

Streets Committee Meeting

January 16, 2025 – 5:00 P.M.

Meeting Minutes

Call To Order at 5:00 pm

Members present included Tom Nelson, Jason Gorr, Jon Monnier, Craig O'Reilly, and Leonard Sodd. Council Liaison Steve Jensen, Public Works Supervisor Joe Zierden, Dave Reese and Nick Peterson of Widseth were also present.

Street Sign Discussion

Nick Peterson of Widseth presented information on street sign inventory and replacement options. He explained that many similar cities use a yearly sign replacement plan or age-based replacement plan. He recommended a 15-year replacement plan for Breezy Point, where signs 15 years or older would be considered for replacement in the next 5 years. This approach would not require additional data collection beyond what has already been gathered.

Joe Zierden asked if there would be cost savings by avoiding testing every sign individually. Nick confirmed this would likely result in savings. The savings would be incurred through less time spent testing signs. We would not be removing any of the previously billed time. Just wanted to make that clear.

The committee discussed the possibility of resurfacing existing sign blanks rather than full replacement. Joe noted they typically buy new signs, especially when damaged or stolen. He mentioned that many main road signs were updated to good standards in recent years.

The committee debated the merits of age-based replacement versus reflectivity testing. Joe expressed that setting an age guideline seemed adequate and would avoid recurring testing costs.

Dave Reese explained that retroreflectivity meters are expensive. He mentioned a third option of having an older person visually inspect signs at night, which is an approved method of testing, but recommended proceeding with the age-based approach for the initial replacement plan.

Zierden noted that sign maintenance is typically done when damage is noticed or complaints are received. He explained that straightening crooked signs is often a filler task in spring.

After discussion, the committee agreed to recommend the 15-year age-based replacement approach.

Nelson made a motion to go with the 15 year age limit for sign replacement and best practices for damaged signs. Gorr seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Sewer Line Televising Discussion

Peterson presented information on sewer line televising options. He explained that based on discussions with city staff, current budget and time constraints may not allow for a yearly televising plan of the entire sanitary sewer system. He recommended at minimum televising streets before full depth reclamation or reconstruction projects to address any sewer issues while pavement is removed. He noted they could create a plan based on the city's needs and budget.

Zierden explained that jetting provides good information on line conditions, but doesn't show groundwater infiltration like televising would. He noted most of their sewer lines are in good condition, being PVC installed in 1978 or newer. The committee discussed that televising is most beneficial for older clay or concrete pipes, which Breezy Point doesn't have many of.

The committee agreed televising during reconstruction projects and for known problem areas as needed was a reasonable approach, rather than a full system-wide plan. Joe noted their jetting program covers the system every 3 years, which is more frequent than many cities.

Nelson made a motion to approve the recommendation to consider televising roads during reconstructs or full depth reclamation projects and future planning for issue areas as needed. Gorr seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Draft Road Plan Overview

Draft Roads Capital Improvement Plan

Nick presented an overview of the draft road capital improvement plan. Key points included:

- Breezy Point has 44.5 total miles of paved roads
- The majority are rated as condition 2, but over 30% are rated 4 or 5 (poor condition)
- Higher rated roads are more expensive to improve per square yard
- Terminal and Red Oak roads may have higher costs if sewer extension is included
- Dove Street improvements in 2033 do not include costs for a potential trail
- The plan uses a minimalist approach of repaving/replacing roads as-is without widening or major upgrades
- Total estimated cost to improve all roads is \$18.2 million over 10 years
- The current road budget is not sufficient to keep up with needs as roads deteriorate

The committee discussed the importance of pursuing overlay projects before roads deteriorate to the point of needing full reconstruction, which is 3-4 times more expensive. They noted the challenge of educating the public on why roads that look "fine" need work.

Zierden explained the current road budget is \$300,000 per year, which is a significant increase from past years but still not enough long-term. The committee discussed the need to determine an appropriate annual funding level that taxpayers can support while allowing needed improvements.

Peterson presented information on gravel roads, noting 90% are 22 feet wide or less. Paving to meet the 22-foot minimum would increase costs. He recommended gradually increasing the gravel road maintenance budget.

The plan includes recommendations for potential new street lights at 5 intersections. The committee discussed street light requests are typically from individual residents rather than widespread demand. Costs and ongoing maintenance were noted as concerns.

For sanitary sewer, no major capital improvements are recommended currently outside of the potential Harbor View extension project being discussed separately.

For sidewalks and trails, potential projects include a trail on Dove Street and improvements to existing trails on Breezy Point Drive. ADA compliance upgrades would be needed for some existing trails.

The committee agreed the plan provides a good framework, but noted funding will be an ongoing challenge requiring council support. They discussed the importance of spreading out major projects over time to avoid all roads needing work simultaneously in the future.

Other

No additional items were discussed.

Adjourn

The Meeting adjourned at 6:00 pm.