BOARD OF RAMSEY

COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

STATE OF MINNESOTA

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

EUGENE A. MONICK

COUNTY AUDITOR



CHAIRMAN JOHN E. DAUBNEY RTHUR T. GIBBONS HAROLD F. GOODRICH

COMMISSIONERS

GEORGE J. VAVOULIS

ROY P. NADEAU ED SALVERDA DONALD F. WIEGAND

RAMSEY COUNTY COURT HOUSE SAINT PAUL MINNESOTA 55102

February 14, 1966

Mr. Deane R. Anklan, County Engineer Mr. William B. Randall, County Attorney Attention Thomas M. Quayle

Gentlemen:

The Board of County Commissioners, in session on February 14, 1966, received petitions of the Villages of Roseville and New Brighton that the Ramsey County Board order the repair and improvement of County Ditches 2, 3 and 5 within the villages.

The Board also received a petition by the Village of Roseville seeking to have the Board of County Commissioners construct an outlet in Ramsey County Ditch No. 5 at the intersection of Minnesota Transfer Railway right-of-way within the Village of New Brighton.

The Board of County Commissioners directed that the County Auditor and County Attorney notice all matters for hearing at the earliest practical time.

The petition for an outlet in County Ditch No. 5 was also referred to the County Attorney and County Engineer for study and recommendation.

Copies of all three notices are forwarded herewith.

We are requesting that the County Attorney prepare the form of notice or notices and advise this office as to the means of noticing the hearing pursuant to the statute governing.

JDS:is attach.

	NAME	COPY
	D. R. A.	
	A. D. C.	
	K. A.	1
	W. J. B.	
	J. F. C.	
	R. I. C.	
	W. V. C.	
	M. D. K.	Z
,	H. C. L.	
	F. N. S.	
	J. H. S.	
	H. A. W.	
	K. E. W.	
-	EHE	

Yours very truly,

EUGENE A. MONICK, County Auditor

Swan, Executive Secretary

Missiphel

STATE OF MINNESOTA)
COUNTY OF RANGEY

PETITION OF THE VILLAGE OF MEW BRIGHTON TO HAPROVE RANGEY COUNTY DITCHES NOS. 2, 3 and 5.

TO: THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIO ERS OF RAMSEY COUNTY, MINNESOTA.

Pursuant to Laws 1957, Chapter 682, the Village of Hou Brighton, Minnesota, does hereby Patition said County Board as follows:

- To repair and improve Ramsey County Ditches Nos. 2
 3 and 5, lying and being within the Villages of Roseville and New Brighton, Ramsey County, Minnesota.
- 2. That it is necessary and expedient and requested that such ditches be improved to allow additional storm sewers constructed and to be constructed to use maid ditches as outlets, and it is necessary that such ditches be improved to prevent flooding of large areas of land within the boundaries of the Villages of Roseville and New Brighton.

Dated this 10 day of February, 1966

VILLAGE OF HEW BRIGHTON

Its Mayor

and

Its Manager

STATE OF MINNESOTA)
)SS
COUNTY OF RAMSEY)

PETITION OF VILLAGE OF ROSEVILLE TO IMPROVE RAMSEY COUNTY DITCHES NOS. 2, 3 and 5.

TO:

THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF RAMSEY COUNTY, MINNESOTA:

Pursuant to Laws 1957, Chapter 682, the Village of Roseville, Minnesota, petition said County Board as follows:

- l. To repair and improve Ramsey County Ditches Nos. 2, 3 and 5, lying and being within the Villages of Roseville and New Brighton, Ramsey County, Minnesota.
- 2. To engage the engineering firm of Banister Engineering Co., 310 Snelling Avenue, Saint Paul, Minnesota, to draw such plans and specifications as may be necessary, and to estimate the cost of such work, to proceed in accordance with Laws 1957, Chapter 682 of the State of Minnesota.
- 3. It is necessary and expedient that such ditches be improved to allow additional storm sewers to be constructed and to use said ditches as outlets.

Dated this 17 day of Manual 1966.

VILLAGE OF ROSEVILLE, MINNESOTA

By (o. V.)
Its Mayor

By Ill Cumber.

Íts Manager

STATE OF MINNESOTA)

COUNTY OF RAMSEY)

PETITION OF THE VILLAGE OF ROSEVILLE, TO CONSTRUCT AN OUTLET TO RAMSEY COUNTY DITCH NO. 5.

TO:

THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF RAMSEY COUNTY, MINNESOTA:

Pursuant to M.S.A. §106.531, the Village of Roseville, Minnesota, petitions the said County Board as follows:

1. To grant permission to the Village of Roseville to construct an outlet in Ramsey County Ditch No. Five (5), to be used as an outlet for the storm sewer system to be constructed within the Village of Roseville and to drain the following described real property lying within the Village of Roseville, Ramsey County, Minnesota, to-wit:

Section Eight (8), Township Twenty-nine (29), Range Twenty-three (23), Ramsey County, Minnesota, and that part of Section Five (5), Township Twenty-nine (29), Range Twenty-three (23), Ramsey County, Minnesota, lying Westerly of the Minnesota Transfer Railway Company right of way.

Said outlet to Ramsey County Ditch No. Five (5) is requested at the intersection of County Ditch No. Five (5) and the right of way of the Minnesota Transfer Railway Company lying within the Village of New Brighton, Ramsey County, Minnesota.

- 2. To have the County proceed pursuant to M.S.A. §106.531.
- 3. It is necessary for the public interests for the Village of Roseville to construct a storm sewer system to drain the area

of land described above, and there is no suitable outlet to drain said land other than through Ramsey County Ditch No. Five (5) as requested herein.

Dated this 17th day of _______, 1966.

VILLAGE OF ROSEVILLE, MINNESOTA

Its Mayor

Its Manager

December 19, 1966

Board of County Commissioners c/o Mr. Eugene A. Monick, County Auditor

Attention Mr. James D. Swan Executive Secretary

Gentlemen:

We recommend that the report of Milner W. Carley & Associates on County Ditch 3 be accepted and the recommendations and proposals be approved by the Board of County Commissioners for additional hearings with the understanding that certain modifications may be necessary before construction.

Prior to final petition for this construction, we would recommend that additional investigation be given to redirecting the outlet of Silver Lake so it would follow the modifications of the Village of New Brighton in 1965. This would eliminate the north-south conduit along the east side of Silver Lake Road as shown in Carley's report.

Yours very truly,

Deane R. Anklan, P.E. County Engineer

DRA:s

From: Marvin Kotillinek

Subject: Silver Lake outlet to County Ditch #3

On June 6, 1962 during the reconstruction of Silver Lake Road a new 24" sectional concrete pipe was placed at normal elevation (932.0) at the outlet. This discharges into a manhole entering ditch #3 at elevation 933.7 and into approximately 1850 feet of 15" clay tile draining Eastward. From From the lake elevation November 3, 1965 was 935.15.

is an apparent disagreement between the Village of New Brighton and the Village of St. Anthony regarding the responsibility and maintenance of this ditch which flows thru both villages. St. Anthony has maintained the ditch in both villages and New Prighton refuses any interest although they have permitted construction of an appartment complex and a school which has disrupted ditch flow. Mr. Raymond A. Hadk, Attorney for St. Anthony has appealed to this department for arbitration, On November 1, 1965, our district foreman, Mr. Harold Arcand was called to inspect the lake outlet that had been meticulously plugged with a fiber glass cover approximately 3" thick, sand bagged and wood braced. A field inspection of the entire ditch system was made by Mr. Harold Arcand, District Fareman, Mr. John Printon. St. Anthony Village Manager and Mr. Norbert Maher, St. Anthony maintenance foreman. The 15" clay tile ditch pipe was found broken in two places in the spartment construction area where recent grading has been done. Thus far the Village of New Brighton has refused to direct the building contractor to repair any ditch demage. Leck of cooperation has alto been displayed in past construction. At Cakwood Drive and Silver Lane earth fill from the new St. Anthony Elementary School in the Village of New Brighton filled the open portion of ditch No. 3 and was alsoned by St. Anthony Maintenance personnel. Waste material from the school construction site was placed

in a	Low are	ea which diverte	d the ditch a	dignment causing e	rosion to t	the Soo Lin	re
Raily	aey embe	ankmeat. This m	ay be called	te attention soon	by railway	officials.	<u> </u>
	- ·		•	n Silver Tane whic	, .		
-Lest	-se-son	utilities were	con struct ed a	n Silver Tane which	h h andles -	oth villag	es
This	was don	ne lov New Bodishda	on who in tur	n refused to resto	re the rose	'. It has	since
			Anna San San San San San San San San San		2		<u>D</u> 2.3500
been	ebondon	1 6 d•		i de la company			
I wil	Ll incl i	ide pictures tak	en by Mr. Hay	old Arcand of the	outlet obst	ruction	
and d	li tá n ds	crege as describe	ed above, Al	so, there are pict	ures taken	by a resid	ent
showi	ing wate	r conditions of	last spring	that can be availa	ble for vie	wing by	, ,
yours	alf or	others.		And the second s			
100	Seledon com						ere, e protestados.
-lhis	informa	iden was given t	o our Distri	et foreman and I h	ave not dis	scussed wit	h
eithe	er wille	ge the context (of this renor	t. However, I hav	e conveyed	than Nas	me and
0.5.012	<u>, i - 3 (ii - 3 - 3 - 3 - 3 - 3 - 3 - 3 - 3 - 3 -</u>		Ja varab 40,000	J. C. Allandia	<u>o oonvegea</u>	0214 0. 113 \$ 13	Loana
that	our res	ponsibility for	the ditch li	es only with in our	road right	-of-way.	- 1 A C S
	Mary Control		· On the second of the second				
		The end of the formation of the		State Committee to		produced a second	10-14-14
	Mark Mark		r ded i Dicha was pedware i was pe su Tin		Terminal Control	er i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i	.
-							
	a Agricus						
	A STATE OF THE STA		ringe militaria (1. et l.) Proet in	A STATE OF THE STA			24.5%
	ĝ*, , 100 € €	ille Markovi i nama problema properti	Care Selection of the Control				ing and a second
	Haraces To	e skilovi vide i ja godi elitekti vet	, esta esta político de la constante de la con	and the first period of the second		e personal de la companya de la comp	1.80
	1						i jest, je
	#7 1 14 1	<u> </u>				ing the second	
		diddin MAAA					····
	18.5						
				ger			- 1 - 2 - 2°

.