

Roseville Public Works, Environment and Transportation Commission Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, February 28, 2023, at 6:30 p.m.
City Council Chambers, 2660 Civic Center Drive
Roseville, Minnesota 55113

1. Introduction / Roll Call

Chair Ficek called the meeting to order at approximately 6:30 p.m. and at his request, Public Works Director Jesse Freihammer called the roll.

Present: Chair Bryant Ficek; and Members Jarrod Cicha, Edwin Hodder, and Allison Luongo

Absent: Member Nancy Misra, Mike Collins, Michael Joyce (Excused)

Staff Present: Public Works Director Jesse Freihammer

2. Public Comments

None.

3. Approval of January 24, 2023 Meeting Minutes

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

Motion

Member Hodder moved, Member Cicha seconded, approval of the January 24, 2023 meeting minutes as presented.

Ayes: 3

Nays: 0

Abstain: 1 (Luongo)

Motion carried.

4. Communication Items

Public Works Director Jesse Freihammer provided a brief review and update on projects and maintenance activities listed in the staff report dated February 28, 2023.

Chair Ficek thanked Mr. Freihammer for putting all the information in the report, especially regarding Dale Street. He noted the County's website is not current so the information in the report has been very helpful. He asked if there were specific reasons for the watermain break.

Mr. Freihammer explained all of the pipes that have broken this winter are ones staff has flagged as in need of repair or replacement and it usually related to the change in weather.

5. City Code Updates: Title 8

Public Works Director Jesse Freihammer reviewed the Title 8 City Code changes.

Member Luongo asked in terms of the buffer, did that assume that any drainage does not grade towards that buffer.

Mr. Freihammer explained water can be graded towards the buffer. As a part of the City's Stormwater Management Standards and the watershed's, it is required that 85 percent of that water for that developed lot be treated first and it will need to be directed toward some sort of best management practice, like a pond or rain garden and then it can be discharged to the wetlands. It is not preventing the water to be directed to the wetland, there can not be any building within that buffer and the water needs to be treated before reaching the wetland.

Chair Ficek thought these changes were good to help protect the water bodies in Roseville. He thought these changes seemed like a good idea and was in favor of the changes.

The Commission concurred.

Motion

Member Hodder moved, Member Cicha seconded, to recommend the City Council to accept the changes to Title 8 in the City Code.

Ayes: 4

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

6. Pathways Project

Public Works Director Jesse Freihammer updated the Commission on the Pathways Project.

Chair Ficek asked for pathways or paths on both sides, would that be for arterials only.

Mr. Freihammer explained that was correct. It is written that ultimately, long term on arterials, the preference is to get it on both sides.

Chair Ficek asked if pathways on both sides were also planned for collector streets.

Mr. Freihammer indicated even though some collector streets are very important, at this time the plan is to only place pathways on both sides along arterial streets. He noted the pathways to collector streets could be added with an amendment for future work to be done if the Commission had that as a recommendation.

Chair Ficek indicated the City is not adding to residential roads.

Mr. Freihammer explained some residential roads are considered collector roads so he would specify local roads and not residential roads. He noted if the Commission wanted to make the recommendation and a motion the next time the Commission discusses that and if there is a need to update the Pathway Master Plan to add segments, he thought it would be a nice amendment to add as a goal in the Pathway Master Plan.

Chair Ficek asked about maintenance on county roads and if there is any cost share to reduce the expense for the City.

Mr. Freihammer explained staff has done a lot of pushback with the County to try to change their policies. He noted the City did get a small change to the policy a few years ago. It is a long-term gain, the County, now with the new pathways, even if the City installs it, the County will actually own the pathways. The City still needs to do the maintenance but long term when it needs replacing the County will replace it. He indicated that is a gain for the City.

Chair Ficek asked if staff is putting as much thought into the pathways along the roads as what is planned for the roads. He thought the better the pathways are designed the longer the pathways will last with less repairs and maintenance to be done to them.

Mr. Freihammer explained that was correct. The City builds pathways almost to the same standards as the roads. Staff also tries to accommodate for drainage.

Member Hodder wondered about the funding mechanism. He asked if the Pavement Management fund included the pathways funding or is this fund just for paving of roads.

Mr. Freihammer explained the Pavement Management fund is just for roads. The City does have the Pathway Maintenance fund which is designed for maintenance of pathways.

Member Hodder asked where the maintenance funds come from.

Mr. Freihammer believed the maintenance funds is coming from local taxes.

Chair Ficek indicated he did not have a chance to review around all of the schools but one was highlighted along the eastside of Lexington and another one is on the eastside of Hamline to Roselawn. He thought this would be a priority for kids to get to their schools.

Mr. Freihammer reviewed a few areas around the schools where pathways will be added.

Chair Ficek thanked Mr. Freihammer for the presentation.

7. Water and Sewer Service Lateral Discussion

Public Works Director Jesse Freihammer presented information regarding the Water and Sewer Service Laterals. He noted staff discussed ownership, issues with maintenance, types of maintenance/replacement options, and how the City helps residents with these issues.

Chair Ficek indicated there is a benefit to the homeowner in getting the inspection done. He wondered if there is a general benefit to the City as well in reducing the Inflow and Infiltration (I&I).

Mr. Freihammer explained every bit of I&I that goes in is paid for on the overall sewer bill to the City. The MET Council monitors the flow out of the City and every drop of water that goes in the City pays for.

Member Cicha asked with the point of sale inspections, is it typically immediately for anyone who sells their house.

Mr. Freihammer explained according to the Ordinance a person has to prove that an inspection was done which is shared with the City and a determination is done. This can be set up a couple of different ways.

The Commission discussed sewer line inspections, video of sewer scoping and replacements.

Mr. John Kysylyczyn, 3083 Victoria Street, explained he was not in favor of point of sale inspections. Another thing he wanted to caution the Commission on is that there are some residents who have extraordinary long sewer lines, including his. He reviewed the history of the area where his home is located and how much his sewer line replacement would cost compared to the ordinary sewer line most residents have.

Member Hodder asked what a better funding mechanism would be to make it work for someone like Mr. Kysylyczyn.

Mr. Kysylyczyn indicated he would not know. There are pluses and minuses with every property purchased.

Chair Ficek asked if the City had any other point of sale requirements.

Mr. Freihammer indicated he was not aware of any others.

Chair Ficek indicated he was reluctant about opening up discussion for this because it seems like it is a bigger policy discussion that is needed. He liked the idea of the revolving loan and would be interested in exploring that further.

Mr. Freihammer indicated this could be brought forward to the Finance Commission for discussion and then something that would need to be built into the budget potentially and work that would be involved to set that up.

Mr. Kysylyczyn noted to add to the revolving loan fund, government always gets paid first when there are liens on houses and the reason why the HRA got involved with those housing issues.

Chair Ficek indicated as he was thinking about this, there is a benefit to the City to have some of this done. He was kind of looking at that incentive and wondered if it could be offered at a really low interest rate or there could be something for low income such as no interest rate. He was not suggesting any particular way but he thought there were ways it could be thought about as to how that equity piece is brought in so that it is something that is more useable to everybody and it has that incentive behind it and more people look to it to figure out it is the right time to do it.

Mr. Freihammer explained staff can look at options and discuss with the Finance Commission, if the City did that, what the potential interest would be and would it be a benefit to the property owners.

Chair Ficek thought it was worth looking at. He did wonder who would do the work. Mr. Freihammer stated the City has a list of qualified contractors.

Member Cicha agreed he liked what was said about the revolving loan fund and thought there was a lot of options around it.

8. Items for Next Meeting

Discussion ensued regarding the March through June 2023 PWETC agenda:

- Met Council and Metro Transit update in March.
- Eureka update in March. Possible strike.
- Commission Name Change in March.
- Speed limits in April.
- Pavement Management update in April.
- Envision Roseville discussion in April.

- May tour of Public Works.
- MSA4 update in June.
- Sustainability topic in June.
- Prep for Joint Council meeting in July.
 - Discuss Organized Collection

Mr. Freihammer also reviewed the upcoming topics after the June meeting.

Mr. Kysylyczyn explained he wanted to talk about the trash issue. There is a standing order from the City Council from April 20, 2015, that this will not be considered and will not be placed on a future agenda, which he did have to say that usually the City Council words things in a motion in the affirmative and they would choose not to vote for something like that, but the Council in 2015 actually voted that it not be considered by a majority vote and that it not be placed on a future agenda by majority vote. The reason why that occurred, partially, was because of actions that occurred in the PWET Commission by previous Commissioners. The Council had previously, a year or two earlier than that, said they were not interested in this and Commissioners previous to this Commission took it upon themselves to try to consume City staff time and resources to continue moving forward on it and the Council was not pleased with that and thought the message had gotten through which is how the City ended up with the April 20, 2015 order. That order was reaffirmed on May 17, 2021. That is where things stand.

Chair Ficek indicated that the PWET Commission clearly will not discuss this on its own.

Mr. Freihammer indicated that was correct and the Commission would need to get new direction on this from the City Council.

9. Adjourn

Motion

Member Cicha moved, Member Luongo seconded, adjournment of the meeting at approximately 8:50 p.m.

Ayes: 4

Nays: 0

Motion carried.