

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

Agenda Item

Date: June 22, 2021

Item No: 3

Item Description: Approval of the May 25, 2021 Public Works Commission Minutes

Attached are the minutes from the May 25, 2021 meeting.

Recommended Action:

Motion approving the minutes of May 25, 2021, subject to any necessary corrections or revision.

Move: _____

Second: _____

Ayes: _____

Nays: _____

Roseville Public Works, Environment and Transportation Commission Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, May 25, 2021, 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; and Members Michael Joyce, Jarrod Cicha,
6 Bryant Ficek, Nancy Misra, and Youth Commissioner Jana Lynch

7
8 **Absent:** Member Shane Spencer, (Excused)

9
10 **Staff Present:** Public Works Director Marc Culver; and Environmental
11 Specialist Ryan Johnson

12
13 **2. Public Comments**

14 None.

15
16 **3. Election of Vice Chair**

17 Chair Wozniak indicated a new Vice Chair needs to be elected as well as appointing
18 a new member to serve on the Ethics Commission due to Member Huiett resigning.
19 He asked for any nominations.

20
21 Chair Wozniak opened the floor for nominations.

22
23 Member Ficek nominated himself for Vice Chair.

24
25 Member Misra arrived at the meeting at 6:35 p.m.

26

27 Chair Wozniak asked if there were any other nominations. Being none he closed
28 nominations.

29
30 **Motion**
31 **Member Ficek moved, Member Cicha seconded, appointing Member Ficek as**
32 **Vice Chair of the PWETC.**

33
34 **Ayes: 5**
35 **Nays: 0**
36 **Motion carried.**

37
38 Chair Wozniak asked if anyone wanted to volunteer to be on the Ethics
39 Commission. He noted Member Joyce was previously on the Ethics Commission
40 for 2020. He asked if Member Joyce was interested in continuing as the
41 representative.

42
43 Member Joyce indicated he was interested in continuing as a representative.

44
45 Chair Wozniak closed nominations.

46
47 **Motion**
48 **Member Joyce moved, Member Cicha seconded, appointing Member Joyce to**
49 **the Ethics Commission.**

50
51 **Ayes: 5**
52 **Nays: 0**
53 **Motion carried.**

54
55 **4. Approval of April 27, 2021 Meeting Minutes**
56 *Comments and corrections to draft minutes had been submitted by PWETC*
57 *commissioners prior to tonight's meeting and those revisions incorporated into the*
58 *draft presented in meeting materials.*

59
60 Vice Chair Ficek indicated on page 3, line 105, the word "hand" should be changed
61 to "hang."

62
63 **Motion**
64 **Member Ficek moved, Member Joyce seconded, approval of the April 27, 2021**
65 **meeting minutes as amended.**

66
67 **Ayes: 5**
68 **Nays: 0**
69 **Motion carried.**

70

71 **5. Communication Items**

72 Public Works Director Culver indicated Mr. Freihammer was not at the meeting
73 due to a new addition to his family recently.
74

75 Mr. Culver provided a brief review and update on projects and maintenance
76 activities listed in the staff report dated May 25, 2021.
77

78 Chair Wozniak noted the City was not selected as a host site for a GreenCorp
79 member for the upcoming year. He indicated the City still has Will Ristow working
80 with the City until August. He also explained there was discussion at the City
81 Council about organized trash collection. That is something he has brought up to
82 the Commission at least once and it was an interesting discussion and took input
83 from the public. The Council voted to not consider it any further at this time with
84 their reasons why. He thought it was interesting and encouraged the Commission
85 to review that item.
86

87 **6. Partners in Energy Update**

88 Mr. Culver introduced this item and introduced Mr. Mike Holsinger. He noted the
89 City was accepted to participate in the program.
90

91 Mr. Mike Holsinger introduced his team: Ms. Yvonne Pfeifer, Mr. Jake Sedlacek,
92 Ms. Dierdre Coleman, and Ms. Morgan Weck.
93

94 Mr. Holsinger presented the Partners in Energy update.
95

96 Chair Wozniak thanked Mr. Holsinger for the detailed and somewhat surprising
97 presentation. He indicated he would like to hear from the three members of the
98 Energy Action Team present.
99

100 Mr. Johnson explained the Energy Action Team was a great experience. He
101 thanked Mr. Holsinger, his team and Excel. He indicated he was impressed how
102 well the team worked out. He reviewed some of the things discussed with the
103 Action team and indicated he was very happy with the plan and was looking
104 forward to seeing how it all moves forward.
105

106 Member Misra indicated she was not able to attend some of the meetings due to a
107 conflict, but the energy burden came up very early in the meetings and was key in
108 every one's mind to make this move forward the way it did. She thought that was
109 very important and valuable. She thought the people at Xcel and the staff with
110 Partners in Energy certainly had a really good understanding of the City's particular
111 situation and the demographics with the issues Roseville specifically faces. She
112 thought that helped a lot in focusing the energy of the group. She thought it was
113 well done.
114

115 Mr. Culver explained he intentionally tried to not get too involved with the group
116 because he did not want to be too much of an influence on the direction and

117 outcomes. He was pleasantly happy and surprised with the outcomes that the group
118 came up with, particularly the energy burden item. He knew the group was going
119 to be talking about the CO2 reduction and energy efficiencies and renewable
120 energy, but he was also surprised by the numbers on the energy burden side. He
121 thought as the group talks more about inclusion and equity and other initiatives and
122 efforts in the community, that will be an important aspect to carry into the energy
123 action plan; to make sure that the City is bringing everybody into this and
124 everybody can be a part of this effort. He thought it will be interesting to see what
125 the Council and community reaction is to this. He noted the City took advantage
126 of this program to fast track an energy action plan for the community due to
127 pressure from the residents and he thought this was a really good opportunity for
128 them to fast track some of these efforts to give them some focus items to start
129 working on.

130
131 Member Joyce thought this was great work for the stakeholders and team and he
132 thought it was great to see. He wondered, compared to the City's baseline goal of
133 this communitive impact of achieving this, what was the percentage of reduction in
134 CO gases listed.

135
136 Mr. Halsinger indicated he did have some notes on that. He indicated greenhouse
137 gas emissions reduction is approximately eighteen percent. In terms of energy
138 savings, the energy savings would be done thirteen percent and dollars saved would
139 be down fifteen percent.

140
141 Member Joyce asked if there was a breakdown of usage, multi-home, single family,
142 and business.

143
144 Mr. Halsinger explained there are separate bowls for the commercial/industrial
145 category as well as residential. Multi-family is a sticky one because some multi-
146 family units are classified as commercial/industrial premises and others are
147 classified as residential properties. It is very difficult to isolate those individually
148 but there are some programs they have that are presuming that they are residential.
149 All of that will be receiving some attention. The specific information that Member
150 Joyce might be looking for will actually be in the plan, either in the body of the
151 work or in the appendix.

152
153 Vice Chair Ficek thought the presentation was good. He noted when Mr. Halsinger
154 talked about the measures he wondered how exactly those things will be measured.
155 He was also curious if the Commission will hear updates on this. He thought this
156 looked great and he hoped it will be successful. He wondered if there will be
157 opportunities, such as in five years, to revisit and figure out what worked and what
158 did not.

159
160 Mr. Halsinger explained the relationship with Partners in Energy is one that is
161 intended to continue for quite some time. There are resources that are available to
162 what is called "graduate communities" which includes monthly updates and in-

163 person meetings on particular subject areas that communities are interested in.
164 There is an ongoing relationship. Some communities have reapproached Partners
165 in Energy asking for additional things to be done or to focus on one particular area
166 or to pursue a different type of project and that is not an uncommon occurrence. As
167 far as reporting is concerned, the City will receive semi-annual implementation
168 reports. He reviewed what the reports consist of. He indicated Xcel Energy has a
169 tremendous capability to be able to keep track of what is going on in communities.
170

171 Chair Wozniak asked if there were any comments from the public with none being
172 offered.
173

174 Chair Wozniak explained he liked the presentation and it seemed well thought out.
175 He thought there was lots of information. He wondered if there were any surprises
176 with Roseville's plan and he wondered if any trends were seen emerging and what
177 have the plan's goals been.
178

179 Mr. Halsinger indicated he was very proud to be working with the staff at Roseville.
180 A lot of the workshops are really calibrated based on the energy of the members of
181 the Energy Action Team. He thought the members of the Roseville Energy Action
182 Team are really passionate, committed and really interested and there was great
183 dialogue and discussions. One of the things that distinguished Roseville was the
184 sense of energy and passion. He thought everyone did a great job. There was a
185 real passion from everyone to do everything and get going on the work. He thought
186 those were the things that distinguished the Roseville assignment from some others.
187 It was a really engaged group. As far as trends are concerned, that is a more difficult
188 question, partly because the Partners in Energy program is designed, not to hand
189 every community a brochure of the available programs, but it is designed to be a
190 reflection of what the community really wants. There is not a real set plan in place.
191 The notion of energy burden is one that many communities are very concerned
192 about and certainly, greenhouse gas reduction is a major issue. He thought those
193 are two themes he has seen kind of growing in the sense of urgency. Different
194 communities are going to have different priorities around business efficiency and
195 residential, but for the most part each community tends to be fairly different.
196

197 Mr. Sedlacek explained he has worked on five different community plans and there
198 is always conversation around lower income families and how the City can help
199 them because they do not have the tools others might have. Other than that, each
200 one of the plans he has worked on is so very different. He noted it sells him even
201 more on the value of the program because each community has come up with
202 something unique, which is fun to see.
203

204 Ms. Pfiefer thought this is really community-specific and driven by the community
205 and is not something Xcel Energy runs, they provide guidance and information, but
206 it really is a community effort.
207

208 Chair Wozniak thanked Xcel Energy for their presentation. He asked if the
209 Commission would be supportive of this energy action plan as presented.

210
211 Member Joyce asked if there are any incentives or financing available, grant-wise
212 or low interest loans for energy efficient homes and upgrades that the community
213 could leverage to scaffold themselves into additional upgrades.

214
215 Mr. Halsinger explained there are a number of options that help to make a lot of
216 these improvements more affordable. From a low-income standpoint, a low-
217 income home energy squad visit is free and that also opens the door to access the
218 home energy savings program which funds a tremendous number of improvements
219 in a home. There are similar programs that are available in multi-family buildings.
220 For more mainstream residential consumers, there are rebates available on high
221 efficiency heating and cooling equipment. A home energy squad visit is one of the
222 best bargains found. He reviewed what the home energy squad visit consists of,
223 and the value is between \$650-\$700 worth of work. He also reviewed what
224 consisted of a business energy visit.

225
226 Chair Wozniak suggested Mr. Halsinger and his team be prepared to go into detail
227 on what assistance is available when presenting to the City Council.

228
229 Vice Chair Ficek indicated he is encouraged by what he has seen in the presentation.
230 He would be curious to see what the MOU entails with some details that go into it.
231 He looks forward to seeing this be implemented.

232
233 Member Misra thought it would be valuable for the Commission to endorse the
234 plan. She thought it has some value and given the Commission's role, it would be
235 helpful to say that this was a well-run process with a lot of different people
236 involved.

237
238 **Motion**
239 **Member Misra moved, Member Joyce seconded, to support this plan as**
240 **presented to go forward to the City Council.**

241
242 **Ayes: 5**
243 **Nays: 0**

244 **Motion carried.**

245
246 **7. Review of Recycling Proposals**
247 Mr. Johnson updated the Commission on the recycling proposals. He made a
248 presentation to the Commission.

249
250 Chair Wozniak asked for April 2021, the processing fee is \$58, what would the
251 revenue share have been at \$75/ton.

252

253 Mr. Johnson reviewed the April Revenue Share reports from 2017 to 2021. He
254 explained the tonnage was very similar with very good collection and a good
255 recycling program. Staff did not see a huge fluctuation with that. What the City
256 has actually collected at \$58/ton, 2021 was \$5,700 and assuming the market is
257 exactly the same, when it is \$75/ton the revenue share would go down to
258 approximately \$1,400.

259
260 Mr. Johnson continued his presentation on City-owned carts versus contractor-
261 owned carts.

262
263 Member Joyce wondered about the 5.5 year versus 3.5. He asked if staff is leaning
264 toward 3.5 years in the contract or is it still a two percent increase for the additional
265 two years.

266
267 Mr. Johnson explained the contract is basically a two percent increase per year from
268 2022 on.

269
270 Chair Wozniak thought Mr. Johnson pointed it out in his presentation, when talking
271 about those numbers, that that was the lowest cost in the base price proposal per
272 household.

273
274 Mr. Johnson indicated that was correct. He reviewed the 2021 recycling RFP
275 proposals with the Commission.

276
277 Chair Wozniak thought Mr. Johnson did an excellent job of compiling the
278 information and presenting the information to the Commission. He thought it was
279 nice in a way that there are only two vendors to reflect on because it makes the
280 discussion and decision a little more straight forward.

281
282 Member Cicha commented regarding the revenue sharing and did not think it would
283 be a good idea for a 5.5-year contract, given the volatility the City has been seeing.
284 He thought with the recent volatility, revenue sharing beyond 3.5 years would not
285 be a good idea.

286
287 Member Joyce echoed what Member Cicha stated and he thought the vendors were
288 doing a general cost of living increase. They are hoping it will go up and will keep
289 the base price low enough to entice and lock into 5.5 years because they are not
290 really showing what the market is going to do. He thought the shorter term would
291 be less risk for the City.

292
293 Chair Wozniak indicated the \$75/ton processing fee is a big jump from the current
294 \$58/ton and he did not see anything in the proposals to indicate that they have made
295 any massive expenditures in processing equipment to justify such a big raise in their
296 processing fee. He stated \$75/ton gets very close to what it costs Washington and
297 Ramsey Counties to process trash at the resource recovery facility, which is in the
298 low 80's. He wanted the Commission to keep in mind that around \$21/ton of that

299 processing fee is money the City pays Xcel Energy to take their refuse derived fuel
300 and burn it for electricity. The real processing costs at the facility is in the low
301 \$60/ton and the recycler is going from \$58/ton to \$75/ton for recyclables that have
302 revenue and have value and yet not explaining perhaps why they are increasing the
303 processing fee. To him, that huge increase in the processing fee really removes the
304 incentive for revenue sharing. He did not see supporting a revenue sharing plan
305 based on a \$75/ton processing fee.
306

307 Member Misra thought the processing fee seemed like a big jump and she was not
308 sure why. She indicated she would also support the shorter term for the contract.
309 To complicate things further, she wondered if the City has looked at the potential
310 for changes that might come about as a result of the Federal Infrastructure Bill
311 because there is a lot of pressure to include sustainability and some recycling
312 programs in that. That would also potentially speak at keeping the contract to a
313 shorter term. She recalled that their current recycler mentioned at a presentation a
314 few years ago that was when China first put the ban on taking their recyclables and
315 did reflect this period of costs going up, but they did way over time there would be
316 some stabilization and there would be more domestic markets for this. She
317 wondered if they are starting to see that now or if there has been any ability to take
318 a look at the possibility. She wondered if the US is rounding the corner and creating
319 markets.
320

321 Mr. Johnson indicated staff works pretty closely with Ramsey County because they
322 have someone that is watching the markets. The City sends Ramsey County its
323 revenue sharing data monthly so Ramsey County can compile it and look at it. The
324 most recent talks, staff knows that there is more processing coming up in the US.
325 He indicated no one knows for sure if the US is rounding the corner at this point
326 and, going forward, it looks really nice where the City sits right now. But when
327 they start looking at the additional processing fee on top of that, it does take away
328 a lot of the benefit. It is too early to tell where this is coming from.
329

330 Vice Chair Ficek indicated on the base collection proposal, he was looking at the
331 differences between the vendor owned or City owned cart and as he thought about
332 it, if they are pushing that cost off to the City he would have thought the price would
333 have gone down as proposer one did but he saw proposer two, when the cart moved
334 to the City, there is a thirty-three cent add in but the base cost still went up even
335 though the proposer is pushing off that part to the City. He wondered if there was
336 any comment from staff on that difference.
337

338 Mr. Johnson explained under most circumstances a vendor owned cart will be more
339 than a City owned cart, this happened with the last proposals as well where one
340 vendor had a cheaper vendor owned cart than a City owned cart. The City is kind
341 of at the situation again where staff is seeing the same couple of proposers and the
342 same scenario. There was not a lot of detail in the proposals that would have added
343 a lot more detail into that other than the pricing of it was passed onto the City within
344 their proposals themselves.

345 Chair Wozniak opened up public comment. Seeing no one, public comment was
346 closed. He indicated that he has heard comments against revenue sharing and in
347 support of a 3.5-year contract. He indicated he would support continuation of the
348 current arrangement with bi-weekly pickup for single family and weekly pickup for
349 multi-family, which is base proposal B1, and A1 has the lowest cost.
350

351 Member Cicha was in favor of proposer 2, 1A. He noted this is lowest cost with
352 proposer two scoring higher on a lot of the scoring systems that have been set up to
353 help guide this decision. He thought the 3.5 term is right.
354

355 **Motion**

356 **Member Cicha moved, Member Joyce seconded, to recommend the City**
357 **Council approve proposer 2 with proposal A-1 with a 3.5-year term.**
358

359 Vice Chair Ficek noted on the ranking system proposer 2 did have the higher score
360 on the City's diversity, equity and inclusion which helped bring them to the top.
361 He also thought this recommendation and motion made sense from that standpoint.
362

363 Chair Wozniak concurred. He wondered if there was anything in the contract that
364 would allow the City to cancel the contract during the 3.5-year term.
365

366 Mr. Culver indicated there was not without cost. The City would have to identify
367 something that the proposer is not doing per contract and give them an opportunity
368 to remedy and if they do not then the contract could be cancelled.
369

370 Chair Wozniak indicated he cannot support revenue sharing at \$75/ton so that
371 would take that off the table for him. If the City were able to negotiate a lower
372 processing fee it might be something worth looking at. He would also support
373 proposal A-1.
374

375 **Ayes: 5**

376 **Nays: 0**

377 **Motion carried.**
378

379 Mr. Culver asked if the Commission, given what is known now, support an increase
380 in the recycling fee so that the City can build up capital so that in three years the
381 City can buy their own carts and theoretically, at that point, have some more
382 competitive pricing.
383

384 Vice Chair Ficek indicated given the two proposals the City had varied in how they
385 approached the City owned cart; he did not know if he saw an advantage in it. If
386 they stayed with the same company and proposals would have come in the same
387 way the City would have had the advantage this round but given that it has not been
388 consistent, he did not know if that were the way he would go with this.
389

390 Mr. Culver noted staff has not talked to the other two contractors on why proposals
391 were not submitted. He noted there were four contractors at the meeting but only
392 two companies submitted proposals. Staff was speculating on this, but he thought
393 the reason is because the contractors felt they could not submit a competitive
394 proposal given the advantage that the existing contractor may have with the carts
395 on the street.

396
397 Vice Chair Ficek thought if there was additional information, other cities that have
398 gone that route and the benefits, he would want to see more data. He indicated he
399 was not opposed to that but based on what the Commission has seen so far, he did
400 not see an inherent advantage.

401
402 Chair Wozniak agreed that City-owned carts would give the City an advantage to
403 lure more vendors to provide service. This may also provide more competitive
404 pricing.

405
406 Member Misra indicated on this particular front, her conservative nature, she did
407 not see why City-owned carts would give them a huge advantage. This is
408 speculation and remains to be seen. She continues to have the issue she had before
409 which is more stuff if kind of empathetical to the idea of recycling. She would love
410 to think that in a few years when this discussion comes up again, that the City will
411 have reduced its base streams and they will not even be talking about as much
412 commodity as they are talking about now. She thought that is the only sustainable
413 way around this question. She would not be in favor of City-owned carts.

414
415 **8. Items for Next Meeting – June 22, 2021**

416 Discussion ensued regarding the June PWETC agenda:

- 417 ■ MS4 Annual Report and Public Hearing
- 418 ■ Preparation for Joint City Council meeting on July 19, 2021.

419
420 Member Ficek stated he would like to get an update from staff on how the lower
421 speed limit is going in St. Paul and Minneapolis.

422
423 **9. Adjourn**

424
425 **Motion**

426 **Member Misra moved, Member Ficek seconded, adjournment of the meeting**
427 **at approximately 9:11 p.m.**

428
429 **Ayes: 5**

430 **Nays: 0**

431 **Motion carried.**