

**Roseville Public Works, Environment and  
Transportation Commission**

**Agenda Item**

---

**Date:** June 23, 2020

**Item No: 5**

---

**Item Description:** Approval of the February 27, 2020 Public Works Commission Minutes

---

Attached are the minutes from the February 27, 2020 meeting.

**Recommended Action:**

Motion approving the minutes of February 27, 2020, subject to any necessary corrections or revision.

Move: \_\_\_\_\_

Second: \_\_\_\_\_

Ayes: \_\_\_\_\_

Nays: \_\_\_\_\_

# Roseville Public Works, Environment and Transportation Commission Meeting Minutes

---

---

Tuesday, February 27, 2020, at 6:30 p.m.  
City Council Chambers, 2660 Civic Center Drive  
Roseville, Minnesota 55113

---

---

1       **1. Introduction / Roll Call**

2       Chair Cihacek called the meeting to order at approximately 6:30 p.m. and at his  
3       request, Public Works Director Marc Culver called the roll.

4  
5       **Present:**       Chair Brian Cihacek; Vice Chair Joe Wozniak; and Members Karen  
6       Huiett, Nancy Misra, Shane Spencer and Youth Member Jan Lynch

7  
8       **Absent:**       Member Stephanie Hammer, Michael Joyce and Youth Member Jan  
9       Lynch (Excused)

10  
11       **Staff Present:**   Public Works Director Marc Culver; Assistant City Engineer  
12       Luke Sandstrom, and Environmental Specialist Ryan  
13       Johnson

14  
15       **2. Public Comments**

16  
17       **3. Approval of January 28, 2020 Meeting Minutes**

18       *Comments and corrections to draft minutes had been submitted by PWETC*  
19       *commissioners prior to tonight's meeting and those revisions incorporated into the*  
20       *draft presented in meeting materials.*

21  
22       Vice Chair Wozniak indicated he sent a few minor changes to the minutes to Mr.  
23       Culver by email.

24  
25       Mr. Culver noted those changes have been incorporated into the digital minute  
26       record.

27  
28       **Motion**

29       **Member Wozniak moved, Member Spencer seconded, approval of the**  
30       **January 28, 2020 meeting minutes as amended.**

31  
32       **Ayes: 5**

33       **Nays: 0**

34       **Motion carried.**

35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80

**4. Communication Items**

Public Works Director Marc Culver provided a brief review and update on projects and maintenance activities listed in the staff report dated February 27, 2020. He also mentioned the Star Tribune article regarding Ramsey County and Washington County's likely future efforts for organics composting and curbside collection.

Chair Cihacek asked if the County had any residual rates (nonorganic materials).

Mr. Culver indicated he had the same thought but has not heard anything. He asked Vice Chair Wozniak if he had any insight on the residual or waste that has been found in the streams.

Vice Chair Wozniak indicated he did not but could find that out and bring back to the Commission at the next meeting. He was sure the County received that information from the compost site where waste currently goes. He noted the food scrap sites will remain open, as plans are now, with the roll out of curbside food scrap collection.

Member Misra inquired if there was any significant difference between what is collected in Ramsey County and the City of Minneapolis.

Vice Chair Wozniak indicated he did not know that.

Mr. Culver explained there was a number in the article for the City of Minneapolis, but it was for the entire city. It was hard to make a comparison because no per capita number was given. He noted it is a much more established program.

Member Spencer thought it would also be interesting to see how Roseville compares to cities of its size, the Metro. Is Roseville in line with other cities.

Mr. Culver mentioned the census and updated the Commission on the status.

Chair Cihacek asked if the Met Council has released its tool for emissions measurement yet.

Mr. Culver indicated he was not aware of that. He noted the city has just subscribed to a tool called Streetlight, mostly for traffic counting but it uses cellular data to count traffic and do quick OD studies and Mr. Sandstrom has been playing around with it.

Mr. Culver explained Xcel Energy came out with a press release regarding resiliency. He reviewed the information with the Commission.

Chair Cihacek updated the Commission on the Forestry Task Force.

81 Vice Chair Wozniak inquired if there was much discussion about addressing the  
82 tree diversifying issue.

83  
84 Chair Cihacek explained part of the conclusion that came about was that there is a  
85 jurisdictional issue inside 706 in which the Park Board is apparently given some  
86 capacities as a tree board but it is not clear in 706 what that means because the next  
87 section states the city overall has responsibility for planting and planning.

88  
89 Chair Cihacek reviewed other items that were discussed at the Forestry Task Force  
90 meeting.

91  
92 Mr. Culver indicated the city Council interviewed two candidates for Chair  
93 Cihacek's open position and Council will be appointing those members on March  
94 9<sup>th</sup>.

95  
96 Vice Chair Wozniak explained in January he received an email from a resident and  
97 thought other Commission Members did as well regarding the poor driving  
98 conditions when snowing on the on-ramps to Hwy 36 at Rice Street. The resident  
99 did not want a response but did want to voice their concerns about the road and how  
100 dangerous it is when it snows. He indicated he was bringing it up because he was  
101 not sure what to do when the Commission receives an email from a resident at the  
102 Commission level.

103  
104 Mr. Culver was fairly certain that staff responded to the resident to indicate the  
105 email was forwarded on to MnDOT.

106  
107 Chair Cihacek thought staff should be the first communicator in those instances and  
108 if needed staff will reach out to the Commission for a response.

109  
110 Member Misra thought as development occurs in the city certain intersections and  
111 roads will become more congested and she wondered how the city is looking at  
112 that.

113  
114 Mr. Culver thought the Commission could have an entire meeting on this. He  
115 reviewed what the city currently does with new developments and the surrounding  
116 intersections.

## 117 118 **5. Sump Pump Enforcement**

119 Assistant City Engineer Luke Sandstrom provided a brief review of the Sump Pump  
120 Ordinance. He noted city staff began an Inflow/Infiltration (I/I) flow monitoring  
121 study in May 2017. With three years' worth of sewer flow data staff would like the  
122 Commission to discuss how to incorporate this data into how the city enforces the  
123 new ordinance.

124  
125 Mr. Sandstrom made a presentation to the Commission.

126

127 Member Misra asked what the cost would be of typical corrections if the sump  
128 pump does have a direct connection.

129  
130 Mr. Sandstrom explained on the cheaper side, if the sump pump pipe is running to  
131 the sewer or to the laundry basket it is a couple hundred dollars at most. The more  
132 expensive cost would be removing the foundation drain which is a more invasive  
133 repair.

134  
135 Chair Cihacek asked who would pay for the inspection.

136  
137 Mr. Sandstrom indicated most cities have an inspection fee so the resident would  
138 pay that fee.

139  
140 Chair Cihacek thought if someone had a third-party inspection done when selling  
141 their home, the housing inspection should include a review of the sump pump  
142 connection. If this were to be made a policy, the policy could state an inspection  
143 must be done when selling a home either by a third party or by the city.

144  
145 Vice Chair Wozniak asked if Chair Cihacek was talking about requiring a home  
146 inspection as a condition of selling a home.

147  
148 Chair Cihacek indicated that was correct but just for a sump pump, not necessarily  
149 an entire house inspection. Many people prior to selling or buying a house will get  
150 a house inspection done so at that point it makes sense for this requirement.

151  
152 Member Huiett explained she would not want this to be the one-off thing, if there  
153 are no other requirements at point of sale. She wondered if there are any other  
154 requirements that this would be lumped into for point of sale homes.

155  
156 Vice Chair Wozniak explained his questions was on the same line of thought. Is  
157 the sump pump connection to sanitary sewer a code violation.

158  
159 Mr. Sandstrom indicated it is against the ordinance so would be in violation.

160  
161 Member Huiett asked what happens if the sump pump is connected to storm sewer.

162  
163 Mr. Culver explained the city still would not let anyone connect to the public storm  
164 water system without some sort of permit or permission.

165  
166 Member Misra asked if staff had any idea of how many sump pumps are there in  
167 the city.

168  
169 Mr. Culver explained based on some observations made during meter replacements,  
170 when the city did a large-scale meter replacement a few years ago, staff believes  
171 there are ten percent of the households have an illegally connected sump pump.

172

173 Mr. Culver explained one option is to inspect the sump pump when doing meter  
174 replacements which staff is a little hesitant on doing because the resident may then  
175 refuse access to the meter for fear of the city catching something else. He noted if  
176 the resident does not allow the city access to the home meter the ordinance does  
177 allow the city to charge a “denial of access” fee which would be implemented onto  
178 the water bill quarterly. Staff does not want to discourage residents from making  
179 the appointment for meter replacement.

180  
181 Member Huiett explained she was concerned with the messaging of catching illegal  
182 sump pump connections and thought the better point of view is addressing the rain  
183 event in the most sustainable ways with several strategies that could be done instead  
184 of the fear of it being an illegal thing. Maybe give alternatives to sump pumps such  
185 as rain gardens and list those. She thought the broader message should be more to  
186 the point.

187  
188 Vice Chair Wozniak indicated a number of other cities have tried the different  
189 approaches that were outlined in the presentation and he wondered if there was any  
190 feedback from the other cities on what, if any impact, it had on I/I in those cities.

191  
192 Mr. Sandstrom explained he worked for West St. Paul for two years and the city  
193 started with a blanket policy because the city had a very large amount that had to  
194 be offset due to the Met Council surcharge. The city went away from the blanket  
195 policy because the city required sewer repairs to be done and found the roads had  
196 many patches and looked like quilts and subsequently had a lot of issues with the  
197 resulting pavement conditions. He reviewed the process West St. Paul went  
198 through.

199  
200 Mr. Culver indicated some of the communities have had more interaction with the  
201 Met Council and the Met Council has come down on them harder with more fees  
202 for flow exceeding what Met Council allows. He noted Roseville has been more  
203 aggressive with its sewer linings and has done other things to significantly lower  
204 the flow rates. The city is making progress on that.

205  
206 Member Misra asked if Roseville had much residential drain tile.

207  
208 Mr. Culver thought a majority of homes in Roseville have internal drainage  
209 systems, like foundation drain tiles. Those would be connected to a sump pump.

210  
211 Member Misra asked if that was prevalent in Roseville.

212  
213 Mr. Culver thought it was.

214  
215 **6. Sustainable Roseville Update**  
216 Public Works Director Marc Culver explained in 2012, Roseville took a more active  
217 role in making the city more sustainable. Staff will look for input from the

218 Commission on what to pursue, what to prioritize and what to bring to the city  
219 Council for recommendations for further action.

220  
221 Environmental Specialist Ryan Johnson presented the information to the  
222 Commission.

223  
224 Mr. Culver noted there will be an intern in house full time working on these items  
225 for eleven months. This person will be able to help staff and this Commission on  
226 many items to help Roseville become more sustainable and will be able to do some  
227 outreach into the community.

228  
229 Vice Chair Wozniak explained there is a program through the Port Authority that  
230 would allow energy improvement costs to be placed on their property taxes. (the  
231 program is called MinnPACE. More information can be found here  
232 <https://www.sppa.com/energy-financing/minnpace> )  
233

234 Mr. Culver indicated the one he was familiar with on that was specific to solar but  
235 was not sure if it extended to other energy things. He noted this is a great program  
236 and the city needs to make people aware of it.

237  
238 Chair Cihacek explained another thing the intern could work on is helping develop  
239 buying pools for a community solar garden. He explained how this could work for  
240 the city and other communities or private entities. This might help the city  
241 accelerate solar power as well as the School District, corporations or other entities.

242  
243 Member Misra asked if there has been any solar energy production this past winter.

244  
245 Mr. Johnson indicated the city has seen a little bit. There have been some snowy,  
246 icy conditions but have been producing a little bit. It will be interesting to see  
247 through February and then see how 2020 looks as well.

248  
249 Member Spencer asked how the city finds the interns.

250  
251 Mr. Johnson explained the city will work through MNTAP which already has a  
252 pool of interested students. The same will be done through Minnesota Green Corp.  
253 which is through the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency.

254  
255 Chair Cihacek asked if anyone in the public had input on this topic.

256  
257 Ms. Tammy McGehee explained she wanted to forward Bob Willmus's message  
258 because he came to speak on the sump pump and was not able to speak but wanted  
259 to point out that there was a charge of \$250 to get the inspection in West St. Paul  
260 and Golden Valley and in addition to that there needs to be a plumber there so the  
261 entire cost was around \$500.00 to get this point of sale inspection so Mr. Willmus  
262 very much favored the current plan and not doing the point of sale with the added  
263 expense.

264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300

Ms. Donna Peterson, 2436 Pascal, indicated it was good to hear about the intern possibility going forward. She thought getting a Green Corp member here will be fantastic and she thought the project Mr. Johnson laid out that the intern will be working on is very interesting. She indicated on Partners for Energy she was not quite sure what the needs will be at the beginning. She hoped that there will be some way that Resilient Roseville could factor into it or play a role.

**7. Items for Next Meeting – March 2020**

Discussion ensued regarding the March PWETC agenda:

- Update on city Ordinance Changes – Chapter 800 Public Works; Chapter 700 Public Ways and Private Property
- Environmental Assessment for Roseville

Mr. Culver explained he will be sending out the link for the Environmental Assessment for the next meeting.

Vice Chair Wozniak wondered with the EAW if the Commissioners should be prepared to submit comments.

Mr. Culver explained the public comments go to the EQB (Environmental Quality Board) and then the EQB distributes the comments to several State agencies and the surrounding communities.

Chair Cihacek did not think that the Commission should send comments but as individuals, comments can be sent to the EQB because he did not think the Commission would want to possibly be in conflict with the city Council.

**8. Adjourn**

**Motion**  
**Member Huiett moved, Member Misra seconded, adjournment of the meeting at approximately 8:11 p.m.**

**Ayes: 5**  
**Nays: 0**  
**Motion carried.**