



City of Inver Grove Heights Pavement Management Citizen Task Force

Meeting 8

March 10, 2022 - 4:00 to 6:00 p.m.

The eighth meeting of the Pavement Management CTF will be held at the **CITY HALL**. The meeting is public. Given Covid numbers have dropped below levels seen prior to virtual meetings, the City intends for this meeting to be held **in person**. If you have issues or concerns regarding an in-person meeting, please contact City Administrator Kris Wilson, copied in the meeting invite email.

Our meeting goals: Review three chapters of the draft report and find consensus on CTF recommendations and chapter content. Also finish discussing aspects of the City assessment policies and provide any additional inputs or thoughts on assessment levels, percentages, and funding alternatives.

AGENDA

| | |
|-------------|--|
| 4:00 - 4:10 | Welcome |
| 4:10 - 4:15 | Instructions and break into small groups |
| 4:15 - 5:00 | Small Group discussion: "Rural" roadway chapter comments Communication chapter comments Utility chapter comments Additional conversation about assessments |
| 5:00 - 5:50 | Reconvene CTF and determine consensus and minority comments (Possible 10min presentation on road diets, depending on time) |
| 5:50 - 6:00 | General discussion, meeting schedule |
| 6:00 pm | Adjourn |

Your feedback is appreciated!

If you have any questions or concerns regarding the meeting format or content, please contact Klay Eckles at keckles@wsbeng.com.



Pavement Management Citizen Task Force Meeting Notes February 17, 2022

Attending: Kelly Kayser (C), Cassie McKenna (VC), Kerry Karinen (VC), Kelton Glewwe, Dan Haak, Craig Kromrey, Paul Mandell, Kevin Sethre, Lisa Snell, Mary T’Kach, Ted Zochert

Absent: Brenda Dietrich, John Murphy, Rick Ellis

Staff/Consultants: Kris Wilson (Administrator), Brian Connolly (Public Works Director), Steve Dodge (Asst. City Eng.), Amy Hove (Finance Director), Klay Eckles (consultant), Alex Mollenkamp (consultant)

Kelly

- Welcome and a look forward to the discussion portion of the task force’s time together – input from everyone is encouraged and desired
- Staff and consultants are aware of some requests for more information on a number of topics that have not been fulfilled. Kelly offered the thought that task force members should keep note of these requests and reach out to Klay or Staff individually if they feel that information is necessary for their analysis, and to also consider whether some of the information might bring too much detail into the group’s discussion.

Klay

- Reviewed a high-level financial plan that would get the city to an average PCI of 70 in 15-years if they spend \$9 million per year on pavement management projects that maximize mileage.

Kelly

Split group into the following small groups for a discussion on funding and assessments:

Group 1: Cassie McKenna, Kevin Sethre, Mary T’Kach

Group 2: Kerry Karinen, Kelton Glewwe, Paul Mandell, Ted Zochert

Group 3: Kelly Kayser, Dan Haak, Craig Kromrey, Lisa Snell,

Group Discussion Conclusions regarding Stormwater Utility

Should the SWU fund cover a greater portion, or all of the storm system repairs as part of the PMP program?

General group consensus was that the stormwater utility fund should cover the expenses related to storm system repairs and should not be supplemented by the pavement management fund and assessments. Specifically, the task force understands that stormwater needs vary greatly by project, so it is generally agreed that the varying cost of stormwater improvements should not impact the assessment amounts from project to project by being included in the assessable portion of the improvements..

Would the CTF be in favor of raising SWU rates across the community if it would provide for a steadier funding source to offset the stormwater costs associated with pavement management projects?

The task force is generally in favor of raising stormwater utility rates in order to accomplish the goal outlined in the answer to the previous. The group supports reviewing the equity of the current “split-rate”

policy. Special emphasis was put on the fact that the stormwater utility rate in the Northwest Area is higher than the rest of the city, and that it seems appropriate for those users outside of the Northwest Area to pay a stormwater utility fee more in line with rates charged in the NW Area. The task force was made aware that a city-wide rate study may be conducted in the near term which could result in a similar recommendation.

Any additional comments specifically related to SWU and its relationship to pavement management?

None at this time.

Group Discussion Conclusions regarding Funding

The City deems having several different funding sources that raise revenue for the PMP as beneficial because it spreads out the costs in different ways.

What are your thoughts on this practice?

The task force is generally in favor of the practice of obtaining funding from multiple sources.

Some members felt that having multiple sources seems less transparent with regard to residents knowing exactly how much they are paying toward pavement management. One member commented that it would be preferable to have actual "line items" on annual property tax statements, so residents would know exactly what their taxes were being spent on. Finance Director, Amy Hove, commented that the county primarily guides what information will appear on the tax statement. It was mentioned that more communication would better inform residents in this area; the group will discuss this further with Charter task #8.

Are there any sources you feel are under-utilized?

One member offered that franchise fees is under-utilized. Others did not have strong opinions; the task force recognizes that this funding source is "locked" into certain terms

Any that are over-utilized?

In some cases the task force feels that assessments may be over-utilized. There was discussion about whether the cost of construction (and therefore the cost of assessments) is outpacing the general public's ability to pay, most notably on the reconstruction projects.

Any additional comments specifically related to funding sources for pavement management?

General consensus was reached that the task force is in favor of continuing to use funds that the city generates from the Host Community Fund. However, there was not consensus on whether to consider getting more or less funding from that source.

Klay Eckles offered that one rationale for using this fund is the fact that garbage trucks add wear and tear to the City's roads when they bring refuse to the landfills. Some discussion followed about limiting the number of trucks in neighborhoods (organized hauling). And a thought was raised to encourage neighborhoods to organize themselves to reduce road damage.

Consideration was given to the idea of increasing the general tax levy in an effort to bonding needs. There was also thought that it could also address funding challenges when ever-increasing project costs outpace residents' ability to pay large assessment amounts.

Group Discussion Conclusions regarding Assessments

What are your thoughts on the use of assessments?

The task force supports the continued use of assessments as a means of funding pavement management. There was also broad consensus that the assessment policy needs to be applied consistently for each project. Members noted that they have memory of assessment amounts being reduced by City Council at the Assessment Hearing due to property owner objections. They also noted that it appears that some project assessments are higher than others due to the stormwater needs and the stormwater utility fund's inability to fund itself. Both are examples, in the task force's opinion, of the assessment amounts not being consistent from project to project.

What are your thoughts on the percentages in the current assessment policy when you consider the amounts of recent assessments?

Some members did not feel the assessment percentages were a big issue because assessments for recent projects have either been equal to the per-policy assessment amount (and below the benefit analysis cap) or have been capped at the amount determined in the benefit analysis.

If assessment revenues were to be reduced where would the city get additional revenue?

This question will be dealt with at the next meeting.

Any specific comments on the city assessment policy (see above)?

Task force inquired about possibly tying the repayment term of an assessment to the dollar amount of the assessment. Overall opinion was not apparent.

Any other comments on overall financing plan for PMP?

The task force generally agrees that new funding sources for the PMP should be explored. However, some on the task force would like to note that special consideration should be made for businesses

One member floated the idea of charging a fee or tax on parking spaces at local businesses. Some members opposed this and other funding options that would specifically target businesses, stating that we don't want to discourage new businesses from coming to the City or unfairly burden those that are already here.

Please share any thoughts or concerns you have about the Rural Roadway Chapter

Homework

- Will be sent out, with special attention to draft chapters of the report that have been written.

Meetings

- Upcoming meeting dates:
March 10th & 31st
April 14th & April 28th (placeholder)

Additional Notes - None
