

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

Agenda Item

Date: October 27, 2020

Item No: 3

Item Description: Approval of the September 22, 2020 Public Works Commission Minutes

Attached are the minutes from the September 22, 2020 meeting.

Recommended Action:

Motion approving the minutes of September 22, 2020, subject to any necessary corrections or revision.

Move: _____

Second: _____

Ayes: _____

Nays: _____

Roseville Public Works, Environment and Transportation Commission Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, September 22, 2020, at 6:30 p.m.
City Council Chambers, 2660 Civic Center Drive
Roseville, Minnesota 55113

*Pursuant to Minn. Stat. 13.D.021, Public Works, Environment
and Transportation Commission members, City Staff, and members of the
public participated in this meeting electronically due to the
COVID-19 pandemic.*

1 **1. Introduction / Roll Call**

2 Chair Wozniak 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 Joe Wozniak; Vice Chair Karen Huiett; and Members Jarrod
6 Cicha, Stephanie Hammer, Nancy Misra, Shane Spencer, and Youth
7 Commissioner Jana Lynch

8
9 **Absent:** Member (Excused)

10
11 **Staff Present:** Public Works Director Marc Culver; City
12 Engineer/Assistant Public Works Director Jesse
13 Freihammer; and Environmental Specialist Ryan Johnson

14
15 **2. Public Comments**

16 None

17
18 **3. Approval of August 25, 2020 Meeting Minutes**

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

22
23 Member Joyce noted on line one, introduction Chair Cihacek was listed rather than
24 Chair Wozniak.

25
26 Member Hammer arrived at 6:36 p.m.

27

28
29
30
31
32
33
34
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

Motion
Member Spencer moved, Member Hammer seconded, approval of the August 25, 2020 meeting minutes as amended.

Ayes: 7
Nays: 0
Motion carried.

4. Communication Items

City Engineer Jesse Freihammer provided a brief review and update on projects and maintenance activities listed in the staff report dated September 22, 2020.

Chair Wozniak asked if the conversion of the Rosedale ring road was a sign that the other work on Rosedale to demolish Herberger's and construct a hotel and a restaurant market, hotels, etc. is all moving forward or is it separate from that.

Mr. Freihammer thought it separate and was a long-term vision. He indicated he has not heard anything recently regarding that.

Chair Wozniak asked how this will alter the East entrance into Rosedale at Snelling because right now it is not a full two-way. He asked if this would change and will the City be involved.

Mr. Freihammer indicated every intersection will get modified and the East entrance will get modified the least because currently on Snelling a person can go both ways.

Public Works Director Marc Culver explained not all of the entrances will allow the one direction to turn left and might be the case with the East entrance. He indicated it is an interesting configuration.

Member Misra indicated she was curious about the development on Fairview by Rosedale. She noted the outlots were mentioned in the update.

Mr. Culver reviewed the retail development with the Commission and some of the restaurants/retail that will be going in.

Mr. Freihammer continued with the update.

Chair Wozniak explained the Commission received an email last week about the Roseville Business Council meeting which is on September 23, 2020 at 7:30 a.m. The meeting will have discussion about transit.

Mr. Culver updated the Commission on the meeting agenda.

73 Chair Wozniak wondered if any Commission Members were able to attend that
74 meeting because he was not able to make the meeting. He noted it would be a
75 virtual meeting. He encouraged any members that are able to attend the meeting at
76 that time to do so and to report back to the Commission.

77
78 Member Joyce indicated he can go to the meeting.

79
80 Chair Wozniak indicated he received via email a question about water reclamation
81 for sidewalk washing at Walmart. He believed staff was copied on the email and
82 assumed the email was answered.

83
84 Mr. Culver thought people get confused about emailing the Public Works
85 Department and the Commission. He indicated staff did respond to this email.

86
87 Mr. Freihammer reviewed staff's response to the email.

88
89 Chair Wozniak asked if anything came up at last night's City Council meeting
90 regarding the Civic Campus Master Plan.

91
92 Mr. Culver indicated there was a nice conversation about it. He noted there will be
93 a detailed presentation of the Campus Master Plan in October. He reviewed the
94 City Council discussion with the Commission.

95
96 Chair Wozniak wondered if the sustainability update was included as a point of
97 information or would Commissioners like to talk about this or have questions about
98 it. He explained there was something in the report about City compost collection
99 and looking at collecting paper products in addition to food scraps and it seems that
100 from a County standpoint it is kind of moving away from paper products and other
101 compostable because of a concern about stuff the County does not want in the
102 compost and confusion on the part of consumers who may not know the difference
103 between compostable items. There was also something in the report about the
104 Green Corp. Member starting.

105
106 Mr. Culver explained the Green Corp. Member started on September 21st and is set
107 up to work from home. This will be a dedicated resource for the City for the next
108 eleven plus months. He has already started on the benchmarking program with the
109 businesses.

110
111 Environmental Specialist Ryan Johnson reviewed the responsibilities of the Green
112 Corp. Member with the Commission.

113
114 **5. Partners in Energy Update**

115 Environmental Specialist Ryan Johnson indicated in late July the City was
116 informed that its application to participate in Xcel Energy's Partners in Energy
117 (PiE) Program was approved.

118

119 Mr. Culver reviewed the PiE presentation program with the Commission and shared
120 a very preliminary schedule.
121
122 Vice Chair Huiett asked for clarification even if a person is not on the team she
123 would imagine that there would be some kind of public engagement and
124 commentary as well as participation and not just the team participation.
125
126 Mr. Culver indicated that was correct. He noted there will be touch points for the
127 Commission and City Council regarding the development of the first draft plan.
128
129 Member Misra applauded the discussion about making sure this is a diverse group
130 on the team and wondered if staff has thought through on how to accomplish that.
131 She thought in Xcel's presentation to the Commission there was the presentation
132 from St. Louis Park which talked about having a pretty robust youth involvement
133 and she thought that was a real asset for a project like this. If there are ways to
134 actively work on engaging high school or college young adults, that would be
135 fantastic.
136
137 Chair Wozniak indicated the Climate Action Plan that the St. Louis Park ultimately
138 approved began with a group at the high school.
139
140 Mr. Culver explained that was a very good point and staff will make sure there is
141 at least one identified youth member on that energy action team.
142
143 Member Joyce thought maybe colleges and youth and people studying that for a
144 field might be good choices for the action team. He wondered if there was someone
145 from the Commission that could be a part of that team.
146
147 Mr. Culver indicated staff would like to have one liaison from the Commission on
148 the Energy Action Team. He asked if there would be any potential volunteers.
149
150 Member Misra indicated she would be interested in being the Commission liaison.
151
152 Chair Wozniak thought there might be room for other members to somehow be
153 more involved than at the Commission level and moving forward this could be
154 figured out. He thought members of the business community might also be
155 interested along with students and maybe some other interested groups as well as
156 church groups that have had solar installations, for example.
157
158 Member Spencer explained some of the things the City has tried to do have not
159 reached some of the different groups. He thought to find a more diverse group the
160 City should lean on the Chamber, Churches, and civic leaders because those people
161 will know better and could identify someone that might be interested and wanting
162 to be more engaged in the community.
163

164 Member Hammer indicated she was thinking about some of the groups that have
165 come to the Commission meetings in the past, Resilient Roseville and Do Good
166 Roseville and some organizations that already have high engagement with folks
167 that are interested in things like this. She wondered if the City had relationships
168 with those folks and knew who they were to engage them to see if some members
169 would be interested.

170
171 Chair Wozniak explained Resilient Roseville would certainly be interested.

172
173 Mr. Culver indicated staff does have good ties with organizations in the City. The
174 key will be to reach out to them for good candidates.

175
176 Member Misra thought the City should also be looking at socio-economic diversity
177 as well. She suggested checking with other Commission Members to see if there
178 are any other connections that could be looked at.

179
180 Chair Wozniak opened up the floor for public comment with no one wishing to
181 speak.

182
183 Chair Wozniak asked what the timeline might look like.

184
185 Mr. Culver indicated staff really wants to be deliberate in trying to recruit members
186 to the team to attain that diversity. He indicated there will be some sort of blasting
187 and media blast. He hoped within the next five to six weeks there will be a team
188 and a timeline.

189
190 **6. Recycling RFP Discussion**

191 Environmental Specialist Johnson explained the City entered into a five-year
192 comprehensive recycling agreement with Eureka Recycling starting on January 1,
193 2017 and ending on December 31, 2021. He reviewed the Recycling RFP with the
194 Commission.

195
196 Vice Chair Huiett thought the question of who owns the cart seems a little
197 ridiculous and wondered if someone could explain why this is important and why
198 can't the City buy the cart from the current contractor so there is not really a swap
199 and what happens to the carts. She did not think this seemed like a high-level
200 priority but when looking at the dollars it starts to make sense

201
202 Chair Wozniak also flagged the cart issue as a discussion point because he thought
203 in the previous contract or maybe in the current contract with Eureka the City had
204 the option of buying the carts the City had for \$175,000 and he believed those carts
205 were new five years ago.

206
207 Mr. Culver noted the carts were new from a previous contract and were three years
208 old at the time and are going on seven years old.

209

210 Chair Wozniak noted carts usually last ten years and are probably nearing the end
211 of their useful life. He indicated the City needs to ask what Eureka's price is for
212 selling the carts to the City now. He also wondered if Eureka would be willing to
213 pay the City for half the price of a used cart.
214

215 Mr. Culver explained from the City's perspective the whole conversation of cart
216 ownership is the recycling fund has a near zero balance as far as Capital purchase
217 of the carts and would have to borrow the capital or something whether it is
218 \$330,000 or some pro-rated price of the carts out there now. That will be the first
219 hurdle. The second part is the handling, the ownership, the risk of the cart
220 ownership then falls on the City. The City previously had a lower price from
221 Eureka to go with the contractor owned carts versus the City owned carts at that
222 point. The advantage of going with City owned carts at that point would have been
223 the carts would have already been on the street and the City would not have to
224 worry about extending Eureka's contract in order to work out a swap, etc. The City
225 would still have some risks with cart ownership such as where would the carts be
226 warehoused. The City would also have to build capital to replace the carts at some
227 point. That is the disadvantage side of the City owning the carts.
228

229 Member Spencer would like to see what the total cost of ownership would be for
230 the City for the carts and what it would cost annually to maintain the carts.
231

232 Member Misra agreed that the total cost is important to look at. She thought that
233 the recycling carts look a lot better as she travels through the City then the garbage
234 carts. The whole purpose of the recycling is waste reduction and wanted to make
235 sure the City was not creating more waste by getting rid of the carts in order to
236 replace them. She wanted to make sure that the carts would be reused by Eureka if
237 taken back otherwise the City is defeating the whole purpose.
238

239 Member Misra asked if the Eureka was able to track where the recyclable materials
240 go and if the Commission could find that out.
241

242 Mr. Johnson indicated staff would check with Eureka and bring it back to the
243 Commission.
244

245 Member Spencer asked if during the RFP process was staff going to ask what the
246 costs would look like with and without a revenue share.
247

248 Mr. Culver explained there have been some conversations regarding both and have
249 been told that Eureka would not be real excited to give the City a non-cost share
250 number because the market is so volatile and Eureka does not know what to set as
251 a fixed price and it could change as the market changes.
252

253 Chair Wozniak noted there are some industry trends that the Commission and City
254 will need to keep an eye on and maybe learn more about. One being glass which
255 is a big cost item for the City and in some cities around the country some recyclers

256 have stopped collecting glass because of the cost and it contaminates paper and
257 other recyclables. The resident survey that the City conducted this year had a
258 number of recycling questions including the level of service that he thought would
259 play into the RFP. There are other communities that have recently or are in the
260 process of renewing of signing new contracts with recyclers and he thought the
261 Commission should look at some of those for some features, some cost issues, etc.

262
263 Mr. Johnson continued his RFP Presentation with the Commission.

264
265 Youth Member Lynch left the meeting at 8:23 p.m.

266
267 Vice Chair Huiett indicated for any vendor RFP for service she thought there is
268 always an opportunity to have equity inclusion be a part of the selection criteria and
269 she was not seeing that as far as any of the engagement efforts or hiring practices.
270 She thought there was a little bit of a contradiction in the RFP where the criteria is
271 not ranked or rated. She indicated there is ranking and it appears that cost is the
272 most important of the forty percent consideration. This is important for them to be
273 intentional about what the City values in the ranking and weighing. She assumed
274 that the mandatory meetings and the submittal itself, there is probably more of a
275 virtual component now for the receiving of submittals and was not sure why there
276 needed to be an in person, mandatory meeting and seems to be an unnecessary risk.
277 It was not clear to her whether this is a request for bid or a request for proposal. It
278 seems like the two are used interchangeably and what she understands is the two
279 are not interchangeable.

280
281 Chair Wozniak thought the equity inclusion and the ranking and weighing certain
282 components of the bid should be a part of the RFP and he believed City staff will
283 take note of those. He agreed that meeting in person seemed to be a no brainer.

284
285 Mr. Culver thought a lot of the comments from Vice Chair Huiett could be clarified
286 by staff and there could be a good discussion about it when the next RFP is
287 reviewed. Clearly equity and inclusion is much more important and a value for the
288 City of Roseville. It always should have been but is clearly a high priority for the
289 City now. As far as proposal versus bid, from a public agency perspective, a
290 proposal generally is something that would be scored. It is going to include not
291 only the price but will also include a lot of factors and variables that will allow staff
292 to score value with that price and the overall proposal and service that is being
293 provided. A bid is generally a hard number and given State Law the City has to
294 take the lowest bid. When it is a proposal and staff can actually score the value of
295 it then the City has a process of how to score and based on the score the contractor
296 can be chosen based on the value of the contractor.

297
298 **7. Items for Next Meeting – October 27, 2020**

299 Discussion ensued regarding the October PWETC agenda:

- 300
 - Proposed 2021 Utility Rates
 - Civic Campus Master Plan Update

301

302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312

- City of Roseville’s Government Alliance on Race and Equity (GARE) Program

8. Adjourn

Motion

Member Huiett moved, Member Misra seconded, adjournment of the meeting at approximately 8:37 p.m.

Ayes: 7

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

DRAFT