



Real People. Real Solutions.

2035 County Road D East  
Maplewood, MN 55109-5314

Ph: (651) 704-9970  
Fax: (651) 704-9971  
Bolton-Menk.com

## MEMORANDUM

Date: January 17, 2017  
To: Prior Lake City Council  
From: Mike Warner, PE  
Subject: 2017 Street Reconstruction Project – Sycamore Trail Improvements  
Feasibility Report Amendments  
City of Prior Lake, MN  
City Project No. TRN17-000005  
BMI Project No.: T18.112541

On September 26, 2016, the Prior Lake City Council adopted Resolution 16-121, which ordered the preparation of a Feasibility Report for the 2017 Street Reconstruction Project Sycamore Trail Improvements. The report was presented to the City Council and was accepted at the November 28, 2016 City Council meeting.

At that meeting, it was noted by City Staff the Project Funding Table presented in the Feasibility Report had been updated. The storm sewer costs were being shown to be funded by the Ad Valorem (property taxes) instead of from the Water Quality Fund. The corrected funding table was presented to the City Council during the feasibility report presentation. The corrected funding table is shown below:

Table 6 - Project Funding				
ITEM	PROJECT COSTS			
	OPTION 1	OPTION 2	OPTION 3	OPTION 4
Ad Valorem	\$209,694	\$259,296	\$240,378	\$319,740
Assessments (40%)	\$151,348	\$184,416	\$171,804	\$228,792
Utility Fund - Sewer	\$40,100	\$40,100	\$40,100	\$40,100
Utility Fund - Water	\$201,830	\$201,830	\$201,830	\$201,830
Water Quality Fund	\$37,328	\$37,328	\$37,328	\$43,448
Assessment Roll (Per Unit)	\$9,459.25	\$11,526.00	\$10,737.75	\$12,710.67
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$640,300</b>	<b>\$722,970</b>	<b>\$691,440</b>	<b>\$833,910</b>

It was also brought to City Staff’s attention the signature page from the neighborhood petition was not included in the feasibility report Appendix D: Resident Questionnaire’s. Exhibit A to this memo is the petition and signature page.

I hereby certify that this plan, specification, or report was prepared by me or under my direct supervision and that I am a duly Registered Professional Engineer under the laws of the State of Minnesota.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Michael R. Warner, P.E.

44693  
Reg. No.

January 17, 2017  
Date

## Exhibit A

### SYCAMORE TRAIL UPGRADE PRIORITIES

October 2016

We the owners of the property (signatures below) of the section of Sycamore Trail from the location where it narrows at the sharp curve, to the end are in support of the proposed 2017 reconstruction project, but would like to offer the following recommendations. These are made in the interest of minimizing project cost, and minimizing intrusion onto neighborhood properties.

- 1) The current road alignment should remain unchanged except for an increase in the curve radius at the transition from the wider street to our section of the street. This sharp curve has been the site of accidents (most recently in September of this year, 2015 when a car sideswiped landscaping boulders in the front yard of an adjacent property and left the street blocked for hours). The current alignment serves all properties well, and by maintaining it we eliminate potential controversy between residents.
- 2) We neither need nor require a turn-around at the end of the street. There has never been a turn-around, and to the best of our knowledge it has never been a problem. Adding a turn-around would add cost, would be intrusive on adjoining properties, and would serve no meaningful purpose.
- 3) The current roadway driving surface varies in width from about 16 feet (at the sharp curve mentioned in item 2 above) to about 24 feet toward the street end. While we believe 16 feet is too narrow, 24 feet is more than adequate for this dead end street. There are numerous examples where the City has accepted and approved narrow dead end streets (some as narrow as 16 feet). In order to minimize cost, and minimize or eliminate intrusion into neighborhood yards, we would recommend a 20 foot width between the lawn sides of the concrete curb and gutter.
- 4) We would expect curb and gutter consistent with the other section of Sycamore.
- 5) We see no need for sidewalks, and it would be inconsistent to have them considering they do not exist in the adjacent areas.
- 6) While we support no-parking on both sides of the street, we would like to eliminate the excessive number of no-parking signs on the Street. Currently you can see as many as 4 or 5 signs from a single location. It would seem that one sign at the entrance to our section of the street saying "no street-side parking, no-turnaround" would be adequate. If that doesn't work to a satisfactory degree, additional signs could always be added later.
- 7) We would like the power/telephone lines buried for obvious reasons. The lines represent an intrusion on properties particularly where the street is narrow, and esthetically do nothing for the neighborhood.
- 8) We accept the need for assessment, but expect the City to take into account the following factors in good faith to minimize the amount: (A) For decades the City provided NO maintenance of the road, forcing residents to pay for 100 percent of the blacktopping costs from contractors, and to purchase their own bags of asphalt for patching; (B) The neighborhood is generally supportive of the project and

will work cooperatively with the City to make it a positive project instead of letting it turn into a City-neighborhood conflict.

9) We would recommend a unit assessment instead of an assessment based upon front-yard footage, and it is our hope that if a small piece of current front yards is required for the modest amount of street widening, that neighbors would deed the land to the City at no cost.

10) We would like an understanding with the City that neighbors who may want driveway replacement would be permitted to negotiate with the City's contractor for installation while the contractor is on site, understanding of course that the neighbor would be responsible for the driveway cost and that driveways projects could not interfere with the City's street upgrade project.

11) We have concern about the fact that surface water from streets and driveways dump directly into the lake. We encourage the City to consider options that would minimize or eliminate lake contamination caused by this circumstance.

12) We would like a best effort made to protect the healthy trees that are roadside.

If the City's upgrade plans address the above considerations, and the proposed assessment is reasonable, we would not expect assessment appeals.

<u>NAME</u>	<u>ADDRESS</u>	
WILLIAM B. HACKETT	3508 SYCAMORE TRL	<del>William B. Hackett</del>
ELLEN M. HACKETT	3508 SYCAMORE TRL	Ellen M. Hackett
Wes Mader	3470 Sycamore Trail	Wes Mader
Charlotte Mader	3470 Sycamore trail	Charlotte Mader
MIKE SPANIER	3483 SYCAMORE TRAIL	M. Spanier
KATHY SPANIER	3483 SYCAMORE	Kathy Spanier
Rob Warmka	3498 Sycamore Trail	Rob Warmka
Cheri Warmka	3498 Sycamore Trail SW	Cheri Warmka
Laura Robinson	3486 Sycamore trail SW	Laura Robinson
Kevin Robinson	3486 Sycamore trail SW	Kevin Robinson
Tammie Hanson	3469 Sycamore trail SW	Tammie Hanson
TIM HANSON	3469 Sycamore trail SW	Tim Hanson
Dan Choudek	3454 Sycamore trail	Dan Choudek
Chris Short	3442 Sycamore TR.	Chris Short
Ron Johnson	3420 Sycamore TR.	Ron Johnson
Peg Johnson	3420 Sycamore TR	Peg Johnson
Ron Curry	3402 Sycamore Trail SW	Ron Curry
Kathy Curry	3402 Sycamore Trail SW	Kathy Curry
<del>John Sunderland</del>	3415 SYCAMORE TRAIL SW	John Sunderland
Kate Sunderland	3415 Sycamore trail SW	Kate Sunderland
Erin Eichten	3406 " " "	Erin Eichten
Tom Eichten	3406 " " "	Tom Eichten
DARLA BAUCHLE	3437 " " "	Darla Bauchle
JOHN BAUCHLE	3437 " " "	John Bauchle
Giff & Nancy Davenport	3478 Sycamore trail SW	Nancy Davenport