project 2026-09K (85th Street Area, College Trail Area, Birch Blvd Area) by Scales, second by Gliva.

Ayes: 5

Nays: 0 Motion carried.

Project 2026-09L (Alameda Trail Area)

Project 09L includes Alameda Avenue and Alameda Path north of Cliff, along with Alameda Avenue and surrounding streets south of Cliff.

The project involves full-depth reclamation of streets originally constructed in 1995 and 1998, which received seal coats in 2003 and 2006 but are now in fair to poor condition, requiring spot curb replacements. Utilities in the area consist of well and septic systems, while the storm sewer system will need some adjustments or replacements in conjunction with the pavement rehabilitation.

The existing conditions, both north and south of Cliff, shows significant pavement distress. The PCI ranges from 13 to 61, averaging 42, highlighting poor to fair conditions and supporting the need for full-depth reclamation.

The assessment area includes some city-owned parcels near the lake or pond to the north, while the remaining parcels consist of single-family residential lots with large acreages.

The total project cost is \$2,580,019, with \$1,308,161 funded through assessments (55%), and \$1,271,858 by the City through the Pavement Management Fund, Local Streets, and Stormwater Capital Funds. The preliminary assessment rate is \$21,622 per single family residential unit.

Assessment terms and interest rates will be set during the assessment hearing in accordance with City policy.

Mayor Dietrich asked if there were any public comments to enter into the record.

Clerk Kiernan replied that none had been received.

Mayor Dietrich opened the Public Hearing, during which the following comments were received about this project.

Lauri Salverda, 10647 Alameda Avenue, expressed concern about receiving the public hearing notice only a few days in advance and missing the opportunity to attend. She stated that the project appears more aesthetic than necessary for infrastructure and is costly for homeowners, with assessments among the highest seen. She also noted that nearby empty lots may soon undergo construction, which would conflict with road work, and requested that the project be postponed until it becomes a more urgent need.

Katie Weber, 11524 Alameda Avenue, agreed that surface repairs are needed but questioned the high assessment cost, calling it excessive for surface work. She asked why appraisals are not being done to confirm the benefits justify the cost and sought assurance the improvements would last to avoid future large assessments. She also questioned why different methods like full reconstruction, FDR, or mill and overlay are used and urged exploring the most cost-effective option with appraisals to ensure fair assessments.

Kari Rahlf, 11511 Alameda Avenue, expressed concern that her relatively new road is already facing significant issues like older streets. She asked about the expected lifespan of the proposed improvements and how residents can remain involved as the project moves forward. She also wanted more details about how the estimated project costs would be spent, especially since the final design is not yet determined, emphasizing the need for durable solutions to avoid repeating these repairs in another 5 to 15 years.

Tom Michaud, 10665 Alameda Avenue, agreed that the road needs replacement but questioned why the project cost had not decreased, given that their area uses septic systems and private wells, so storm, sanitary, and water main work should not be needed. He asked if the cost would be reduced since those utilities are not part of their project.

Mayor Dietrich said that question will be posed to the engineers.

Patrick White, 11240 Alameda Court, agreed the road surface is in poor condition and noted the project seems straightforward. However, he expressed concern that individual homeowners are being assessed significantly higher costs than in other similar projects and asked if there is any possibility of adjusting the amounts due to the high costs

Motion to close the Public Hearing for Project 2026-09L (Alameda Trail Area) by Gliva, second by Scales.

Ayes: 5

Nays: 0 Motion carried.

Mayor Dietrich acknowledged there were several questions about project costs compared to previous projects and asked for further explanation about how the costs were determined, noting that each project has unique factors.

Engineer Merchlewicz explained that in areas with large lots, like this project area, costs are assessed per lot, so individual properties bear more cost than in denser neighborhoods where costs are

spread among more homes. He stated that staff use about 4% of the average property value, based on Dakota County assessments, to calculate an assessment cap. For these properties, that cap is around \$36,000, and the proposed assessments fall well below this amount, so there is no recommendation for a special benefit adjustment.

Mayor Dietrich noted that some residents view the project as mainly an aesthetic upgrade, while others recognize surface issues needing repair. She asked how the decision was made to choose a full reconstruction over other options like mill and overlay for this neighborhood.

Engineer Merchlewicz explained that the feasibility study considered pavement condition ratings and physical defects like alligator cracking, indicating the pavement is at the end of its life. Geotechnical testing confirmed that FDR is the appropriate solution. He stated that aesthetic fixes like seal coats only cover the surface, and mill and overlay repairs would quickly develop the same cracks again. FDR offers a longer-lasting solution with an expected pavement life of 50 years, with only a mill and overlay needed midway through that period.

Mayor Dietrich asked for confirmation, and Engineer Merchlewicz confirmed that an FDR is expected to result in a road with a lifespan of about 50 years.

Mayor Dietrich asked for an explanation regarding stormwater and sewer costs, noting that residents with their own wells do not see a price adjustment reflected in the project costs.

Engineer Merchlewicz said he did not recall that information being presented earlier and, if it was mentioned, it was an error. He clarified that there is no cost deduction related to wells or septic systems and explained that the earlier information was likely copied by mistake from another source.

Council Member T’Kach noted that one of the residents had asked about a price change and expressed uncertainty about whether that question had been answered.

Engineer Merchlewicz explained that there is no price change from what was previously presented. He clarified that earlier references to sanitary and water main work were incorrect and likely resulted from a copy-and-paste error. The current cost figures are based on the correct calculations from the feasibility study.

Motion to approve Resolution 2025-118 Ordering Improvement and Authorizing Preparation of Plans and Specification for City Project 2026-09L (Alameda Trail Area) by Gliva, second by T’Kach.

Ayes: 5

Nays: 0 Motion carried.

E. Resolution Adopting Assessment Roll for Public Nuisance & Diseased Tree Abatement Program, Resolution 2025-119.

Code Compliance Coordinator Rainey explained that if prepayment is not received within thirty days after the special assessments are levied and adopted by the City Council, the assessments will be sent to the County Auditor to be placed on the property tax list to be paid in two equal installments with an eight percent interest rate of the unpaid balance, extending over a period of one year. He noted that the following parcels are proposed to be placed on the 2025 Assessment Roll.

3245 69th Street East for tree removal in the amount of \$2,850 (PID #207116003310)
6339 Apple Court for lawn cutting in the amount of \$135 (PID #206720102010)
4511 Audrey Avenue for tree removal in the amount of \$2,950 (PID #203110003070)
5373 Babcock Trail for lawn cutting in the amount of \$390 (PID #200321007010)
6535 Dawn Way for lawn cutting in the amount of \$135 (PID #203655006111)

Mayor Dietrich opened the Public Hearing. There were no public comments.

Motion to close the Public Hearing for Public Nuisance & Diseased Tree Abatement Program by Scales, second by T’Kach.

Ayes: 5

Nays: 0 Motion carried.

Motion to approve Resolution 2025-119 for 2025 Public Nuisance & Diseased Tree Abatements by T’Kach, second by Gliva.

Ayes: 5

Nays: 0 Motion carried.

7. REGULAR BUSINESS:

A. Rental Housing Licenses

Administrator Wilson presented the following rental housing licenses including 3 renewals and 1 new license.

8825 Branson Drive
4376 Upper 71st Street East
5466 Bryce Avenue
4681 Blaine Avenue

All applications have been reviewed by staff and found to meet the necessary requirements. Staff recommends approval of all licenses.

Motion to Approve four Rental Licenses by Gliva, second by Scales.

Ayes: 5

Nays: 0 Motion carried.

B. Conveyance of Easements to Dakota County for Veterans Memorial Greenway (*Continued from April 28 Meeting*), **Resolution 2025-120.**

Parks Project Manager Wotzka and Dakota County Real Estate Manager Singer provided an overview of the Veterans Memorial Greenway project, discussed project staking and alignment evaluations, explained details of the Regional Greenway Trail Easement and the Regional Greenway Corridor Easement, and included a request for the City Council to adopt a resolution approving the conveyance of these easements.

The Veterans Memorial Greenway will take place in three phases with a planned completion in late 2026 or 2027. Tentative construction estimates are Phase I (Central) 2024-2025; Phase II (West) 2024-2025/2026; and Phase III (East) 2025-2026/2027.

Phase II of the project will include four memorial nodes dedicated to Native American Veterans, Gold Star Families, Military Units and Flyers, and Support Organizations. The project will feature a grade-separated bridge over Highway 3, along with trail improvements in Lakeside Park in Eagan, Southern Lakes Park in Inver Grove Heights, and on City property containing transmission lines. It also involves securing new regional trail easements with Xcel Energy, the City of Eagan, and the City of Inver Grove Heights.

The project involves alignment staking, which includes marking the centerline of the trail using lath painted pink and tied with pink ribbon labeled "Trail CL." Two extra laths have been placed at the

edge of the lake where the boardwalk will cross, and property corner irons have been located to assist with defining boundaries.

The trail alignments have been revised in several areas to enhance feasibility and ensure proper routing through different sections of the Greenway. These revisions reflect efforts to optimize the trail's path for construction and long-term use.

A Trail Easement is planned in Rich Valley, where part of the Greenway will cross, requiring an easement agreement to secure the corridor. Additionally, the Greenway Corridor Easements have been described for the south, middle, and north segments, each representing a specific portion of the trail that will need easements to allow for construction, operation, and public use through City-owned properties and parklands.

The corridor easement defines legal and operational responsibilities for both the County and the City in managing the trail corridor. Dakota County will build the paved recreational trail and handle its maintenance, repair, replacement, and removal of hazardous trees under a future Supplemental Maintenance Agreement. Vegetation management will be carried out according to a jointly approved Vegetation Management Plan, implemented through a Maintenance Agreement agreed upon by both the City and the County.

Dakota County requested that the City Council adopt a resolution approving the conveyance of a Greenway Trail Easement within Rich Valley Park and a Greenway Corridor Easement within City-owned property adjacent to and within Southern Lakes Park.

Council Member Gliva said she was thinking about the last meeting and wanted to know if residents' concerns about the trail being close to their homes and the look of the area behind their properties had been addressed.

Real Estate Manager Singer said that meetings have taken place with some residents to review the trail staking. He explained that Option 5, the easternmost alignment, has not been physically staked yet and is still under evaluation. This option is currently favored based on discussions so far, but it still requires approval from the DNR and Flint Hills Resources. Although it exceeds 7% slopes and poses challenges to greenway standards, it is likely to become the preferred route if approved, due to cost and other factors.

Mayor Dietrich asked how far the alignment had to vary from the 7% slope standard.

Real Estate Manager Singer explained that the slope varies somewhat, reaching about 7.5% at its steepest point. He noted that while some trails in the County's greenway system do have slopes around that level, they try to avoid such steep grades because of concerns related to trail use and speed. He added that the slope occurs along a curve, which can make it more challenging, and indicated that fencing may be necessary in some areas to address speed and fall hazards.

Mayor Dietrich asked for confirmation that the County would be responsible for all costs related to maintenance and any foreseeable future expenses.

Real Estate Manager Singer confirmed that the County is fully responsible for all operations and maintenance costs related to the greenways. This includes pavement management and any structural improvements, such as drainage culverts, interpretation signs, or wayfinding elements, which the County would pay for, replace, or maintain.

Mayor Dietrich asked if there were any public comments to enter into the record.

Clerk Kiernan replied that none had been received.

Council Member T’Kach asked whether Option 5 is the preferred option.

Real Estate Manager Singer confirmed that Option 5 is currently the preferred choice of the design team, as they are working through the final stages of approval from Flint Hills and the DNR.

Council Member T’Kach asked whether that option would meet ADA guidelines or standards.

Real Estate Manager Singer explained that the design team will need to evaluate whether the option meets ADA standards. He noted that exceptions can be requested if full compliance is not possible, which may be necessary in this case. He mentioned there could be ways to include benches or small flat areas as resting spots to help address accessibility. The design team has not finalized those details yet, but such features are likely to be added.

Council Member T’Kach asked about the reason for moving away from Option 6 or 7.

Real Estate Manager Singer explained that Option 6 would have a greater environmental impact because it requires removing vegetation and would be difficult to construct, as it is squeezed between private property and a pond. While still feasible and a possible alternative if approvals from the DNR or Flint Hills cannot be secured, Option 5 was initially selected because it avoided wetland impacts and conflicts with earlier alignments and Flint Hills infrastructure.

Council Member T’Kach asked whether City staff agrees with this option.

Real Estate Manager Singer said that City staff has been involved in the project, though perhaps not deeply engaged in the detailed complexities of the route options. He noted that Option 5 closely resembles an alignment reviewed during the 90% design phase and does not differ significantly from earlier plans.

Council Member Scales said he visited the area with others and found it beautiful, mentioning that Phase 1 also looked very nice. However, he raised a safety concern about a corner where a fence begins too late to prevent someone from going down a hill and suggested that spot be reviewed.

Motion to Approve Resolution 2025-120 Approving Conveyance of Easement to Dakota County for Veterans Memorial Greenway by Scales, second by T’Kach.

Ayes: 5

Nays: 0 Motion carried.

C. 2nd Reading of Ordinance Amending City Code Related to Temporary Expansion of Premise for On-Sale Liquor License Holders.

Administrator Wilson presented the 2nd reading of an ordinance repealing and replacing Inver Grove Heights City Code Title 4, Chapter 1, Section 15(C), related to the temporary expansion of premises for on-sale liquor license holders and exemptions from Large Assembly Permits. Each on-sale liquor license applies to a specifically defined, compact, and contiguous area where alcohol can be sold and consumed, which impacts liability insurance, parking requirements, and water and sewer charges. However, businesses sometimes wish to temporarily expand into areas like parking lots for special events. The goal is to make the process of obtaining a Temporary Expansion of Premise more efficient for local businesses.

Currently, businesses with on-sale liquor licenses may apply for up to 3 temporary expansions per year, each lasting no more than 2 days, and each expansion requires City Council approval at a regular meeting. Often, businesses must also obtain a separate Large Assembly Permit.

Under the proposed new process, Council approval would be granted in concept through the issuance of a punch card either at the time of the annual liquor license approval or when first needed during the calendar year. Specific events would then be reviewed and approved by staff, with notice required 21 days before the first event of the year and 14 days before subsequent events. The proposal would increase the number of permitted single-day expansions from 3 to 10 per year, eliminate the need for a separate Large Assembly Permit, and allow for two alternative rain dates to be approved with the initial approval.

For each event, license holders would be required to provide details including the date, time, and estimated attendance, proof of insurance, a site plan showing the temporary expansion area, traffic flow, parking, emergency access routes, information on lighting and noise control, a severe weather plan, and measures to ensure minors are not served. Businesses would be allowed to reuse information from prior applications for similar events, simplifying the process.

Changes made since the first reading include requiring a public hearing during the annual request before the Council, allowing responsibilities delegated to the Police Chief to be carried out by the Chief or their designee, granting the right to appeal the Police Chief's denial of a specific event to the Council at its next regular meeting, and adding language explicitly exempting events with a Temporary Expansion of Premise from needing a separate Large Assembly Permit.

Compact and contiguous is a term used in the section of State law that regulates the sale and serving of alcohol but not defined in State law or City Code. The general meaning is a relatively efficient space or shape with all areas physically connected, without any breaks or divisions and with minimal offshoots or long, thin extensions. In addition to being compact and contiguous, the expansion area must be demarcated in some fashion to clearly indicate the area where the alcoholic beverages are allowed to be consumed or served. The City is working on an information sheet for applicants to provide guidance and examples of what will be acceptable compact and contiguous space, acceptable severe weather plan, and other details.

April 28 was the 1st Reading of Ordinance and Council approved. Tonight is the 2nd Reading of Ordinance and notice was mailed to all current on-sale liquor license holders with a copy of the proposed Ordinance. May 27 is the 3rd Reading of Ordinance.

Council Member Gliva asked for confirmation that, under permit exemption applicability, item C states that The Best Foundation and the Mayday 5K are exempt.

Administrator Wilson explained that this is an existing exemption from the Large Assembly Permit that has been in place for years, and that they did not set out to overhaul the Large Assembly Permit but simply added the underlying sentence that follows it.

Council Member Gliva explained that she asked the question because she believes the event has not been held for the past three or four years.

Administrator Wilson said that if the Council wanted to direct a change, which could be done, but the language is existing, and they did not set out to modernize the Large Assembly Permit, only to add an exception to it.

Motion to approve 2nd Reading of an Ordinance Amending City Code Related to Temporary Expansion of Premise for On-Sale Liquor License Holders by Gliva, second by Scales.**Ayes: 5****Nays: 0 Motion carried.****8. PUBLIC COMMENT:**

Sandy Honerbrink, a resident at 2318 75th Street East, urged caution with grant spending and called for strict financial oversight. She requested the Council send letters opposing new voting equipment without an independent audit and to object to fluoridated water due to health concerns for children. She criticized the lack of public input on a recent trail project, questioned duplicating parks and trails, and expressed frustration over rising taxes. She also encouraged more community engagement and communication from officials and urged protection of local housing zoning authority.

9. MAYOR AND COUNCIL COMMENTS

Mayor Dietrich told Council Member Murphy that if he could not make the Commission appointments, he could share his thoughts in writing and consider how he would like to engage with the Council, then discuss those ideas with Administrator Wilson.

Council Member Murphy agreed and apologized for being absent.

Mayor Dietrich responded that it was completely understandable and stressed that she wants Council Member Murphy to stay involved in the process.

10. ADJOURN:**Motion to Adjourn at 10:05 p.m. by T’Kach, second by Gliva.****Ayes: 5****Nays: 0 Motion carried.**

Minutes prepared by Recording Secretary Tammy Greenlee