

Roseville Public Works, Environment and Transportation Commission Meeting Agenda

Tuesday, July 24, 2012, at 6:30 p.m.
City Council Chambers, 2660 Civic Center Drive
Roseville, Minnesota 55113

-
- | | |
|-----------|---|
| 6:30 p.m. | 1. Introductions/Roll Call |
| 6:35 p.m. | 2. Public Comments |
| 6:40 p.m. | 3. Approval of June 26, 2012 Meeting Minutes |
| 6:45 p.m. | 4. Communication Items |
| 6:55 p.m. | 5. Pathway Master Plan |
| 7:30 p.m. | 6. Assessment Policy Revisions |
| 8:00 p.m. | 7. Draft Complete Streets Policy |
| 8:25 p.m. | 8. Possible Items for Next Meeting – August 28, 2012 |
| 8:30 p.m. | 9. Adjourn |

*Be a part of the picture...get involved with your City...Volunteer!
For more information, stop by City Hall or call Carolyn at 651-792-7026 or check our website at
www.cityofroseville.com.*

Volunteering, a Great Way to Get Involved!

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

Agenda Item

Date: July 24, 2012

Item No: 3

Item Description: Approval of the June 26, 2012 Public Works Commission Minutes

Attached are the minutes from the June 26, 2012 meeting.

Recommended Action:

Motion approving the minutes of June 26, 2012, subject to any necessary corrections or revision.

June 26, 2012 minutes

Move: _____

Second: _____

Ayes: _____

Nays: _____

Roseville Public Works, Environment and Transportation Commission Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, June 26, 2012, at 6:30 p.m.
City Council Chambers, 2660 Civic Center Drive
Roseville, Minnesota 55113

1 **1. Introduction / Call Roll**

2 Chair Jan Vanderwall called the meeting to order at approximately 6:30 p.m.

3
4 **Members Present:** Chair Jan Vanderwall; and Members Joan Felice; Steve
5 Gjerdingen; Jim DeBenedet; with Member Dwayne
6 Stenlund arriving at approximately 7:40 p.m.

7
8 **Staff Present:** City Engineer Debra Bloom; with Chair Vanderwall noting
9 that Public Works Director Duane Schwartz was attending
10 a joint meeting of School District No. 621 and the
11 Roseville City Council meeting at this same time.

12
13 **Others Present:** Ron Leaf, Sr. Water Resources Engineer and Rebecca
14 Nestingen, PE, Water Resources Engineer with S. E. H.

15
16 **2. Public Comments**

17 No one appeared to speak at this time.

18
19 **3. Approval of April 24, 2012 and May 22, 2012 Meeting Minutes**

20 Member Gjerdingen moved, Member Felice seconded, approval of the April 24,
21 2012, meeting as presented.

22
23 **Ayes: 3**

24 **Nays: 0**

25 **Abstentions: 1 (DeBenedet)**

26 **Motion carried.**

27
28 Member DeBenedet moved, Member Felice seconded, approval of the May 22,
29 2012, meeting as amended.

30
31 **Corrections:**

- 32 • Page 2, Line 42: Correct Title of Member DeBenedet (no longer Chair) and
33 identify his comments as related to County Road "D-2" (DeBenedet)

- Page 8, Line 325: Specify blank acronym as “Capitol Region Watershed District (CRWD)” (Staff)
- Page 8, Line 328: Specify referenced acronym for DWSMA as “Drinking Water Supply Management Area” (Staff)

Ayes: 4

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

4. Communication Items

City Engineer Debra Bloom provided an update on various construction projects were included in tonight’s meeting packet or available on-line at the City’s website at www.cityofroseville.com/projects, and as detailed in the staff report dated June 26, 2012.

Discussion among Ms. Bloom and PWETC Members included ongoing communication with City contractors, property owners, and private contractors doing work related to the 2012 Pavement Management Plan (PMP); drainage improvements at the Brenner storm water pond including a pipe extension; pond installation at the end of the Skillman Avenue cul-de-sac and two (2) separate drainage solutions for the Fairview Pathway project including addressing standing water on Fairview by Evergreen Park with the catch basin extended to mitigate that problem.

Further discussion included Member Gjerdingen’s observation about the Har Mar neighborhood streets and paths, and questioning how far the City and/or private paths extended (e.g. to the fence?) with Ms. Bloom advising that the City was responsible for installing Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) ramps as part of road projects, but identifying the private/ public portions and areas of responsibility for the City and those privately held by Har Mar Mall’s ownership. Member Gjerdingen asked if Har Mar had been approached about the degrading pavement on the pathway connections on their private property, Ms. Bloom advised that, she would contact their management to determine their interest.

Member Felice noted several areas on Har Mar Mall’s private property where curb drops were also needed for pedestrian and non-motorized traffic

5. Discuss Joint Meeting with the City Council

Chair Vanderwall sought individual Member comments on the recent annual joint meeting of the PWETC and City Council.

Chair Vanderwall expressed his appreciation for how the Commission had been received and for the City Council’s strong support for getting moving on organized trash collection. Chair Vanderwall opined that the City Council’s positive support motivated him to keep that effort moving forward.

80 Past Chair DeBenedet opined that since this could be the result of the City of
81 Maplewood moving forward with a similar implementation for organized
82 collection, and had already met expectations of their residents in reducing costs
83 for them, lending additional overall support. Member DeBenedet noted
84 Councilmember Johnson's comments regarding the PWETC providing additional
85 input to the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) Task Force to lend additional
86 support for continued and consistent investment in the City's infrastructure,
87 particularly that underground infrastructure that was "out of sight, out of mind"
88 for most of the general public. Member DeBenedet suggested that the PWETC
89 ask the City Council to forward additional information to the PWETC for further
90 analysis and recommendations.

91
92 Related to CIP items, Member Felice questioned the status of the City's Asset
93 Management Software, with Ms. Bloom reporting that staff has evaluated a
94 number of different software packages and has narrowed it down to four (4)
95 different products. Ms. Bloom stressed the importance for staff to recommend a
96 software package to the City Council that is easy to use and tracks the right
97 information.

98
99 Member DeBenedet opined that the most important element to consider in such an
100 Asset Management Program would be training and commitment to retain
101 competency of those using the software program(s). Member DeBenedet asked
102 that a future PWETC agenda include information from staff on their
103 recommendations for a program, and how it will be used, by whom, and how it
104 will be managed in-house.

105
106 Ms. Bloom noted that the software programs, while varying in their
107 sophistication, included components across city-wide departments, incorporating
108 management of vehicles, utilities, buildings, roadways, sewer systems, pathways;
109 as well as fuel consumption tracking, employee and equipment hours per project
110 or program, and payroll components. Ms. Bloom assured the PWETC that staff
111 was carefully evaluating the programs to determine which product would provide
112 what the City needed, while being user-friendly and capable of being easily
113 maintained with limited staff resources.

114
115 Chair Vanderwall noted that "complexity" and "easy to use" were a difficult
116 concept to address in one sentence.

117
118 Ms. Bloom concurred, noting that many cities contacted by City staff had chosen
119 a system that required hiring additional staff to manage the system.

120
121 Chair Vanderwall noted that School District No. 623, his employer, had a
122 document management system shared jointly with other school districts, with that
123 system initially small and over time having additional layers.
124

Ms. Bloom advised that some programs can generate work orders from citizen website inquiries and disseminate them to the appropriate department; the products can track trees, parks and their various components, virtually any item that can be counted or tracked could be incorporated into the system. Ms. Bloom advised that all departments, including the Parks and Recreation and Police Departments were involved in evaluating the software programs in order to make an informed decision.

Member Felice noted the need to allow for prioritization of areas and needs as well, with Ms. Bloom responding that the idea was to understand what the City had (inventory), what it costs to maintain those assets, and how to include that cost in annual budgets and how to prioritize those items, all generating the need for careful consideration before a staff recommendation is brought forward to the City Council.

Chair Vanderwall noted the City Council asking the PWETC to consider and make future recommendation for long-term funding alternatives and options for the existing Pavement Management Program (PMP). Chair Vanderwall opined that discussions to-date on water/sewer infrastructure needs and rates to support that infrastructure have been beneficial for the public and their awareness of the needs and costs; and those discussions should continue in the public realm. Chair Vanderwall suggested that a future PEWTC agenda should include discussing the PMP and funding options.

Member DeBenedet concurred with Chair Vanderwall's comments regarding the support of the City Council for PWETC recommendations; and observed that everyone had the same interest across the community and were working toward those common goals.

Member Gjerdingen stated that he liked the variety of topics covered at the joint meeting, opining that it was the best joint meeting held to-date; and advised that he took away from the meeting a lot of things the City Council expected the PWETC to move forward with, including organized collection, how it was administered, and even whether the recycling and trash programs should be bundled. Member Gjerdingen opined that this provided the PWETC with a lot of latitude in exploring ways to accomplish the goal; and provided direction for a more proactive approach in determining priorities.

Chair Vanderwall cautioned the need for the PWETC, as a citizen advisory group, to work with staff on how to organize moving forward on projects and initiatives in order to recognize staff needs and their work priorities. Chair Vanderwall expressed his interest in looking at options; however, also expressed his concern in keeping those options open by defining the process moving forward and the responsible parties in that process.

Member Gjerdingen suggested that the PWETC become more proactive in providing the City Council with recommended motions on items moving forward, similar to that provided by staff in their reports to the City Council and action requests.

Member Felice stated that a lot of ground was covered during the joint meeting, and she appreciated the receptiveness of the City Council toward the PWETC and its accomplishments and upcoming work plan.

Chair Vanderwall noted that he left the meeting feeling that, even though the PWETC was a citizen volunteer group, the City Council considered recommendations of the group as meaningful and important to the work of the City Council.

6. **Final Vote on Organized Collection**

Member Felice opined that, with all the time spent on this issue to-date and hearing from all parties, it was time to move forward and achieve a positive potential outcome.

Chair Vanderwall expressed his regret that Member Stenlund was not in attendance for this vote; however, he noted that Member Stenlund had been a strong and consistent advocate in support of organized collection.

Member DeBenedet commented on one area of concern with the draft resolution on page 1 in the “NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED...” introductory statement; and suggested revised language to read as follows:

“NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the City of Roseville, Public Works, Environment, and Transportation Commission hereby recommends to the Roseville City Council to ***[begin the state-mandated process to implement]*** organized solid waste collection in the City of Roseville with the consideration of the following goals:...”

Member DeBenedet opined that the actual PWETC recommendation is that the City Council begin the process, including the lengthy discussion between haulers and the City, and just recommending that the process be initiated, not whether it actually comes to fruition in the end.

Member Gjerdingen expressed concern in the PWETC appearing to make an actual commitment; with Chair Vanderwall clarifying that there was no commitment, just initiating a very lengthy process.

Member DeBenedet moved, Member Gjerdingen seconded, the adoption of a resolution entitled, “Resolution Recommending Consideration of Organized Trash Collection;” for formal recommendation to the Roseville City Council; ***with page 1 amended to read as follows:***

215 “NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the City of Roseville,
216 Public Works, Environment, and Transportation Commission hereby
217 recommends to the Roseville City Council to ***[begin the state-mandated***
218 ***process to implement]*** organized solid waste collection in the City of
219 Roseville with the consideration of the following goals:...”
220

221 Chair Vanderwall opined that he liked the idea that the first goal was economic.
222 Chair Vanderwall advised that he anticipated once the City Council received this
223 resolution of recommendation they would return the issue to the PWETC to start
224 the process as a commission, whether that included Public Hearings at the
225 PWETC level or if those would be held at the City Council level. Chair
226 Vanderwall opined that his perspective was that the PWETC should serve as the
227 body for public comment via Public Hearings.
228

229 Member DeBenedet, referencing Goal #5 (page 2) suggested the need for caution
230 related with statements about safety unless there was reliable evidence to support
231 that statement. Member DeBenedet opined that, while the number of trucks on a
232 road affecting safety may not have justifiable data to support it, obviously the
233 more vehicles on a road, the more accidents occurring.
234

235 Chair Vanderwall, from his perspective with bus transportation and 1500 – 2000
236 bus stops in Roseville, advised that he frequently fielded questions from parents
237 expressing concern with trucks going too fast on city streets; and other relevant
238 pieces to this beyond trucks using city streets. On a related note, Chair
239 Vanderwall noted that there are currently 3,600 kids in summer school in
240 Roseville, making it a year-round issue, not just during the regular school year.
241

242 Member DeBenedet clarified that he was not asking that Goal #5 be struck at this
243 point just cautioned the need for more research or specific evidence.
244

245 Member Felice opined that, while it may be harder to measure actual data,
246 perceived security and safety was an important factor to consider in
247 neighborhoods as well.
248

249 Chair Vanderwall noted that this was a significant step by the PWETC; however,
250 he noted that it had been under discussion and analysis for a considerable time,
251 and opined that it was now time to move forward.
252

253 **Ayes: 4**

254 **Nays: 0**

255 **Motion carried.**
256

257 **7. Review DRAFT Comprehensive Storm Water Management Plan (CSWMP)**
258 **Update Discussion**

259 City Engineer Bloom briefly introduced this item subsequent to the discussion
260 held at the last meeting, and comments incorporated into this updated draft.

Ms. Bloom also reported on the informational meeting for the public held on June 21, 2012;, and the disappointing turn out (3 residents) even after a direct mailing to all property owners living on lakes, a published notice and on-line notices. Ms. Bloom advised that staff and the consultant were currently reviewing options to invite the public again, perhaps – with the permission of the PWETC – at the July PWETC meeting.

S.E.H. Project Manager Ron Leaf, Sr. Water Resources Engineer and Rebecca Nestingen, PE, Water Resources Engineer with S. E. H. were present to review the latest revisions and seek additional Member comment.

Mr. Leaf advised that additional information had been received from the Lake Owasso Study and would be incorporated into the Plan.

At the request of Chair Vanderwall, Mr. Leaf led the PWETC through the goals section by section and noted comments for previous goals, as well as those added after the last discussion.

Section 1. Introduction

Member Gjerdingen expressed concern with the opening paragraph and reference to the freeway systems; suggested that the comment was out-of-date and indicated one mode of transportation and Roseville as a bedroom community. Member Gjerdingen suggested alternative language indicating that Roseville was an inner-ring suburb, located in closer proximity to both Minneapolis and St. Paul.

Mr. Leaf concurred that such a revision also tied into the sustainability goals of the updated Plan, and should be reflected in the overall flavor of the plan.

Section 4. Goals and Policies (pages 13 – 18)

Section 4.1 (Insert Narrative)

Chair Vanderwall noted the need to included in the narrative the areas of Roseville that have experienced flooding issues for years; and those things that had been significantly improved, as well as those things yet to be done. Chair Vanderwall noted the need to recognize existing problems in the goal statement and the goal to correct those problems, while recognizing budget constraints and the need to prioritize those items or address them in the most cost-effective method possible.

Ms. Bloom reiterated that the purpose of this Plan was to establish policies and goals for use to guide discussions and the process to address problems.

Mr. Leaf opined that it was worth clarifying, to the best extent possible, that while there was no guarantee that there wouldn't be ongoing flooding issues depending on actual rain events, the City would attempt to achieve a reasonable level of

protection through design standards that supported the goals and policies of the Plan.

Goal 1 – Flood Protection and Runoff Management (Table 7)

Member DeBenedet expressed concern that, as a substantially developed community, a broader policy statement was needed that the City would attempt to provide flood protection through runoff management and through enhancement of existing drainage facilities and management of those facilities. Member DeBenedet noted that consideration of time spent, resources committed, and cost-effectiveness, all needed to be part of the discussion.

Section 2.1 Climate and Precipitation (Table 1, page 3)

Member DeBenedet questioned if this section needed to be updated to give consideration to anticipated updated precipitation numbers coming in the next year; and in anticipation that those updated numbers may be higher. Member DeBenedet suggested that it may be worthwhile to have a paragraph included in this section describing what could happen if those precipitation levels were increased and how it would affect this Plan.

At the request of Member Felice, Mr. Leaf provided a definition of “freeboard elevations” in Policy 4 related to the lowest homes level compared to the high water level for a 100-year design standard.

Member DeBenedet, related to that question, asked a similar question based on assumptions for freeboard calculations measured from the lowest floor elevations (e.g. Millwood Avenue pond); with Mr. Leaf advising that it could be dependent on various scenarios.

Using the Millwood Pond as an example, Ms. Bloom noted the project proposed for this year extended the flared end section to improve the freeboard for this pond.

Member DeBenedet asked that the Plan include freeboard elevations accordingly.

Goal 2 – Surface Water Protection (Table 8)

At the request of Member DeBenedet, Ms. Bloom confirmed that the Rice Creek Watershed District (RCWD) did not have the same standards for redevelopment in problem areas; and advised that the City was aware of problem areas and the need to implement long term solutions in those areas. Ms. Bloom used the I-35W corridor and Fairview Avenue as examples of problem areas; and staff’s awareness of issues within that watershed area. Ms. Bloom advised that whenever a redevelopment or improvement project came forward, staff made sure that the storm water review included requirements for property owner(s) to take care of their portion of the water capacity issues at that time. Ms. Bloom noted that, while RCWD may not require it, the City did require compliance with water quantity concerns for larger rain events. Ms. Bloom advised that the City had

adopted a set of standards, identified what would work in specific drainage subareas, and mandated that those items be incorporated into redevelopment projects being pursued in those project areas.

At the request of Member DeBenedet, Ms. Bloom clarified that the CSWMP was considered a part of the City's Comprehensive Plan and it had the full force of law and is used to review any and all redevelopment plans submitted. Ms. Bloom noted that this Plan provided an overarching provision, and standards were in place to implement the law. (Reference Policy No. 3)

Chair Vanderwall questioned if the City had sufficient regulations regarding yard treatments (e.g. fertilizer, grass clippings) and other ordinances currently in place to protect surface water; with Ms. Bloom advising that staff and the consultant would take note of that concern and review policies to determine that sufficient regulations were in place.

Mr. Leaf expressed appreciation for Chair Vanderwall's question, and suggested that it would be relatively easy to "cut and paste" language from City ordinance, or references to them, addressing lawn clippings and other items. Mr. Leaf suggested that the narrative portions could reference them at a minimum.

Ms. Bloom noted that the City's existing illicit discharge and nuisance ordinances addressed those items, but referencing it in this Plan would reinforce these items.

Mr. Leaf noted that referencing those things would set the tone of where the City is now, and where the City was headed during the ten (10) year duration of the Plan and its Comprehensive Plan as well. Mr. Leaf clarified that the policies were intended to recognize those things that may change over the next decade and serve as a benchmark with some built in flexibility to adjust as things change.

At the request of Member DeBenedet regarding the 10,000 square feet reference, Ms. Bloom advised that this was a direct quote from the City's current erosion control ordinance.

Goal 3 – Groundwater Protection (Table 9)

At the request of Chair Vanderwall, Mr. Leaf clarified that the intergovernmental collaboration reference in the goal statement was mostly referring to Ramsey County.

Member DeBenedet, with concurrence by Chair Vanderwall, noted his previously-stated concerns that a requirement for groundwater monitoring for larger underground infiltration systems be provided, particularly for commercial properties and/or parking lots; with the overall goal for groundwater protection.

Chair Vanderwall questioned if this was something that was primarily a City responsibility or was accomplished through collaboration.

Mr. Leaf noted that an additional Policy Statement could be included to incorporate monitoring; and advised that they would research what was currently available. Mr. Leaf noted that it would be difficult to monitor every infiltration basin throughout the City; however, staff could identify high risk areas or smaller subwatersheds.

Chair Vanderwall suggested language that would provide for any impervious surface of 25,000 square feet or more, or something to that effect.

Member DeBenedet expressed his preference that it would tie more to land use or commercial uses.

However, Chair DeBenedet noted that it could also affect schools and churches with large parking lots and/or impervious surfaces.

Member Stenlund arrived at this time, approximately 7:40 p.m.

Goal 4 – Public Education and Outreach (Table 10)

Member Felice noted her ongoing frustration with the education and outreach opportunities provided and the few people who attend them, using the June 21, 2012 public information meeting for the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan as an example. Member Felice opined that people needed to be educated where they were; and suggested signage at storm water ponds and other applicable locations that would provide that education by graphics and statements of the purpose of the ponds and what was supposed to happen. Member Felice opined that this would provide a better educational opportunity in the place of publishing information or holding meetings with little result. Member Felice suggested that, while residents were walking, they could be educated at the same time through signage.

Ms. Bloom concurred; however, she asked for clarification if that was a Goal, a Policy, or an Implementation Strategy. Ms. Bloom restated Member Felice's original statement as "educate people where they're ready to be educated."

Chair Vanderwall opined that he heard it as a Policy to ensure that the City had an "effective public education and outreach tool or process."

Member Felice suggested a Policy or Implementation Strategy would be to identify areas where educational signs could have the most impact.

Member Gjerdingen suggested including that signage and narrative information on the City's website as well.

Chair Vanderwall suggested that there may be other options as well to attract people's attention as they moved throughout the community, and opined that it shouldn't stop at signage.

Ms. Bloom suggested that to address these items a goal should be added to develop on-going educational opportunities.

Member DeBenedet noted that lack of public interest in the annual storm water permit meeting held at the PWETC, concurring that it did little to educate the public, but if someone walked by a pond and saw a graphic or information, they would be inclined to stop and look at it.

Chair Vanderwall noted the many acronyms used in these policies, as well as throughout the Plan, and the need to ensure that the public can understand the language and for it to be user-friendly.

Ms. Bloom duly noted that comment, advising that they would review the overall Plan for acronym use and make sure they were defined clearly.

Chair Vanderwall noted the need to promote stewardship through use of volunteers in that public education and outreach portion as well.

Ms. Bloom suggested an additional Policy or Goal to “Promote Stewardship.”

Mr. Leaf noted that, while a challenge in the past, a lot of effort could come forward as people became connected.

Chair Vanderwall opined that this was typical of any volunteer effort beyond an emergency situation.

Chair Vanderwall suggested that various presentations or annual updates be incorporated on the City’s website with a tracking of hits to determine the level of interest on specific topics.

Member Felice noted the significant interest of Roseville residents in environmental issues, and suggested that the narrative include that acknowledgement.

Chair Vanderwall noted the need to include coordination with area schools in the policies.

Goal 5 – Pollution Prevention and Maintenance (Table 11)

In Policy No. 4, Member Gjerdingen noted the need to address sweeping requirements, based on City Code, for private commercial areas as well.

Ms. Bloom responded that this was required by the Illicit Discharge Ordinance.

Member Gjerdingen also addressed Roseville pathways and debris that could end up in the storm water system.

Member Stenlund suggested that all impervious surfaces should be included; however, he noted the need to prioritize them based on discharge loads. Member Stenlund suggested the need to get the public involved in being sweepers of those impervious surfaces; not to rely on City employees to do so. Member Stenlund opined that there was a significant amount of education yet required to help residents understand what constituted illicit discharges, and how to get that component to the knowledge of the general public.

At the request of Member Gjerdingen, Ms. Bloom advised that the City's nuisance ordinance addressed trash on commercial and other properties.

In Policy No. 5, Chair Vanderwall noted the need to address small spills on private property, not just public property; with Ms. Bloom advising that the City's illicit discharge ordinance also referenced that.

Member Stenlund noted the need for all City staff, not just appropriate City staff, to be able to recognize problem areas, providing more eyes and ears for the staff responsible to be made aware of problems and address them. Member Stenlund suggested a team approach with more eyes available when driving around the City on their daily work assignments, and the need to teach them what to look for.

Mr. Leaf suggested "walking the walk" and leading by example.

Chair Vanderwall suggested that the narrative Goal Statement could emphasize prevention, since prevention eliminated the need for more maintenance; and have the policies engender public awareness to prevent and reduce maintenance costs.

Member DeBenedet noted the ever-increasing attitude that it was better to seek forgiveness rather than ask for permission; and the need to make people aware that this is not always the case. Member DeBenedet noted that this needed to be part of the education process to avoid having flagrant disregard of rules by some when the majority of residents were attempting to follow the rules for the betterment of the overall community.

Member Felice concurred, noting that many of those decisions caused permanent damage and had considerable negative consequences.

Member Stenlund suggested including winter management in this section, not just summer management (e.g. snow storage); with Ms. Bloom advising that this was included Policy No. 7 and as part of the Implementation section as well. Ms. Bloom noted the need, however, to include all property owners, not just residents in those discussion and implementation.

Chair Vanderwall suggested that staff check for consistency with the ordinance for phosphorus loading; and include language “near water resources,” in that section as well.

Member Stenlund noted that a phosphorus law was already in place, but the Plan needed to reflect that provision and based on soil tests to ensure water quality.

Goal 6 – Coordination and Collaboration (Table 12)

Ms. Bloom noted that while the Implementation Plan included coordinating with schools via HANC educational opportunities, the School District and other collaborative efforts could also be included.

Chair Vanderwall noted the overall desire for the City to coordinate with other agencies and groups.

Member Stenlund noted the need to make classification information available to students and provide opportunities for them to have access to that information and those features, and their understanding of the differences of those features (e.g. wetlands versus storm water ponds).

Mr. Leaf suggested that as a longer-term implementation goal to provide an interactive tool on the website.

Member Gjerdingen suggested this would be another good place to reference the City’s nuisance and/or illicit discharge ordinances for trash pick-up; with Ms. Bloom offering to follow-up on those references.

In Policy No. 2, Member Felice questioned the meaning of “educational materials;” with Ms. Bloom advising that the intent was to have a consistent message and build upon that foundation through use of partner activities and promotions as part of the implementation policy.

Mr. Leaf noted that the intent was to use those materials already available and not recreate them.

Member Felice suggested including that statement in the policy to clarify it.

Member Stenlund questioned the location of “engineered green space construction,” through the use of plant materials and trees to improve water quality.

Ms. Bloom advised that this was discussed via Low Impact Development (LID) efforts.

Member Stenlund noted the need, once developed, to regulate and maintain that green space and avoid it being converted to something else.

Ms. Bloom advised that such regulations were already required as part of City Code and part of the approval process addressing maintenance and sustainability.

Member DeBenedet suggested, as part of the land development process and permitting, there should be a maintenance agreement as part of the ordinance related to storm water management.

Ms. Bloom noted that part of the work plan is to update the drainage ordinance.

Member Stenlund emphasized the need to include it as part of an operations plan to avoid pond evolution and standard designs for a rain garden community.

Ms. Bloom made note in the Policy section to include maintenance for construction of LID's.

Member Stenlund concurred, noting the need to preserve the engineer-built system.

Ms. Nestingen suggested adding that to Policy No. 10; with Mr. Leaf clarifying that the preservation and maintenance of the system should address the entire system.

Mr. Leaf, upon learning that the City did not have a template for a maintenance agreement, advised that he would provide an example to staff.

Chair Vanderwall noted that it was addressed in Policy No. 9 of Goal 5 (Table 11) as well.

In Policy No. 1, Member DeBenedet noted that language should be revised to ensure that the City was not held liable, since laws and rules change consistently; with Chair Vanderwall suggesting language be revised to state that the "City shall ENDEAVOR to inform developers..."

Discussion ensued about various options for forums or workshops, tours and presentations that would engage students and residents, while recognizing the limited staff resources available.

Goal 7 – Sustainability (Table 13)

Ms. Bloom questioned if Policies No. 2 and 4 specifically addressed the concerns of Member Stenlund; with Member Stenlund enthusiastically supporting exploring additional multi-use facilities from a sustainability perspective (e.g. soccer field and storm water pond) and providing multi-use of green spaces.

Chair Vanderwall, referencing the Goal Statement, questioned if sustainable was intended as self-renewing and specific to water, or what was actually intended.

626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670

Member DeBenedet opined that, in part, sustainability tries to reach ponds versus pipes; however, he noted the unknown consequence and costs for clean-out of hazardous materials from those ponds. Member DeBenedet noted that pond locations could also be perceived to be an amenity for land uses.

Mr. Leaf noted the improving technologies and cost of management based on those improving technologies and sustainability efforts now compared to that interest in the past.

Ms. Bloom noted that an entire section of this Plan addressed parks (pages 6 and 7); with Member Stenlund recognizing that collaborative sustainability efforts could see part of the Parks budget assisting with the Storm water budget.

Mr. Leaf noted that this also included more people using parks, and providing an educational technique.

While recognizing that the Parks & Recreation Commission may want to limit multi-use options at some parks, Member DeBenedet opined that if they were designed properly, there should be minimal problems within limits.

Ms. Bloom noted that this includes porous pavement in some multi-use areas as well in the General Goal Statement.

Member Stenlund noted that this would provide more treatment at the source versus along the path.

Member Gjerdingen sought the threshold of when storm water ponds were fences and when they were not, opining that the fences were a major eyesore.

Ms. Bloom advised that storm water fencing was a property owner decision; and while she did not encourage it, some private developers perceived that they provided a level of safety to avoid liability issues. Ms. Bloom advised that her typical response was that fences don't keep people out; they keep emergency responders out; as well as being unattractive.

Member Stenlund noted that there were also options to keep ponds more shallow or sides less steep, providing for a safe as well as sustainable design.

Member Gjerdingen questioned to benefit of having more and smaller storm water treatment ponds dispersed throughout a property rather than one large pond; and how that affected sustainability.

Member DeBenedet suggested that not be included as a goal or policy, but that staff and the consultant provide a recommendation.

Ms. Bloom noted that the Policies said to “encourage,” and “support” and staff could provide options accordingly.

Member Stenlund noted that they could be pieces of the puzzle, rather than relying on one option.

At the request of Ms. Bloom regarding Policy No. 2 and whether that achieved the intent, Member Stenlund opined that it did not; and that phosphorus needed to be identified as a stressor, and an option provided for phosphorus reduction that could be managed and maintained.

Ms. Bloom suggested that staff could add another goal to address those stressors.

Member Gjerdingen suggested a fifth policy that the “City shall review BMP’s that lend to long-term or easy maintenance...”

Member Felice advised that it would be useful to have some record retained by the City of successful projects to serve as models for residents.

Ms. Bloom advised that this would be a good Implementation Strategy.

Implementation Plan

With Mr. Leaf seeking initial comments of the PWETC related to the Implementation Plan, Ms. Bloom suggested that those comments be held until the next meeting. Ms. Bloom advised that staff would incorporate tonight’s comments in the next draft. Ms. Bloom noted that, as always, individual feedback and comments were encouraged from Members between meetings for review off-line.

Member DeBenedet reminded staff of the request that revisions from tonight’s discussion be provided at least one (1) week prior to the next month’s meeting.

Member Stenlund suggested a goal be included to provide an understanding that progressive thinking to address future needs will need to be provided beyond today’s water quality technologies and efforts.

Mr. Leaf noted that this was the intent of the Plan, to address where the City should be going.

Member DeBenedet questioned how to focus on those proactive technologies for implementation (e.g. upgraded water data for large rain events, and monitoring large site infiltration systems).

Mr. Leaf noted that he considered that part of the entire sustainability process for the whole system, and taking all factors into consideration.

717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762

Chair Vanderwall questioned if that proactive thinking needed to be a separate goal or to recognize that the Plan is continuing to evolve and will be adjusted as appropriate. Chair Vanderwall suggested that this needed to be a separate goal or included in the Preface.

Ms. Nestingen noted that Section 7 talked about plan amendments; however, Ms. Bloom noted that depending on the nature of the amendment, they needed to go through a formal approval process.

Ms. Bloom noted that the Master Plan should serve as a foundation, with items included in the Implementation Plan. Ms. Bloom noted that past efforts by staff in attempting to celebrate accomplishments were relegated to the City Council's consent agenda and eventually phased out as staff resources were reallocated and reprioritized.

Member Stenlund, referencing Page 107, noted that the goal of the Plan was to have unimpaired waters when done; and to have a measurable outcome of how various stressors were addressed over the ten (10) years to achieve those goals.

Mr. Leaf opined that the overriding goal addresses that intent.

Due to the lateness of the hour, Chair Vanderwall advised that the remaining agenda items, Assessment and Complete Streets Policies, would be taken up at the next meeting of the PWETC.

8. Assessment Policy Revisions

9. Review DRAFT Complete Streets Policy

10. Possible Items for Next Meeting – July 24, 2012

- DRAFT Complete Streets Policy
- Assessment Policy Revisions
- Storm Water Management Plan Update Discussion (continued)
Members asked that staff and the consultant provide revisions at least one (1) week in advance of the July meeting to allow sufficient time for PWETC review.

Ms. Bloom questioned at what point the PWETC wished to invite formal public comment on the Storm Water Management Plan.

- Organized Trash Collection Process
Chair Vanderwall cautioned that, once the City Council had taken action on the PWETC recommendation for the organized trash collection, that item needed to be immediately included on the next PWETC agenda following City Council action, and other items would need to be prioritized accordingly.

763 • Pathway Master Plan

764 Member DeBenedet asked that additional and updated information on the
765 existing build-out of the pathway system, based on the original Pathway
766 Master Plan, be incorporated into the Complete Streets discussion. Based on
767 discussions at the joint meeting of the PWETC and City Council, Member
768 DeBenedet noted their request to review the Master Plan and determine how it
769 relates to the Parks Master Plan Implementation program; and what is and is
770 not included.

771
772 Ms. Bloom confirmed that staff could provide a priority list and those
773 pathways incorporated in the Parks Master Plan Implementation program as
774 additional information for the PWETC.
775

776 At the request of Member DeBenedet and previous concerns of Member Stenlund
777 to include trees as storm water management options for Complete Streets, Ms.
778 Bloom advised that this information was included in the SWMP's Implementation
779 Plan (page 22). Member DeBenedet, in reviewing the draft Complete Streets
780 Policy modeled from that developed by Ms. Bloom for the City of Falcon
781 Heights, noted that it tied in with the CSWMP as well.
782

783 At the request of Member Gjerdingen to look at Parks bond allocated funding for
784 pathway build-out, Chair Vanderwall suggested waiting until the Parks
785 Commission provided their available numbers before moving further with
786 discussion at the PWETC level.
787

788 Member Stenlund confirmed that, had he been at the meeting during the vote, he
789 would have voted in support of the organized collection resolution and
790 recommendation to the City Council.
791

792 **11. Adjourn**

793 Member Stenlund moved, Member DeBenedet seconded, adjournment of the
794 meeting at approximately 8:43 p.m.
795

796 **Ayes: 5**

797 **Nays: 0**

798 **Motion carried.**

Roseville Public Works, Environment and Transportation Commission

Agenda Item

Date: July 24, 2012

Item No: 4

Item Description: Communication Items

- Projects update-
 - Josephine Woods– The Developer has installed the pathway connection from the end of the cul- de- sac to Josephine Road.
 - Josephine Lift Station– Work is anticipated to start after Labor Day and be complete by September 30.
 - Rice Street Reconstruction Phase 2- Staff continues to meet with Ramsey County regarding this project. The project has been delayed to at least 2014. Recent discussion focuses on project scope, funding, and schedule challenges due to MnDOT’s proposed work on 35E from 2013-2015.
 - 2012 Pavement Management Project- the first lift of bituminous has been placed in the neighborhood west of Har Mar, . Watermain replacement work has begun on Lydia. For more information go to: www.cityofroseville.com/2012PMP
 - Fairview Pathway, Phase 1- The contractor has started work on the final portions of this phase of the project. Work to be completed in the next 4 weeks: bike lane striping, work on Gortner Avenue, and warranty work.
 - Fairview Pathway, Phase 2- This project is out for bid and anticipated to be awarded in August with construction commencing shortly thereafter.
 - Skillman Drainage improvements- City staff has been working with the Roseville School District, who has committed to partnering with the City to implement a flood reduction project on the Fairview Community Center property. The proposed improvements involve the construction of a rate control storm water pond at the southeast corner of the Fairview Community Center property, near the Skillman cul de sac. The pond will be constructed on non-play areas; no field use will be lost. This pond will hold water during rain events only; it will not be designed to hold a permanent pool of water. This project is currently out to bid, and will be constructed in late August/ early September.
 - Staff is working on final plans for the following projects:
 - Waterman lining project

Recommended Action:

None

Attachments:

A.

Roseville Public Works, Environment and Transportation Commission

Agenda Item

Date: July 24, 2012

Item No: 5

Item Description: Pathway Master Plan

Background:

The Commission discussed developing a build out plan for the Pathway Master Plan in concert with the Parks Master Plan pathways priorities. Staff has included a map and table that have been revised and brought up to date with projects constructed since the plan was adopted in 2008. These can be used as working tools for the discussion. Your recommendations should be shared with the Parks and Recreation Commission for concurrence before recommending a final plan. We are also attaching the adopted Pathway Master Plan from 2008.

Recommended Action:

Attachments:

- A. Map
- B. Table
- C. 2008 Pathway Master Plan
- D. Parks Master Plan Trail Priorities

Roseville Pathway Master Plan (with updates)



Prepared by:
Engineering Department
July 19, 2012

- Footpath (3.17 miles)
- Sidewalk (38.06 miles)
- Striped Shoulder (29.09 miles)
- Trail (33.02 miles)
- New Pathway Since 2008 (2.75 miles)
- Planned Pathway 2013-2015 (3.60 miles)
- Proposed Segments (26.18 miles)
- Proposed Striped Shoulder (1.56 miles)

Data Sources and Contacts:

* Ramsey County GIS Base Map (7/02/12)

* City of Roseville Engineering Department

For further information regarding the contents of this map contact:

City of Roseville, Engineering Department,
2660 Civic Center Drive, Roseville MN

DISCLAIMER:

This map is neither a legally recorded map nor a survey and is not intended to be used as one. This map is a compilation of records, information and data located in various city, county, state and federal offices and other sources regarding the area shown, and is to be used for reference purposes only. The City does not warrant that the Geographic Information System (GIS) Data used to prepare this map are error free, and the City does not represent that the GIS Data can be used for navigational, tracking or any other purpose requiring exacting measurement of distance or direction or precision in the depiction of geographic features. If errors or discrepancies are found please contact 651-792-7075. The preceding disclaimer is provided pursuant to Minnesota Statutes §466.03, Subd. 21 (2000), and the user of this map acknowledges that the City shall not be liable for any damages, and expressly waives all claims, and agrees to defend, indemnify, and hold harmless the City from any and all claims brought by User, its employees or agents, or third parties which arise out of the user's access or use of data provided.

0 500 1000 1500 2000 Feet

mapdoc: PathwayMasterPlan2008withUpdates.mxd
map: PathwayMasterPlan2008withUpdates.pdf

1/2 mile to
Roseville Area
Middle School

Pathway Master Buildout Plan See Map (Scoring per 2008 Pathway Master Plan)		RANKING CRITERIA										SCORE	Length	Estimated Cost	Build Year	Funding Source
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J					
		20	20	15	25	15	15	25	10	5	20					
SCORE WEIGHT		4	4	3	5	3	3	5	2	1	4					
21	Rice St	19	19	12	20	13.5	7.5	21.25	9	2.75	17	141			Future	
6	County Road B2	19	13	10.5	25	12.75	8.25	23.75	8.5	3	17	140.75			2013-2015	
12	Fairview Ave (South of B2)	16	14	13.5	18.75	12	9	21.25	7.5	3	18	133			Done: 2011-2012	
7	County Road B	19	13	12.75	21.25	12	7.5	21.25	8	2.25	13	130			2013-2015	
17	Victoria St (B to C)	14	11	10.5	17.5	12.75	13.5	23.75	8	3.25	15	129.25			2013-2015	
4	County Road C	17	14	11.25	15	12	8.25	21.25	8.5	3.75	17	128			Future	
18	Victoria St (South of B)	15	15	9.75	13.75	12.75	13.5	18.75	8	3	15	124.5			2014-2015	
16	Victoria St (North of C)	13	15	9	18.75	11.25	12	21.25	7.5	3	13	123.75			Future	
15	Lexington Ave	18	17	10.5	20	12.75	10.5	13.75	8	3	7	120.5			Future	
11	Fairview Ave (North of B2)	17	15	12.75	10	11.25	6.75	22.5	7	3.25	13	118.5			Future	
5	County Road C Sidewalk	17	12	11.25	15	9.75	10.5	21.25	6.5	3	11.25	117.5			Future	
26	Rosedale to HarMar Connection	17	11	13.5	7.5	10.5	3.75	23.75	7	3.5	17	114.5			Future	
8	Roselawn Ave	15	14	10.5	11.25	10.5	9.75	17.5	6.5	3	12	110			Future	
25	NE Diagonal RR Connection (Walnut to Co Rd C)	14	16	10.5	3.75	14.25	6.75	18.75	6.5	3.5	16	110			Future	
20	Dale St South of Reservoir Woods	10.67	10.67	9	13.33	11	9	23.33	7.33	2	13.33	109.67			Future	
13	TH 51 connection to Old Snelling (Arden Hills)	15	14	4.5	11.25	9	11.25	18.75	6	4.25	10	104			Future	
14	Hamline Ave	12.25	15	6.75	16.25	8.25	9	16.25	6	3.5	9	102.25			Future	
31	Millwood to County Road C2 Link	10	8	3.75	18.75	8.25	12	16.25	5.5	4	12	98.5			2013-2015	
34	Alta Vista Drive	10	11	8.25	6.25	7.5	12.75	16.25	6	3.25	13	94.25			Future	
1	County Road D	12.75	10	9	5	9	6.75	20	5	3.25	13	93.75			Future	
10	Cleveland Ave	14	13	6.75	3.75	9.75	8.25	16.25	5	4	12	92.75			Future	
9	Larpenteur Ave	11	7	7.5	5	6	13	18.75	4.5	4.75	15	92.5			Future	
33	Cohansey St to HANC Connection	9.75	8	3.75	20	4.5	12.75	12.5	5	3.25	10	89.5			Future	
30	Villa Park Connections	12	9	3.75	10	6	15	12.5	4	3.5	13	88.75			Future	
2	County Road C2 (W of Snelling)	12	11	3.75	2.5	9.75	10.5	20	4	2.5	11	87			Future	
3	County Road C2 (E of Snelling)	12	7	5.25	3.75	9.75	10.5	16.25	4	3.5	14	86			Future	
29	Lovell to Minnesota Connection	6	6	3.75	21.25	5.25	6.75	12.5	4.5	3.25	11	80.25			Future	
27	Heinel Drive Connection	9	8	4.5	6.25	3.75	12.75	11.5	5	2.75	12	75.5			Future	
19	Dale St North of Co Rd C	7	6	8.25	6.25	6	10.5	11.25	4.5	4	10	73.75			Done: 2011	
28	Judith to Iona Connection	9	8	3.75	7.5	5.25	12	10	3.5	2.75	11	72.75			Future	
23	Langton Lake Loop	9	6	3	3.75	3	15	7.5	6.5	3.75	15	72.5			Future	
22	Brenner to Langton Connection	8	6	3.75	3.75	3	11.5	7.5	2.5	4.5	11	61.5			Done: 2011	
24	Twin Lakes Redevelopment Area Connections	9	4	4.5	3.75	6.75	6	8.75	3.5	2.5	8	56.75			Future	
32	Eustis to St Croix Connection	6	4	3	5	3.75	7.5	7.5	2.5	2.75	7	49			Future	

PATHWAY MASTER PLAN

City of Roseville, Minnesota

September 22, 2008

Developed for:
The Roseville City Council
and Citizens

Developed by:
Pathway Advisory Committee



Public Works

2660 Civic Center Drive, Roseville, MN 55113-1899
phone (651) 792-7003 fax (651) 792-7040

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	3
Purpose.....	4
Benefits	5
Pathway Advisory Committee	6
Pathway Advisory Committee Mission	6
Process.....	7
Work Plan	7
Background.....	8
History of Roseville’s Pathways	8
Current Conditions.....	8
Pathway Types	12
Supplemental Facilities	13
Current Operation & Maintenance Practices	13
Trail Management Program	14
Issues	15
Policies and Standards.....	17
LOCATION	17
CONNECTION.....	19
IMPLEMENTATION	20
MAINTENANCE	21
EDUCATION/INFORMATION/REGULATION.....	22
Recommendations	23
Project Prioritization	24
Project Ranking.....	24
Ranking Criteria.....	24
Detailed Description of Priority Projects	26
Pathway Project Ranking Results	28
Appendices	29
Definitions.....	29
1997 Pathway Master Plan Committee	32
1997 Planning Process	33
Imagine Roseville 2025 Final Report	34
Exhibit 1: Existing Land Use Map.....	35
Exhibit 2: Roadway Jurisdiction Map.....	36
Exhibit 3: Bus Route Map	37
Exhibit 4: City Pathway Map.....	38
Exhibit 5: Pathway Master Plan Map	39

Introduction

The development of a pathway network in the City of Roseville, as well as in the entire metropolitan area continues to have the support of Roseville residents. This desired network of pathways is essential in moving people to and from various destinations as well as providing additional recreational opportunities. The City currently has about 104 miles of pathways that provide some alternative to driving but are mostly used for recreation. This is a good start but if we as a City want to continue to provide a desirable place to live and work we need to pursue the construction of pathways in an organized and progressive manner.

In 1992, the City invited residents to participate in *Vista 2000* -- a series of forums designed to bring together citizens, city officials and business, education and civic groups to create a vision for our community's future. One of the outcomes of *Vista 2000* was the creation of the Roseville Pathway Master Plan (1997). This plan was instrumental in the development of almost 20 miles of pathways over the last 10 years.

The City Council spearheaded a community visioning process in 2006 entitled: Imagine Roseville 2025 (IR2025). To answer questions about how Roseville will change in the coming years and begin shaping our community's future. The City Council adopted the Steering Committee's Final Report on March 29, 2007. The following areas of the IR2025 final report all had goals and strategies that support the development of pathways within the City of Roseville:

Area	Goal
Community	Roseville is a welcoming community that appreciates difference and fosters diversity
	Roseville is a desirable place to live, work and play
	Roseville has a strong and inclusive sense of community
Safety	Roseville is a safe community
Environment	Roseville is an environmentally healthy community
Parks, Open Space, Recreation, Wellness	Roseville has world-renowned parks, open space and multigenerational recreation programs and facilities
	Roseville supports the health and wellness of community members
Infrastructure	Roseville has a comprehensive, safe, efficient, and reliable transportation system
	Roseville has a well-maintained, efficient, and cost-effective public infrastructure
Finance and Revenue	Roseville has a growing, diverse and stable revenue base
	Roseville responsibly funds programs, services and infrastructure to meet long-term needs

For more information on the specific strategies to achieve these goals, we have attached the final report as an Appendix. It is evident from the adopted strategies within the IR2025 final report that the community continues to support the development of a more extensive pathways system that will

link the current pathway system to itself, neighboring communities, and the regional system creating a network that will function in the same fashion as our vehicular transportation system.

This is an update of the 1997 plan. The intent of this document is to provide guidance for the future development of pathways in the City of Roseville.

Purpose

Imagine every Roseville resident being within short walking distance of a pathway that links them to numerous local and metro-wide destinations. Places like; schools, libraries, parks, stores, friends or work could be easily accessed just getting on the pathway network and walking, biking or skating there. A successful network would mean that people living in the Langton Lake neighborhood could safely walk or bike to Rosedale for lunch and a movie and then over to Har Mar to pick up some new books. A student from the Lake Owasso area could bike to morning class at the University of Minnesota. Someone who's out for some exercise could bike around Bennett Lake on their way to Lake McCarrons, then off to the Gateway Trail to explore the northeast suburbs. Or a homeowner near Lake Josephine could bike to their job in downtown Minneapolis. The opportunities are limitless if we develop a safe network of pathways that connect to our neighboring communities.

Pathways are not a new concept, they are found throughout the metropolitan area. Numerous communities are developing pathways with every new development or redevelopment. Roseville alone has about 104 miles of on and off-road pathways. The sidewalk, once a lost idea, is starting to make its way back into suburban development because it connects neighborhoods creating a healthier and more livable community.

The need is for a congruent system that links the existing pathways with each other creating a grid not unlike the street network. The goal is to provide a safe alternative to the automobile that can provide access as conveniently and efficiently as that allowed for the automobile. Every street within the City should have a facility that provides safe travel for light traffic, i.e. pedestrians, cyclists and in-line skaters, whether it's a shared on-road facility or separated off-road facility.

The purpose of this document, the Roseville Pathway Master Plan, is to provide a set of guidelines for use in the development of a pathway network for our community. These guidelines provide policies and standards for the planning, design, construction, maintenance, promotion and regulation of the community's pathway facilities. This plan is not intended to define interior park paths, those will be defined on an individual basis as the parks are planned and developed, although, the guidelines will provide some of the necessary elements for proper design and development. The recommendations provided in this plan focus not only on the physical facilities, but also on education and enforcement as important components of a general program to promote safe pathway use. Once the master plan is adopted as part of the Roseville Comprehensive Plan it will serve as a planning tool to assist the City Council on decisions regarding pathway issues.

Benefits

There are many factors that make up the perceived quality of life for a community; education, diverse recreation opportunities, strong economy, clean and healthy environment and convenient transportation are just a few. A successful pathway network can help make a community a better place to live, work, play or visit by improving the quality of life. Creating places for light traffic means more than just special trails, though those might certainly be an important part of an overall plan. Creating an active community environment means taking a look at the broader scope of where there are, and aren't, opportunities to safely connect to destinations. It involves land use design, retrofitting the transportation infrastructure, funding and much more.

Of all the benefits that pathways can provide for a community, the most obvious are recreation and social. A growing urban population with increasing amounts of leisure time, combined with an overall surge in health consciousness, has led to an increasing demand for outdoor activities such as jogging, walking, biking and in-line skating.

Encouraging the development and use of alternative modes of transportation can benefit the community as well as the individual. Some benefits are:

1) Safety

- Pathways provide people, young and old, a designated space for accessing area destinations.
- Pathways create safe alternatives to the school-busing program.
- Pathways direct people to safe street crossings.

2) Social

- Pathways promote strong neighborhood connections creating a more livable community.
- A pathways network can provide access and mobility to users of any age or ability.

3) Economic

- Bicycles and in-line skates, as well as walking, are an affordable and low maintenance alternative to automobile use.
- Pathways, because of their size and construction, are less costly to develop and maintain than roadways.
- Surveys have indicated that the value of a home goes up an average of 6% as a result of its close proximity to a trail.

4) Transportation

- A pathways system provides an increased convenience for non-motorized transportation to access local and regional destinations.
- Pathway use, as an alternative, assists in the relief of roadway congestion and frees up parking spaces.
- Pathways provide another level of service in the desired multi-modal transportation system by provide connections to transit.

5) Health

- Users of pathways, whether they walk, bike or in-line skate, will improve their physical fitness and reduce personal stress.
- Pathway trips, when utilitarian, add fitness into ones daily routine.

6) Environmental

- Using pathways as an alternative to motorized vehicles reduces air or noise pollution.
- Bicycling and in-line skating are energy efficient.
- Pathway use does not consume fossil fuels.

Pathway Advisory Committee

The Public Works, Environment and Transportation Commission (PWETC) reviewed the goals and strategies including in the IR2025 report and recommended to the City Council that the Pathway Master Plan be updated (Infrastructure, Goal 1, Strategy D1).. In November of 2007 the Council directed staff to seek members for a committee to guide the update and provide input to staff through this process. A work plan and schedule was also approved by the City Council. Staff advertised for interested community members to volunteer for this committee. The following people were appointed to this committee:

<u>Representing</u>	<u>Members</u>
Public Works Environment and Transportation Commission	Jan Vanderwall
Parks and Recreation Commission	Sarah Brodt Lenz
Active Living Ramsey County Bicycle Committee	Ken Yokanovich
Community at Large	Sarah Heikkila
	Mike Tracy
	Lisa Edstrom
	Kathleen Cassen Mickelson
	Deb Parker
	Bob Clarkson
	Gregg Moder
City Staff	Duane Schwartz
	Debra Bloom
	Lonnie Brokke
	Jeff Evenson

Pathway Advisory Committee Mission

Develop a Pathway Master Plan that provides the community direction for the development of a safe and contiguous pathway network, reaching all residents and providing a more livable community.

Process

The Pathway Advisory Committee's process for the development of this updated document started with the review of the existing Pathway Master Plan to determine if the plan continues to reflect Roseville's pathway needs. They also were asked to determine if the existing plan policies and standards remain in keeping with the community's goals and strategies as defined in the IR2025 Final Report. City staff's role was to provide support and guidance by setting up meetings, gathering information, answering questions, editing the plan, and otherwise assisting the Committee as needed. Many steps were taken during the update process in the update of this document including the identification, analysis, discussion and recommendation of many light traffic transportation issues and elements.

Work Plan

We anticipate working through the following outline as a work plan for the update process and expect this to require 4-5 meetings with a completion date of August 2008.

1) Background

- Review 2003 update version of plan.
- Reviewed community issues, demographics, pathway history and current system inventory and operations
- Discuss what has been accomplished in last five years

2) Analysis

- Identify areas of plan in need of update
- Discuss Imagine Roseville 2025 goals and strategies
- Review guidelines from federal and state agencies
- Design Guidance Accommodating Bicycle and Pedestrian Travel: A Recommended Approach (FHWA) This and other light traffic resources are available online at: http://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/ped_bike/index.htm
- Mn/DOT Bikeway Facility Design Manual. This and other light traffic resources are available online: <http://www.dot.state.mn.us/bike/> and <http://www.dot.state.mn.us/peds/>

3) Development

- Update general policy statements for each category
 - i) Location
 - ii) Connection
 - iii) Implementation
 - iv) Maintenance
- Education / Information / Regulation
- Determine system revisions/ needs based on revised policies
- Prioritize needs
- Develop Capital Improvement Plan (CIP)
- Compile information into document

Background

History of Roseville's Pathways

Trail development in Roseville started during the early 1970's with a small loop in Sandcastle Park which led to the construction of the very popular Central Park system, the 1995 construction of the County Road C pathway and the 1997 expansion of the Acorn Park trails. In 1975 a comprehensive plan for trails was developed similar to the network that is being proposed with this document. The desire was to have an integrated system of paths that connected residents to area parks. The intent was mainly recreational.

The City's first pathway plan created a surge of development in the 1970's locating pathways mainly in the parks. City code was changed later to dictate that developers were responsible for providing pedestrian accommodations to their new facility, so sidewalks started to sprout up in commercial and industrial areas. Outside funding sources became more available in the 1980's, which also increased the development of pathways including a growing interest in basic pathway facilities for bike commuters.

As a follow-up to Vista 2000, on September 11, 1995 the City Council appointed a volunteer advisory committee to work with staff to develop a comprehensive pathway master plan. The advisory committee was made up of fourteen Roseville residents and three staff members. We have included information regarding this process in the Appendix. This plan was approved by City Council in 1997 and updated in 2003. The main focus of the 2003 update was to re-prioritize the list of pathway project that were identified within the 1997 plan, eliminating the ones that had been constructed and creating new priorities.

Current Conditions

Demographics

2000 US Census Data indicates that Roseville has a stable population; this is mainly due to limited developable land. Some additional census information:

- Roseville's population increased 1% since 1990; from 33,485 in 1990 to 33,690 in 2000.
- Roseville lost 1,250 residents under the age of 45 from 1990 to 2000.
- Roseville has a large population of older residents. 20% of the 2000 population was age 65 or older. This compares with 12% for Ramsey County and 10% for the Twin Cities region.
- The overall age of Roseville is notably older than the county and the region. The 2000 median age of Roseville's population was 41.0 years. This compares with 33.7 years for the County and 34.2 years for the region.
- The aging resident stability indicates that Roseville is a desirable place to live and most are staying in the community.

The data indicates that seniors and empty nesters occupy most of the households. These demographics define the need for the creation of a pathway network that allows seniors the means to exercise and make short utilitarian trips.

The fact that the city is nearly developed also indicates that pathway construction and location will be somewhat restricted due to previously defined corridors and limited space.

Land Use

Roseville is virtually 100% developed. Origins, destinations and travel routes are well established. Understanding and defining land use is critical to pathways development in that these destination points are where people want to walk or bike - areas such as, major civic buildings, recreational and cultural facilities and shopping areas. For more information see Exhibit 1- Existing Land Use Map.

Transportation System

With Roseville being completely developed, the transportation system and travel routes are well established. Because of its proximity to the core cities and its age, Roseville's development patterns have been mainly a continuation of the core grid. The major through traffic corridors that carry the bulk of the vehicles are laid out with half-mile spacing. These arterial roads are designed to carry the majority of the traffic and do it quite well. For the same reasons they also serve well as corridors for light traffic, providing commuter cyclists with an efficient means to their destination be it work, school or the store. But in the past they had not been designed to accommodate bicycle and pedestrian traffic thus making most of them dangerous for such travel due to the domination of vehicular traffic.

1) Roadways (Exhibit 2)

- a) MNDOT: Major high volume roads, including Snelling, Interstate 35W, and Highway 36.
- b) County: High volume roads that make up the 1/2 mile roadway grid pattern in Roseville.
- c) City: Lower volume neighborhood streets and collectors.

2) Transit (Exhibit 3)

Ninety percent of the City's population lives within a 1/2 mile of a bus route. Here is a brief description of the transit system that serves Roseville:

- a) Transit Centers: Rosedale & Little Canada (Rice Street at Little Canada Road)
- b) Park and Rides: Roseville Skating Center, Grace Church, & Rosedale Shopping Center
- c) Fixed route bus service: Metropolitan Council provides 13 fixed routes.
- d) Non-fixed routes: There are several transit options offering door to door service at reasonable rates. Each program has eligibility requirements. These services are provided by Metro Mobility, Roseville Area Senior Program, and the American Red Cross.
- e)

3) Pathways (Exhibit 4)

The City of Roseville has approximately 104 miles of both on and off-road pathways.

- a) County: There are some on-road striped shoulders that meet the minimum standards as stated in the definitions. There are approximately 29 miles of on-road pathways.
- b) State: Currently there are no State pathway facilities in Roseville. The closest facility is the

Gateway Trail south and east of the City.

- c) City: This system consists of the park interior pathway system and some connecting routes between destinations along major roads. There are approximately 69 miles of city owned and maintained off-road pathways.

Described below are the major paths that make up the majority of the City's existing pathway system.

- Central Park Pathways
The pathway system in Central Park has always been popular because of its proximity to attractive and diverse natural amenities, its connection to numerous recreational areas and its size, which provides multiple access points and lengthy paved paths. The Central Park paths are heavily used and provide a very good trail experience for recreational users and a good thoroughfare for utilitarian users.
- County Road C Pathway
The pathway in the County Road C corridor was constructed in 1995 with funding assistance from ISTE. This path provides an essential central spine through the City, connecting users to a number of City amenities like commercial/retail centers, Central Park, Acorn Park, City Hall and the Lexington Avenue pathway.
- County Road B2 Pathway
This off-road trail provides access from the Lexington Avenue trail through the Rosedale Mall shopping area. It was expanded, using federal funds, in 2005 to extend from Rosedale to the west city boundary where it connects up to the Minneapolis Diagonal Trail. This corridor is a major connector for students within the walking area for Roseville Area Schools, providing connections to Roseville High School, Parkview Elementary, and Roseville Middle School.
- County Road B Pathway
This corridor consists mainly of off-road concrete sidewalks providing access to and from residential areas, Har Mar shopping area and Lexington Avenue pathway. This sidewalk, from Rice Street all the way to Cleveland Avenue, provides an east/west pedestrian corridor.
- Dale Street Pathway
This corridor is mainly an off-road bituminous pathway connecting County Road C to Larpen Avenue. This pathway briefly merges with the Roselawn/ Reservoir Woods Trail at Roselawn. The pathway was identified in the 1997 plan and constructed in 2000 using Federal funds. The segment of Dale Street from Roselawn to Larpen does not have an off-road pathway. The connection to Larpen Avenue is achieved through Reservoir Woods Park.
- Larpen Avenue Sidewalk

Three segments of this sidewalk have been constructed along Larpenteur Avenue since the development of the 1997 plan. The segments are Hamline to Oxford (2000), Galtier to Rice Street (2001) and Oxford to Reservoir Woods (2003). The segment of Larpenteur between Reservoir Woods Park and Galtier still does not have an off-road facility.

- **Lexington Avenue Pathway**
This is the main north/south spine of the City. The corridor consists of both bituminous path and concrete sidewalk running from Larpenteur Avenue north through Roseville and into Shoreview. Shoreview's development of this pathway corridor provides a wonderful opportunity to create a regional north/south link.
- **Roselawn/ Reservoir Woods/ McCarrons Pathway**
This off-road trail was identified in the 1997 plan and constructed in 2000 using Federal funds. It follows Roselawn from Lexington Avenue through Reservoir Woods Park under Dale Street to McCarrons Blvd. This pathway then continues along both North and South McCarrons Blvd to connect to Rice Street.
- **Rice Street Path**
This is an important north/south link from Roseville to St. Paul. The corridor has a bituminous path of varying width and condition. This is a critical feeder to the Trout Brook County Trail at McCarrons Park. The Trout Brook Trail connects to the Gateway State Trail.

User Groups

Users differ widely in their means of travel, ability and preference for travel environment. Some will place importance on their ability to get from one place to another, keeping their trip time short and not concerning themselves with the conditions around them. Others will favor traveling in a pleasant environment, even going out of their way to experience scenic and natural amenities. This plan for a linked pathway network will accommodate all user groups in some capacity. The major types of users are:

- a) Commuter Bicyclists - desire to travel safely at higher speeds with minimal stops.
- b) Recreational Bicyclists – desire a safe and scenic corridor with occasional rest areas
- c) Pedestrians - Walkers, joggers, students, strollers, in-line skaters, skate boarders, people with disabilities, young bicyclists and tri-cyclists– desire a smooth surface, a safe facility, and scenic corridor
- d) Cross-country skiers, snowshoers – desire a natural, scenic corridor, groomed snow
- e) Skate-boarders – desire a smooth and often challenging surface

Pathway Types

On-Road Pathways

On-road paths are a paved portion of the roadway that provides space for the use of light traffic. (Exhibit 4: City Pathway Map)

- 1) **Bike Route:** A shared right of way located on roadways designated with appropriate signage to encourage bicycle use. (none in Roseville)
- 2) **Bike Lane:** A portion of the roadway that is designated by physical barrier or striping, and pavement markings for the preferential or exclusive use of bicycles. (none in Roseville)
- 3) **Striped Shoulder:** A portion of the edge of a paved road surface that is contiguous with the road surface and separated by striping at least 4 feet wide. (Approximately 29.7 miles)
- 4) **Shared lane:** Low traffic roads that have no additional space provided for light traffic but that can be shared between automobiles and light traffic because of low traffic volumes. Shared lanes are not designated as pathways although they do provide good access routes to other pathways.

Off-Road Pathways

While a community's streets and roadways typically provide the best means of accessing a variety of destinations by bicycle, off-road pathways can enhance the primary transportation system. Pathways that are separated from the motor vehicle traffic can be excellent transportation routes for recreational cyclists and pedestrians, specifically young children, and in many instances, can provide pathway users with linkages not available to motor vehicles.

- 1) **Trail** An off-road pathway that is generally 6-12 feet wide bituminous paths, a majority of which are in parks. These pathways are multiuse. (Approximately 32.51 miles)
- 2) **Sidewalk** Concrete sidewalks, usually within the road right of way, generally 4-6 feet wide and running parallel to the road, intended for use by pedestrians. (Approximately 36.49 miles)
- 3) **Foot Path** Wood chip trails, ag-lime trails, and turf trails are not considered part of the pathway network because they are exclusive to parks. This document is not about park pathways. They are mentioned for inventory purposes only. (Approximately 4.28 miles)
- 4) **Other** Boardwalks are not considered part of the pathway network because they are exclusive to parks. This document is not about park pathways. They are mentioned for inventory purposes only. (Approximately 1.2 miles)

Supplemental Facilities

Bicycle and pedestrian facilities include more than just the paths themselves. Secure and appropriate bicycle parking and locker facilities, comprehensive maps of Roseville's pathway network, mass transit integration, rest areas, and trailheads are key components of a complete pathway network. Roseville has few supplemental facilities for pathway users. They consist mostly of:

A) Bicycle parking and lockers

- bike racks of obsolete design that are sporadically placed in some parks and public buildings
- occasional bike racks located at commercial buildings
- few if any, bike lockers
- current city code does not address the issues of bicycle parking.

B) Pathways Map

- comprehensive pathways map showing all types of facilities within the City
- partnering with Active Living Ramsey County on developing a comprehensive County pathway map.

C) Trail Heads and Rest Area

- utilizes existing parks w/ restrooms, picnic areas, recreational areas, drinking fountains
- need intermittent rest stops with benches between destinations

D) Transit Accommodations

- abundant transit opportunities
- limited and often unsafe light traffic access to transit stops and park and rides
- bus shelters at bus stops along high traffic roads
- bus benches at many bus stops

Current Operation & Maintenance Practices

Off-Road Pathways

The City's maintenance staff has the responsibility of making sure routine maintenance operations are completed.

Listed below are the maintenance operations performed for the City's off-road pathways.

- Plowing: Remove any accumulation promptly and continuously until cleared. Accumulation of two inches or more shall be removed within 24 hrs.
- Sanding: Sand any time ice or snow adheres to the pathway.
- Sweeping: Sweep three times annually, spring, summer and fall, or when safety is of concern.
- Sealing/ Patching: Fill cracks or holes as they occur.

On-Road Pathways

The City's maintenance staff is responsible for the maintenance of the on-road pathway facilities on City of Roseville streets. Listed below are the maintenance operations performed for the City's on-road pathways.

- Plowing: When there is an accumulation of two inches or more of snow it will be removed within 24 hrs.
- Ice control: apply ice control when ice or snow adheres to the pathway.
- Sweeping: Sweep three times annually, spring, summer and fall, or when safety is of concern.
- Sealing/ Patching: Fill cracks or holes as they occur.

On-Road pathways located on County Roads are maintained by Ramsey County.

Trail Management Program

Since 1999 the Public Works Department has had the responsibility to implement a long term reconstruction and major maintenance program. The Trails Management Program (TMP) is modeled after the Pavement Management Program and consists of: Inspection/Evaluation, Maintenance, Sequential Planning and Financial Planning. The TMP utilizes state of the art pavement tools to help identify and prioritize pathway maintenance and rehabilitation. All of the pathways are broken down into segments that are surveyed approximately every 5 years and actual pavement distresses are measured and entered into a computer database. The measured distresses are used to determine the pavement condition index (PCI). The PCI is a numerical rating between 100, a new pavement, and 0, a completely failed pavement. This methodology was originally developed by the US Army Corps of Engineers and later revised by the Minnesota Local Road Research Board. It has become a standard method to evaluate pavement condition. A computer program that utilizes pavement research findings to predict the degradation of pavement with time then analyzes the pathway data. The rate of degradation has been calibrated to match our actual experience. In addition, the program allows us to model different maintenance strategies to gauge their impact on the overall system and budget. The program is quite flexible and allows us complete discretion in choosing the most appropriate maintenance technique.

The overall PCI of pathways in Roseville is reasonably good, 75 for bituminous and 85 for concrete. This has held steady since 1999 when the TMP was implemented.

Issues

The current pathway system is a good start. But it lacks some important elements that will take it to the next level. These are the types of elements that come with time and public support and demand for a complete network. Developing a master plan is an important initial step in identifying the issues that can provide the City with a complete pathway network. After studying the existing conditions of Roseville and outlining goals for a pathway network the Pathway Advisory Committee defined these issues as most relevant to Roseville.

A) Safety

- Improve transportation facilities for children, senior citizens, people with disabilities, pedestrians, bicyclists, students within school walking areas, all light traffic.
- Design pathway facilities that can provide a safe alternative to the school busing program.
- Encourage the use of traffic calming at intersections and along boulevards especially on the arterial roadways.

B) Connectivity

- Improve the ability to safely travel from one location to the next
- Provide linkages between major destinations
- Extend system to connect to all dead-end pathways
- Develop pathway networks that relate to our neighboring community's pathways
- Overcome barriers that deter pathway use
 - Highway 36, Snelling Avenue, Interstate 35W, arterials
 - Narrow bridge decks and underpasses
 - Poorly defined crosswalks at intersections
 - Intersections designed and engineered for vehicles not young children or senior citizens
 - Traffic lights timed for vehicles not senior citizen and children

C) Regional Links

- Expand pathway opportunities to the larger metropolitan area.
- Create linkages to State trail facilities.
- Utilize existing vehicular corridors to regional parks and pathways.
- Redesign regional corridors to provide for pathway facilities.
-

D) Maintenance

- Increase funding equipment and personnel to maintain a growing pathway network.
- Meet the needs of a demanding public.
- Reconstruct existing facilities that don't meet the current standards (mostly in parks).
- Redefine the pathway management program for maintenance and operations.

E) Aesthetics

- Unify public design elements (i.e. signs, gateways, landscaping, lighting, and parking).

- Establish design criteria for private development (i.e. parking, lockers, and access).

F) Regulation and enforcement

- Develop a consistent and appropriate signage program.
- Expand signage program to include pathways beyond the parks.
- Educate users about pathway etiquette and regulations.
- Inform users through signage of destinations outside of the parks.
- Increase policing of pathway system.
- The emphasis should be on education, with no consequences for violators.

G) Education and Promotion

- Provide programs that are directed at teens and adults, as well as, those for children.
- Provide more programs that teach about safety and etiquette.
- Continue to update the Pathway Map to make it user friendly.
- Make the Pathway Map readily available.
- Create more pathway events like Tour de Roses.
- Inform the local business community about our pathway goals.
- Dispel common public myths about pathways.
- Develop ways to count pathway users.

Policies and Standards

The policies (bold) and standards were developed to guide the City in the development of Roseville's pathway network. They are detailed statements that aid in the resolution of the previously defined pathway issues. The intent of this section is to define the minimum standards for pathway facilities in Roseville. In certain instances it may be necessary to increase the standards in order to provide a safe and efficient facility for the community. *Standards that were left undefined in this document are defined by MNDOT pathway guidelines.*

LOCATION

1. Inventory and acquire rights-of-way that have become available.

- 1.1. Where possible use available rights-of-way first. Use shared rights-of-way second.
- 1.2. Purchase private rights-of-way last.
- 1.3. Sharing pathway rights-of-way with underground utilities will be allowed as long as there is no interference with the function of the pathway.

2. Provide pathway facilities along all roads.

- 2.1. Develop a pathway along all arterial roads where equal alternate parallel routes are not available.
- 2.2. All officially adopted recreational corridors shall have a trail on both sides of the roadway.
- 2.3. Consider sidewalks in primarily residential areas to minimize impacts to property owners.
- 2.4. Develop pathways using the following recommended standards as guidelines. Since there are both Rural and Urban roads in the City, there are two sets of guidelines on the next page

BL = Bicycle Lane; *A portion of a roadway designed for exclusive use by people using bicycles. Bike lanes are distinguished from the portion of the roadway used for motor vehicle traffic by physical barrier or striping and pavement markings. The widths of these lanes vary between 5-10 feet, depending on speed and Average Daily Traffic on the road.*

SL = Shared Lane; *Any roadway upon which a bicycle lane is not designated and which may be legally used by bicycles whether or not such facility is specifically designated as a bikeway. The standard driving lane is to be shared between vehicles and light traffic.*

WOL = Wide Outside Lane; *Any roadway upon which a bicycle lane is not designated and which may be legally used by bicycles whether or not such facility is specifically designated as a bikeway. A widened outside driving lane, 14 feet or greater, is to be shared between vehicles and light traffic.*

T = Trail; *An off-road pathway that is 8- 12 feet wide that is generally shared use, designed for the use of bicycles, in-line skaters and pedestrians.*

SS = Striped Shoulder; *A portion at the edge of a paved road surface that is contiguous with the road surface and separated by striping at least 4 feet wide.*

Urban (curb and gutter) Cross Section Roads Pathway Design Guidelines							
Motor Vehicle ADT (2 lane)		<500	500-1000	1,000- 2,000	2,000- 5,000	5,000- 10,000	>10,000
Motor Vehicle ADT (4 lane)		N/A	N/A	2,000- 4,000	4,000- 10,000	10,000- 20,000	>20,000
Motor Vehicle Speed	25 mph	SL	WOL	WOL	WOL	BL = 5 ft or T = 8 ft	N/A
	30 mph	SL w/ sign	WOL	BL = 5 ft or T = 8 ft	BL = 5 ft or T = 8 ft	BL = 6 ft or T = 8 ft	BL = 6 ft or T = 8 ft
	35-40 mph	WOL	BL = 5 ft	BL = 5 ft or T = 8 ft	BL = 6 ft or T = 8 ft	BL = 6 ft or T = 8 ft	BL = 6 ft or SS = 8 ft
	45 mph and greater	BL = 5 ft	BL = 5 ft	BL = 6 ft or T = 8 ft	BL = 6 ft or T = 8 ft	BL = 6 ft or SS = 8 ft	T or SS = 10 ft
BL = Bicycle Lane, SL = Shared Lane, WOL = Wide Outside Lane, T = Trail, SS = Striped Shoulder							

Rural (shoulder and ditch) Cross Section Roads Pathway Design Guidelines							
Motor Vehicle ADT (2 lane)		<500	500-1000	1,000- 2,000	2,000- 5,000	5,000- 10,000	>10,000
Motor Vehicle ADT (4 lane)		N/A	N/A	2,000- 4,000	4,000- 10,000	10,000- 20,000	>20,000
Motor Vehicle Speed	25 mph	SS = 4 ft or SL	SS = 4 ft or SL	SS = 4 ft or WOL or T = 8 ft	SS = 4 ft or T = 8 ft	SS = 4 ft or T = 8 ft	N/A
	30 mph	SS = 4 ft or SL	SS = 4 ft or WOL	SS = 4 ft or T = 8 ft	SS = 4 ft or T = 8 ft	SS = 6 ft or T = 8 ft	SS = 6 ft or T = 8 ft
	35-40 mph	SS = 4 ft or SL	SS = 4 ft or WOL	SS = 6 ft or T = 8 ft	SS = 6 ft or T = 8 ft	SS = 6 ft or T = 8 ft	SS = 8 ft or T = 8 ft
	45 mph and greater	SS = 4 ft	SS = 4 ft	SS = 6 ft or T = 8 ft	SS = 8 ft or T = 8 ft	SS = 8 ft or T = 8 ft	T or SS = 10 ft
BL = Bicycle Lane, SL = Shared Lane, WOL = Wide Outside Lane, T = Trail, SS = Striped Shoulder							

- 3. Develop pathways around every lake, to and in every park and open space.**
 - 3.1. Pathway development around lakes will be designed to provide, at minimum, views to the lake.
 - 3.2. Bodies of water not defined as lakes shall have pathways when they fit into the overall pathways system.
 - 3.3. Pathways in parks and open spaces will be developed consistent with their individual park master plans.
- 4. Provide and designate pathways for winter activities where appropriate.**
 - 4.1. Cross-country and snowshoe locations will be designated on a separate brochure.
 - 4.2. Snowmobiles and other unauthorized motorized vehicles will not be allowed on off-road pathways
- 5. Develop destination trail loops for exercisers.**
 - 5.1. Loop pathways will be designated, measured and signed.
 - 5.2. Where possible, develop pathway loops that are unbroken by street crossings and other obstructions.
- 6. Develop a pathways system that is accessible from all areas of the city.**
 - 6.1. The pathways system will be designed to provide an unobstructed connection no further than 1/4 mile to a pathway from any given property.

CONNECTION

- 7. Provide a safe network of pathway linkages for pedestrians and cyclists to and between educational facilities, churches, business centers, transit stops, parks and open space.**
 - 7.1. Business centers shall have pathways connecting to the public pathway network.
 - 7.2. Schools shall have off- road connections to the pathways network.
 - 7.3. Parks, open space and transit stops shall have a pathway connecting them to the pathways network.
 - 7.4. Include school property for possible pathway loops and linkages to the greater pathways network.
 - 7.5. Provide public access to school facilities/grounds (i.e. running track)
- 8. Provide access around/through major obstacles.**
 - 8.1. Major obstacles include Highway 36, Snelling Avenue and Highway 35W.
 - 8.2. When bridge reconstruction takes place, light traffic accommodations shall be integrated into the design.
 - 8.3. Connections across major obstacles shall be at controlled intersections or be grade separated.
- 9. Provide pathway linkages for light traffic to the regional pathway system.**
 - 9.1. To complete major linkages to the regional pathway system; utilize bridges and tunnels to

overcome major obstacles.

9.2. Signage shall be utilized to inform and direct users of regional trail linkages.

10. Provide a pathway system that promotes a sense of community through the connection of neighborhoods.

10.1. Utilize existing or purchase new easements to construct pathways between neighborhoods.

10.2. Develop a lower hierarchy trail as neighborhood connectors.

11. Provide a pathway system that connects to local and regional commercial sites.

11.1. Provide pathway access from neighborhoods to commercial uses for consumers.

11.2. Provide connections from neighborhoods to the regional system for commuting cyclists.

IMPLEMENTATION

12. Coordinate planning and design of pathway connections with neighborhood groups, civic organizations, school districts, business districts and other governing agencies.

12.1. Share the Pathway Master Plan with representatives of these various groups.

12.2. When projects are implemented; representatives for the impacted groups will be consulted before plans are finalized.

12.3. Allow for phasing of some pathways to see them through stages of implementation and funding.

12.4. Develop landscape standards for enhancing existing pathways and developing new pathways. Low maintenance landscaping should be considered.

13. Consider alternative pathway types, suitable to intended use.

13.1. Pathways intended for wheeled uses shall be paved.

13.2. Pathways in ecologically sensitive areas shall be designed to minimize their impact.

13.3. Pathways intended for winter activities will not have their snow removed.

13.4. Non-paved pathways will be utilized to restrict some uses.

14. Pathways shall be designed to avoid user conflicts.

14.1. High use areas need separate pathways for separate uses.

14.2. In areas of potential or known conflict trails shall be signed for their intended use.

14.3. Direction of traffic flow, on high use pathways, will be defined and signed or marked.

14.4. Significant space or barriers shall be provided between pathways and conflicting adjacent uses.

14.5. Pathways where conflicts with speed occur shall have defined speed advisories that are properly signed.

14.6. Pathways shall be designed to provide for adequate visibility based on MNDOT standards for pathway facilities.

15. Develop a consistent palette of design elements.

15.1. Design elements shall consist of signage, trail markings, curb cuts, driveway crossings,

medians/dividers, intersections/crosswalks, furniture, lighting, walls, and typical pathway and roadway sections.

- 15.2. Develop a design goal to provide a boulevard between pathways and roadways that provides civic beauty and traffic calming.

16. Establish a formal review process for new and renovated public and private development projects that addresses pedestrian and bicycle issues.

- 16.1. City staff will utilize the City Plan Review Process to ensure consistency with the Pathway Master Plan.
- 16.2. Staff will develop and use a checklist to aid in the plan review process that shall be required to complete prior to plan approval.

17. Pathways shall be part of roadway design and construction.

- 17.1. The City shall consider pathways as part of the transportation system.
- 17.2. The City recognizes that residents adjacent to the pathways may not be the only beneficiaries.

18. Seek ways to encourage businesses to address light traffic issues through the redevelopment of their property.

- 18.1. Provide incentives (low interest loans) for Roseville businesses to redevelop their property with improvements for light traffic.

MAINTENANCE

19. Pathways will be kept in good repair and useable.

- 19.1. During winter, the highest use pathways shall be cleared of snow as close to bare pavement as possible.
- 19.2. During winter, all pathways shall be cleared of enough snow to allow passage.
- 19.3. Pathways will be cleared within 24 hours after a snowfall ends.
- 19.4. All paved pathways shall be swept once during the spring and once during late summer.
- 19.5. Vegetation encroaching in pathway corridor shall be trimmed to allow safe passage according to Mn/DOT standards.
- 19.6. All pathways and their related facilities shall be inspected annually. Inspection data shall be entered into a management system to help guide the maintenance and replacement decisions.

20. Maintenance responsibilities will be assigned based on function and use of the facilities.

- 20.1. The City is responsible for all off-road pathway maintenance.
- 20.2. Residential property owners are encouraged to clear snow from pathways.
- 20.3. Commercial and institutional property owners are responsible to clear snow from adjacent pathways when event is 2 inches or greater.

21. The City will develop and implement maintenance practices that will minimize the burden

on adjoining properties.

- 21.1. City will minimize property damage during pathway maintenance practices.
- 21.2. City will reestablish turf damaged as a result of pathway maintenance.
- 21.3. City will replace or repair mailboxes damaged by snow removal machinery.
- 21.4. No more snow will be deposited on private driveways and sidewalks than would be typically deposited by street snow removal.
- 21.5. City will make efforts to schedule snow removal to minimize double shoveling.

EDUCATION / INFORMATION / REGULATION

22. The City shall regularly update this Plan.

- 22.1. The Pathway Master Plan will be adopted by reference into the City's Comprehensive Plan.
- 22.2. The Plan will be evaluated on a regular basis.

23. Utilize pathway projects to educate the community about the benefits of a well-planned pathways system.

- 23.1. Staff will pursue grants when available to assist in funding the implementation of pathway networks in innovative neighborhoods.
- 23.2. Staff will report successes in pathway projects to the local papers as an educational and promotional practice.
- 23.3. When projects receive public funding, they will be required to develop pathway systems that meet best-value standards in design and construction.
- 23.4. Public pathway systems shall meet the highest of standards in design and construction.

24. Provide proper signage for a safe, user-friendly pathway network.

- 24.1. Signage standards will be taken from the Minnesota Manual for Uniform Traffic Control Devices.
- 24.2. Sign location and placement guidelines will be taken from the MNDOT manual.
- 24.3. Provide pathway network maps at primary locations to better orient users to the Roseville system. Accompanying the map shall be a list of rules for pathway etiquette.

25. Develop regulations for pathway use and enforcement.

- 25.1. Staff will develop pathway regulations to be published and posted to further improve pathway usability.

26. Develop and provide events that promote non-motorized modes of travel.

- 26.1. Add a pathway safety program to the Safety Camp.
- 26.2. Continue to promote Roseville's pathway facilities with events like the Rosefest "Tour de Roses."

27. The City will develop a promotion and education plan.

- 27.1. Provide a "safe biking" class in the Community Education program.
- 27.2. Encourage area cycling shops to support and promote the City's pathway network.

- 27.3. Utilize the OVAL for cycling events both competitive and educational.
- 27.4. Gather and/or develop educational and promotional videos for use at schools, promotional events or local cablecasts.
- 27.5. Collaborate with school officials on ways to educate students on pathway safety and use.
- 27.6. The City will widely circulate pathways plan and maps.
- 27.7. The City will encourage citizen volunteers to aid in pathway maintenance and improvements.
- 27.8. Utilize the City's webpage to educate, inform and promote alternative modes of travel and the Roseville pathway network.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are intended to direct the City to take action in the development of an appropriate and well-guided pathway network for the community's transportation and recreational needs.

- A) Formally adopt by reference the Roseville Pathway Master Plan as part of the City of Roseville's Comprehensive Plan to guide the City in all pathway-related issues.
- B) Support the effort to maintain the City's growing system of pathways through proper funding of equipment, personnel or contracted services. By committing to pathway operations and maintenance, the City is assuring Roseville will have a well-maintained transportation and recreation pathway network for now and into the future.
- C) Support and promote the development of pathway facilities in Roseville through the construction of new facilities through out the City. Recommend a funding program to implement the development of pathway facilities described in this document. Pathway facilities provide not only provide a health benefit for users, they also can reduce congestion, and reduce green house gas emissions.
- D) Development and redevelopment projects shall conform to the Pathway Master Plan goals and policies. Plans shall be reviewed as a part of the design review process to ensure that development and transportation (all modes) work well together.
- E) Review and update the Pathway Master Plan at least every five years to ensure that the plan remains consistent with the community's goals and needs.

Project Prioritization

The purpose of prioritizing projects is so the City can focus on certain projects that have been deemed important. In other words, when a project is ranked as a top priority staff may develop conceptual plans and budget estimates, seek additional funding from outside sources and add them to the development schedule.

Prioritizing pathway projects for development can be a misleading task. Often project ranking becomes somewhat skewed as sometimes lower ranking projects are developed prior to others that have been ranked higher. Often there are other forces that affect the development schedule. For example, local and county street reconstruction; if a street corridor is designated to have a pathway and that street is proposed for reconstruction then that project would move up because the opportunity has presented itself. Likewise, if a number of projects have been submitted for external funding and a lower ranked project is approved, it too would move up on the list. The table on the following page shows the priority projects selected by the Advisory Committee and their subsequent average scores using the criteria ranking methodology defined below.

Project Ranking

The following criteria are used by the Advisory Committee to determine priority recommendations. The Committee was asked to place a value from 0-5 on each criterion based on the policies and standards and their understanding of the community's needs. Then they were asked to evaluate projects by weighing each criterion for that specific project. The end result was a ranking that in turn prioritized the projects. Listed below are the criteria used to rank projects and a brief explanation of each.

Ranking Criteria

A. Connects multiple destinations.

The pathway provides convenient access to businesses, schools, churches, work, parks and a variety of other community amenities and destinations.

B. Connects to regional system.

The pathway provides linkage to the larger network of pathways that extend beyond Roseville.

C. Connects to Transit

Connects bus stops, transit hubs, or provides a connection to other transit amenities.

D. Provides a Safe Route to School

The pathway provides a safe connection from neighborhoods to schools throughout Roseville and adjacent communities.

E. Creates a convenient and safe commuter connection

The pathway provides a continuous and safe on-road connection from neighborhoods towards places of business, including St. Paul and Minneapolis.

F. Creates a positive recreational experience.

The pathway corridor has few stops and is scenic, attractive or appealing.

G. Eliminates a safety concern.

The pathway provides an alternative or improvement for children, seniors, wheel chair bound, bicyclist, walkers, joggers, in-line skaters, cross-country skiers, parents with strollers mitigating existing unsafe conditions. The corridor has shown that current users are putting themselves in unsafe or undesirable situations by traveling under current conditions.

H. Volume of usage.

The pathway corridor has shown a consistent need for facility development based on proximity to significant land uses such as an educational facility, park or business center.

I. Adjoining property compatibility.

Pathway can be constructed without major costs associated with its location or without detriment to the abutting landowners. Things such as; topography, right-of-way width, driveways, land use, anticipated use can all influence the impact a pathway project may have on adjoining properties.

J. Fills a void in pathway network.

The pathway eliminates a barrier or shortcoming in the pathway network that may inhibit bicycle or pedestrian travel. A “void” is a missing segment in a continuous pathway.

This table is an example of how a typical project may have been ranked.

Project Name: Sample Project				
	Criteria	Weight 1-5	Score 0-5	Weighted Score
A	Connects multiple destinations	4	4	16
B	Connects to regional system	4	3	12
C	Connects to transit	3	2	6
D	Provides a Safe Route to School	5	5	25
E	Creates a convenient and safe commuter route	3	1	3
F	Creates a positive recreational experience	3	1	3
G	Eliminates a safety concern	5	5	25
H	Volume of usage	2	5	10
I	Adjoining property compatibility	1	3	3
J	Fills a void in pathway network	4	5	20
				123

Detailed Description of Priority Projects

	Project Name	Description
1	County Road D	Develop pathway facilities, both on and off road between Cleveland and Fairview Avenue.
2	County Road C-2 West of Snelling	Develop both on and off road pathways within the County Road C-2 alignment from the west City Boundary to Snelling Avenue. This corridor would include a grade separated crossing of 35W.
3	County Road C-2 East of Snelling	Develop both on and off road pathways within the County Road C-2 alignment from the Snelling Avenue to Victoria St.
4	County Road C	Construct an on-road bicycle facility from Lexington Avenue to Rice Street.
5	County Road C Sidewalk	Construct a sidewalk on the north side of County Road C from Western to Rice Street.
6	County Road B-2	Develop sidewalk from Lexington Avenue to Rice Street.
7	County Road B	An off-road trail will provide connection from Highway 280 to Cleveland Avenue.
8	Roselawn Avenue	Develop both on road and off-road pathways from TH 280 to Lexington Avenue.
9	Larpenteur Avenue	An off-road trail from Reservoir Woods to Galtier Street.
10	Cleveland Avenue	Develop pathway, both on and off road, between County Road C and County Road D.
11	Fairview Avenue (north of B-2)	Development of both on-road and off-road pathways between County Road B-2 and County Road D.
12	Fairview Avenue (south of B-2)	Development of both on-road and off-road pathways between Roselawn Avenue and County Road B-2.
13	TH 51 connection to Old Snelling (Arden Hills)	Work with Arden Hills to develop a regional pathway connection along Snelling Avenue to Old Snelling Avenue in Arden Hills connecting Roseville to Mounds View High School, Valentine Hills Elementary School, Bethel College, Lake Johanna Park and County Road E2 commercial businesses.
14	Hamline Avenue	An off-road trail from County Road B-2 to TH 51 (Snelling).
15	Lexington Avenue	Develop an off-road trail on the east side of Lexington Avenue from Larpenteur Avenue north through the City connecting to Shoreview's pathway system.
16	Victoria Street (north of C)	Develop an on- road and off-road pathway from County Road C to County Road D.
17	Victoria Street (B to C)	Develop an on- road and off-road pathway from County Road B to County Road C.
18	Victoria Street (south of B)	Develop an on- road and off-road pathway from Larpenteur Ave to County Road B

	Project Name	Description
19	Dale Street North	The construction of an off-street trail from S. Owasso Blvd to County Road C.
20	Dale Street South	The construction of an off-street trail from Reservoir Woods Park to Larpenteur Avenue.
21	Rice Street	Develop an on- road and off-road pathway from Larpenteur to the north City boundary. .
22	Brenner to Langton Connection	Develop a pathway connection between Brenner Ave and Langton Lake Park.
23	Langton Lake Loop	Develop a pathway that goes around all of Langton Lake.
24	Twin Lakes Redevelopment Area Connections	Develop pathway facilities, both on and off road, as a part of public street infrastructure project within Twin Lakes Redevelopment area (between Fairview and Cleveland). Provide connection from the redevelopment area into Langton Lake Park.
25	NE Diagonal RR Connection (Walnut to Co Rd C)	Develop a trail connection between Cleveland Avenue and Walnut Street along County Road C or along the Railroad right- of- way south of County Road C.
26	Rosedale to HarMar Connection	A light traffic overhead bridge structure across Highway 36 and pathway connection between Rosedale and Har Mar Mall.
27	Heinel Drive Connection	Develop a pathway connection between S. Owasso Blvd and County Road C along Heinel Drive
28	Judith to Iona Connection	Develop a pathway connection between Judith Ave and Iona Lane.
29	Lovell to Minnesota Connection	Develop a pathway connection between Lovell Ave and Minnesota Street.
30	Villa Park Connections	Develop a pathway connection from Shryer Ave and from Ryan Ave into Villa Park
31	Millwood to County Road C2 Link	Develop a pathway connection that creates a link between the corner of Millwood and Chatsworth through the Ramsey County open space to County Road C2.
32	Eustis to St. Croix Connection	Develop a pathway connection between Eustis Street and St. Croix Street.
33	Cohansey St to HANC Connection	Develop a pathway connection between Cohansey Street and HANC.
34	Alta Vista Drive	Develop a pathway connection along Alta Vista Drive between Larpenteur Avenue and Reservoir Woods Park.

Pathway Project Ranking Results For locations see Exhibit 5 (Total possible points)		RANKING CRITERIA										SCORE
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	
		20	20	15	25	15	15	25	10	5	20	
SCORE WEIGHT		4	4	3	5	3	3	5	2	1	4	
21	Rice St	19.00	19.00	12.00	20.00	13.50	7.50	21.25	9.00	2.75	17.00	141.00
6	County Road B2	19.00	13.00	10.50	25.00	12.75	8.25	23.75	8.50	3.00	17.00	140.75
12	Fairview Ave (South of B2)	16.00	14.00	13.50	18.75	12.00	9.00	21.25	7.50	3.00	18.00	133.00
7	County Road B	19.00	13.00	12.75	21.25	12.00	7.50	21.25	8.00	2.25	13.00	130.00
17	Victoria St (B to C)	14.00	11.00	10.50	17.50	12.75	13.50	23.75	8.00	3.25	15.00	129.25
4	County Road C	17.00	14.00	11.25	15.00	12.00	8.25	21.25	8.50	3.75	17.00	128.00
18	Victoria St (South of B)	15.00	15.00	9.75	13.75	12.75	13.50	18.75	8.00	3.00	15.00	124.50
16	Victoria St (North of C)	13.00	15.00	9.00	18.75	11.25	12.00	21.25	7.50	3.00	13.00	123.75
15	Lexington Ave	18.00	17.00	10.50	20.00	12.75	10.50	13.75	8.00	3.00	7.00	120.50
11	Fairview Ave (North of B2)	17.00	15.00	12.75	10.00	11.25	6.75	22.50	7.00	3.25	13.00	118.50
5	County Road C Sidewalk	17.00	12.00	11.25	15.00	9.75	10.50	21.25	6.50	3.00	11.25	117.50
26	Rosedale to HarMar Connection	17.00	11.00	13.50	7.50	10.50	3.75	23.75	7.00	3.50	17.00	114.50
8	Roselawn Ave	15.00	14.00	10.50	11.25	10.50	9.75	17.50	6.50	3.00	12.00	110.00
25	NE Diagonal RR Connection (Walnut to Co Rd C)	14.00	16.00	10.50	3.75	14.25	6.75	18.75	6.50	3.50	16.00	110.00
20	Dale St South of Reservoir Woods	10.67	10.67	9.00	13.33	11.00	9.00	23.33	7.33	2.00	13.33	109.67
13	TH 51 connection to Old Snelling (Arden Hills)	15.00	14.00	4.50	11.25	9.00	11.25	18.75	6.00	4.25	10.00	104.00
14	Hamline Ave	12.25	15.00	6.75	16.25	8.25	9.00	16.25	6.00	3.50	9.00	102.25
31	Millwood to County Road C2 Link	10.00	8.00	3.75	18.75	8.25	12.00	16.25	5.50	4.00	12.00	98.50
34	Alta Vista Drive	10.00	11.00	8.25	6.25	7.50	12.75	16.25	6.00	3.25	13.00	94.25
1	County Road D	12.75	10.00	9.00	5.00	9.00	6.75	20.00	5.00	3.25	13.00	93.75
10	Cleveland Ave	14.00	13.00	6.75	3.75	9.75	8.25	16.25	5.00	4.00	12.00	92.75
9	Larpenteur Ave	11.00	7.00	7.50	5.00	6.00	13.00	18.75	4.50	4.75	15.00	92.50
33	Cohansey St to HANC Connection	9.75	8.00	3.75	20.00	4.50	12.75	12.50	5.00	3.25	10.00	89.50
30	Villa Park Connections	12.00	9.00	3.75	10.00	6.00	15.00	12.50	4.00	3.50	13.00	88.75
2	County Road C2 (W of Snelling)	12.00	11.00	3.75	2.50	9.75	10.50	20.00	4.00	2.50	11.00	87.00
3	County Road C2 (E of Snelling)	12.00	7.00	5.25	3.75	9.75	10.50	16.25	4.00	3.50	14.00	86.00
29	Lovell to Minnesota Connection	6.00	6.00	3.75	21.25	5.25	6.75	12.50	4.50	3.25	11.00	80.25
27	Heinel Drive Connection	9.00	8.00	4.50	6.25	3.75	12.75	11.50	5.00	2.75	12.00	75.50
19	Dale St North of Co Rd C	7.00	6.00	8.25	6.25	6.00	10.50	11.25	4.50	4.00	10.00	73.75
28	Judith to Iona Connection	9.00	8.00	3.75	7.50	5.25	12.00	10.00	3.50	2.75	11.00	72.75
23	Langton Lake Loop	9.00	6.00	3.00	3.75	3.00	15.00	7.50	6.50	3.75	15.00	72.50
22	Brenner to Langton Connection	8.00	6.00	3.75	3.75	3.00	11.50	7.50	2.50	4.50	11.00	61.50
24	Twin Lakes Redevelopment Area Connections	9.00	4.00	4.50	3.75	6.75	6.00	8.75	3.50	2.50	8.00	56.75
32	Eustis to St Croix Connection	6.00	4.00	3.00	5.00	3.75	7.50	7.50	2.50	2.75	7.00	49.00

Appendices

Definitions

AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC (ADT) - The average of 24 hour traffic counts collected over a number of days greater than one, but less than a year.

ARTERIAL - As defined in the Roseville Comprehensive Plan including both Arterials and Minor Arterials.

BICYCLE - Bicycle means every device propelled solely by human power on which any human may ride, having two tandem wheels except scooters and similar devices, and including any device generally recognized as a bicycle though equipped with two front or rear wheels. (MN 169.01 Subd.51) (Considered a vehicle by MN Statute 169.01 Subd.2, MN 169.222 Subd.1)

BICYCLE LANE (BIKE LANE) - Bicycle Lane means a portion of a roadway or shoulder designed for exclusive use by people using bicycles. Bicycle lanes are to be distinguished from the portion of the roadway or shoulder used for motor vehicle traffic by physical barrier, striping, marking, or other similar device. (MN 169.01 Subd. 70)

BICYCLE NETWORK - A continuous system of pathways and roadways in a region or municipality.

BICYCLE PATH (BIKE PATH OR OFF-ROAD BIKEWAY) - Bicycle Path means a bicycle facility designed for exclusive or preferential use by people using bicycles and constructed or developed separately from the roadway or shoulder. (MN 169.01 Subd. 9)

BIKE ROUTE - A shared right of way located on roadways designated with appropriate signage to encourage bicycle use. (MN 169.01 Subd. 62)

BIKEWAY - Bikeway means a bicycle lane, bicycle path, or bicycle route, regardless of whether it is designed for the exclusive use of bicycles or is to be shared with other transportation modes. (MN 169.01 Subd. 72)

BUSINESS CENTER - Area with a concentration of retail, food and/or service businesses including Rosedale, HarMar, Rosedale Square, Lexington and Larpenteur corner, Rice and Larpenteur corner and their surrounding areas.

COMMUTER BICYCLIST – A person who engages in cycling for utility purposes; travelling to work, school or for other utilitarian reasons.

CROSSWALK – A Crosswalk is that portion of a roadway ordinarily included with the prolongation or connection of the lateral lines of sidewalks at intersections or any portion of a roadway distinctly indicated for pedestrian crossing by lines or other markings on the surface. (MN 169.01 Subd.37)

FOOT PATH - Wood chip trails, ag-lime trails, turf trails and boardwalks are not considered part of the pathway

network because they are exclusive to parks. This document is not about park pathways. They are mentioned for inventory purposes only.

GRADE SEPARATED – A Grade separated pathway is one that passes over or under a road or highway. This can be achieved either by providing a pathway tunnel, a pathway bridge, or providing pathway accommodations alongside a road that passes under or over a road or highway.

LIGHT TRAFFIC - Pedestrians, bicyclists, in-line skaters and other types of non-motorized traffic.

PEDESTRIAN – A Pedestrian is any person afoot or in a wheelchair (both motorized and non-motorized). It can also mean a young child on a tricycle or small bike.

RECREATIONAL BICYCLIST – A person who engages in cycling for entertainment or fitness purposes.

RECREATIONAL CORRIDORS – High use corridors intended to link recreational facilities in Roseville and the adjacent communities. There are Lexington Avenue, Dale Street, Victoria Street, County Road C, B and B2.

RIGHT OF WAY - a general term denoting land, property, or interest therein, usually a strip, acquired for or devoted to transportation purposes. “Right-of-way” means the privilege or immediate use of the highway. (MN 169.01 Subd. 45)

ROADWAY – Roadway means that a portion of a highway improved, designed, or ordinarily used for vehicular travel, exclusive of the sidewalk or shoulder. In the event a highway includes two or more separate roadways, the term roadway as used herein shall refer to any such roadway separately, but not to all such roadways collectively. (MN 169.01 Subd. 31)

RURAL ROAD – A road that does not have curb and gutter and usually has a shoulder, with storm sewer provided by ditches and culverts.

SHARED LANE - Low traffic roads that have no additional space provided for light traffic but that can be shared between automobiles and light traffic because of low traffic volumes. Shared lanes are not designated as pathways although they do provide good access routes to other pathways.

STRIPED SHOULDER – Shoulder means that part of a highway which is contiguous to the regularly traveled portion of the highway and is on the same level as the highway. These are at least 4 feet wide. (MN 169.01 Subd. 33)

SIDEWALK – Sidewalk, usually within the road right of way, generally 4-6 feet wide and running parallel to the road, intended for use by pedestrians. (MN 169.01 Subd. 33)

STREET OR HIGHWAY – Street or highway means the entire width between boundary lines of any way or place when any part thereof is open to the use of the public, as a matter of right, for the purpose of vehicular travel. (MN 169.01 Subd. 29)

TRAFFIC CALMING - Physical and other measures used on a street or highway to reduce the dominance and speed of motor vehicles.

TRAILS MANAGEMENT PROGRAM (TMP) - Program developed to provide the community of Roseville with a network of pathways based on the Pathways Master Plan, including construction/implementation and maintenance/management components.

TRAIL - An off-road pathway that is generally 8-12 feet wide. These pathways are multiuse designed for the preferential or exclusive use of bicycles, in-line skaters and pedestrians. Usually constructed of bituminous pavement.

UTILITARIAN – Pathway use pursued for a non- recreational purpose. (i.e. walking to the store to get milk, biking to the library for a book)

URBAN ROAD – A road that has curb and gutter, with storm sewer provided by catch basins.

VEHICLE – Vehicle means every device in, upon, or by which any person or property is or may be transported or drawn upon a highway, except devices used exclusively upon stationary rails or tracks. (MN 169.01 Subd. 2)

WIDE OUTSIDE LANE - Any roadway upon which a bicycle lane is not designated and which may be legally used by bicycles whether or not such facility is specifically designated as a bikeway. A widened outside driving lane, 14 feet or greater, is to be shared between vehicles and light traffic.

1997 Pathway Master Plan Committee

As a follow-up to Vista 2000, on September 11, 1995 the Council appointed a volunteer advisory committee to work with staff to develop a comprehensive pathway master plan.

The Council determined the Committee membership to be as follows:

- 1 City Council Member
- 1 Planning Commission Member
- 1 Parks and Recreation Commission Member
- 1 VISTA 2000 - Leisure Committee Member
- 1 VISTA 2000 - Transportation Member
- 8 At large Members

Information regarding the application process was sent to all VISTA 2000 members (52), Planning Commission applicants from the last appointment (11), and a list of individuals provided by the Parks and Recreation Office (10). Information was also advertised in the Roseville Review, Roseville Focus and on Cable Channel 16.

Applications were received from seventeen citizens. On November 1, 1995 the Council interviewed the applicants. The Parks and Recreation Commission and the Planning Commission recommended members from their Commissions to serve on the Committee. The Council appointed the following individuals to the City of Roseville Pathways Advisory Committee:

Original Committee Members	
Kelley Casey – Chair(Parks & Recreation Commission liaison))	Irene Bussjaeger - VISTA 2000 Leisure Committee
Hugh Faville - Vice Chair	Dean Maschka - City Council liaison
Ron Bole - Secretary	John Rhody - Planning Commission liaison
Steve Bauer	Harry Wernecke - VISTA 2000 Transportation Member
Ann Berry	Jan Vanderwall - School District liaison
Eunice Haagenstad	Randy Neprash
Joanne Chabot	Todd Rehnmann
City Staff	
Bob Bierscheid - Parks and Recreation Director	Karl Keel - Public Works Director
Chuck Stifter - Park Project Coordinator	

1997 Planning Process

The process for the development of this document was for the Pathways Advisory Committee to define Roseville's pathway needs and develop a document of policies and standards to be used as guidelines by the City to meet those needs. City staff's role was to provide support and guidance in preparing meetings, gathering information, answering questions and otherwise assisting the Committee as needed. Many steps were taken during the development process in preparation of this document including the identification, analysis, discussion and recommendation of many pathway and light traffic transportation issues and elements.

- 1) Background
 - Reviewed community issues, demographics, pathway history and current system inventory and operations
- 2) Analysis
 - Studied master plans from other communities
 - Pathway plans studied:
 - a. Davis, California - Bikeway Plan
 - b. Duluth / Superior - Metropolitan Bikeways Plan
 - c. City of Hutchinson - Light Traffic Project Action Plan
 - d. La Crosse Area - Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan Element
 - e. City of Lakeville - Comprehensive Trails System Plan
 - f. Livingston County - Greenway Initiative
 - g. City of Madison, WI - A Bicycle Transportation Plan
 - Reviewed guidelines from federal and state agencies
 - a. Guide For The Development of Bicycle Facilities by American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO)
 - b. Minnesota Bicycle Transportation Planning and Design Guidelines by the Minnesota Department of Transportation. (MNDOT)
- 3) Development
 - Developed general policy statements for each category
 - a. Location
 - b. Connection
 - c. Implementation
 - d. Maintenance
 - Education / Information / Regulation
 - Developed specific standards further defining the policies
 - Developed pathway network layout
 - Developed criteria for project prioritization
 - Prioritized pathway projects
 - Compiled information into document

Exhibit 1: Existing Land Use Map

Exhibit 2: Roadway Jurisdiction Map

Exhibit 3: Bus Route Map

Exhibit 4: City Pathway Map

Exhibit 5: Pathway Master Plan Map

October 26, 2011 Draft #2

Roseville Trail Projects:

1. County Rd B2 from Lexington to Rice with connectors to Central Park and Acorn Park
\$1,000,000 sidewalk on south side, bike lane on both sides
Options to reduce cost such as grants or partners should be evaluated. It should be noted that these options may create conditions or criteria that may complicate implementation.
2. County Rd B from Eustis Rd to Cleveland*
\$500,000 logistically tied up with road ownership,
Road rebuild at same time would make project feasible to address drainage issues. If transferred to Roseville with \$ it would be at least 5yrs
*Uncertainty of road transfer makes this project potentially un-implementable within 5 year period.
3. Oasis Park – Langton Lake Park connectors
\$350,000 for bridge and trail C2 to Oasis on existing easement
Consider combination with natural enhancements
4. Southwest Roseville stormwater upgrades with natural trails
\$150,000 Stormwater management needs may create opportunity school/park/church concept. The status of stormwater upgrades are uncertain which creates uncertainty in implementing this project.

Alternate trail projects for consideration:

- Increased bike lane on Victoria from County Rd B to Northern city limits
- Enhance Terminal Rd and Walnut Road trail
- Partner with Ramsey County For County Rd C connection to Northeast Diagonal Trail
- Prior Rd County Rd B to Roselawn
- Oakcrest Rd link between Willow Pond Park and Pocahontas Park
- Fernwood and Eldridge Rd connector between Brue Russell, Keller Mayflower, and Lexington Park
- Shryer Ave connection between Pioneer Park and Reservoir Woods
- Tamarac Park to trail on South side of McCarrons Lake
- Hand Ct. to Grandview connector near Materion Park
- Matilda Rd connector between Mapleview and Ladyslipper Parks
- Valley Park connector to W Owasso Rd trail

Roseville Public Works, Environment and Transportation Commission

Agenda Item

Date: July 24, 2012

Item No: 6

Item Description: Assessment Policy Discussion

Background:

At the March meeting, the Public Works Commission discussed the City's Assessment policy. Attached is a revised assessment policy draft incorporating all of the changes that were discussed at the meeting. Staff has reorganized this document substantially, as a result, the document shows minimal redlines. The redlines that have been left in are changes that were substantive and not previously discussed with the Commission. Some of the items added:

- Introduction statement
- Special Benefit Test language.
- Combined language from all sections to create a section that covered how to determine assessable frontage
- Clarified language in water and sanitary sewer sections.
- Added a definitions section.

Recommended Action:

Discuss assessment policy.

Attachments:

A. Assessment Policy

City of Roseville
SPECIAL ASSESSMENT POLICY

The purpose of this policy is to be used as a guide by the City of Roseville when preparing assessment rolls, so as to assure uniform and consistent treatment of affected properties. It is the general policy of the City of Roseville to assess all affected properties according to this policy without regard to funding source.

Special assessments are a charge imposed on properties for a particular improvement that benefits the owners of those selected properties. The authority to use special assessments originates in the state constitution which allows the state legislature to give cities and other governmental units the authority "to levy and collect assessments for local improvements upon property benefited thereby." The legislature confers that authority to cities in Minnesota Statutes Chapter 429.

1. Special Benefit Test: The proposed assessment shall be equivalent or less than the anticipated increase in market value for properties being assessed. Appraisals shall be completed to determine the influence of a reconstruction project on the value of the properties proposing to be assessed.

~~1.2.~~ Determining Assessable Frontage: All assessments shall be calculated using property front footage on the segment of the infrastructure included in the improvement project. The assessment rate shall be determined by dividing the total project cost by the total assessable frontage. The following formulas shall apply for calculating the total assessable frontage for the improvement project.

- (a) The assessable frontage shall be 100% of the short side of the lot.
- (b) Corner and Multiple Frontage R1 and R2 lots: All corner and multiple frontage R1 and R2 parcels shall be considered as having 10% of the long side as being assessable footage unless such parcels could be split or subdivided. This is in addition to the short side frontage.
- (c) Corner and Multiple Frontage Lots (other zoning): All corner and multiple frontage lots for other property zoning shall be calculated at 10% for the first 150 feet of the long side and then 100% for any additional footage. This is in addition to the short side frontage.
- ~~(d) Corner R1 and R2: All corner frontage R1 and R2 parcels shall be considered as having 10% of the long side as being assessable footage unless such parcels could be split or subdivided.~~
- ~~(e) Multiple Frontage R1 and R2: All multiple frontage R1 and R2 parcels shall be considered as having 10% of the second side as being assessable footage unless such parcels could be split or subdivided.~~
- ~~(f) Corner and Multiple Frontage Lots: All corner and multiple frontage for other property zoning shall be calculated at 10% for the first 150 feet of the long side and then 100% for any additional footage.~~
- ~~(g)~~ (d) Odd Lot Formula (all zoning): The odd lot formula shall apply for For all zoning, odd and irregularly shaped lots, which have rear widths that vary by more than 25% in comparison with the front width. The lot will be assumed to have a depth equal to one-half the sum of the two sides and said depth will be divided into the area of the lot to determine the assessable frontage.
- ~~(h)~~ (e) Lots with more than 4 sides: All lots of more than four sides will be geometrically converted to a four-sided lot of equal area, then the odd-lot formula as stated described in (ed) will be used to determine the assessable frontage. Where this is

not practical, the assessable frontage will be determined by assuming the lot to have an assessable frontage equal to those of the typical rectangular lots near it which are comparable in overall area and nature.

(f) Private Driveway: If a public improvement takes place along a roadway with a private driveway, all properties with access to the road will be assessed. The frontage of the private property or properties directly adjacent to the roadway will determine the assessable frontage for all other properties along the private driveway.

3. Roadway New Construction: On all new public roadways constructed, where no roadway exists, the properties abutting the new road shall be assessed for 100% of the cost.

3.4. Roadway Reconstruction Projects: The following is the assessment policy for all roadway reconstruction projects in the City of Roseville.

- (a) Property zoned R1 and R2 shall be assessed up to 25% of the project cost for a 7-ton, 32-foot wide pavement with concrete curb and gutter and required drainage.
- (b) All other property zoning shall be assessed up to 50% of the project cost.
- (c) Municipal State Aid Roadways:
 - Property zoned R1 and R2 shall be assessed up to 25% of the cost of a 7-ton, 32-foot wide pavement with concrete curb and gutter and required drainage, even if the width or strength is greater.
 - All other property zoning shall be assessed up to 50% of the project costs.
- (d) Ramsey County or Minnesota Department of Transportation Roadways:
In the event that special assessments result in more funds being due the City from special assessments than the total City cost share of the improvements to a Ramsey County or MnDOT roadway, special assessments for such properties shall be reduced proportionately until the total special assessments equal Special assessments on a Ramsey County or MnDOT roadway will be equal to or less than the total City cost share of the improvement.
- (e) All property accessing a private driveway at an intersection signal system shall be assessed 100% of the proportionate share of the signal system cost.

4.5. Sanitary Sewer Construction:

- (a) Properties currently connected to public sanitary sewer will not be assessed for reconstruction or major maintenance projects.
- (b) Shall be assessed on a front footage basis with all types of land use and zoning being identically assessed.
- (c) Any sanitary sewer main in excess of 8 inches in diameter will normally be considered oversized. The added cost for oversizing sanitary sewer shall be subtracted from the total cost of the improvement. For each presently utilized parcel, there will be subtracted from the total cost of the improvement, added costs for oversized sanitary sewer. The added cost for oversizing sanitary sewer mains shall be subtracted from the total cost of the improvement. Any sanitary sewer main in excess of 8 inches in diameter will normally be considered oversized. The result of said subtraction will be the cost to be assessed. This will be divided by the total number of assessable feet to establish the assessment rate for said presently utilized parcel.

1 ~~(b)~~(d) New development property, or property which has altered its land use within the
2 past three years, shall be assessed at 100% of the city's expense for the
3 improvement.

4 ~~(e)~~(e) Sewer services shall be assessed on a per service basis at 100% of the city's
5 expense for such services.

6 ~~(d) — All side lots or multiple frontage parcels shall be determined to have 25~~
7 ~~assessable feet for the first 150 feet of said side or second frontage of the parcel~~
8 ~~and shall conform to Paragraphs b) and c) of sections 5 & 6.~~

9 6. Storm Sewer Construction: There shall be no assessments for storm sewer projects not
10 associated with roadway projects.

11
12 ~~5-7.~~ Watermain Construction:

13 (a) Properties currently connected to public watermain will not be assessed for
14 reconstruction or major maintenance projects.

15 ~~(a)~~(b) Shall be assessed on a front footage basis with all types of land use and zoning
16 being identically assessed.

17 ~~(b)~~(c) Any watermains in excess of 8 inches in diameter will normally be considered
18 oversized. The added cost for oversizing watermain shall be subtracted from the
19 total cost of the improvement. For each presently utilized parcel, there will be
20 subtracted from the total cost of the improvement, added costs for oversized
21 watermains. Any watermains in excess of 6 inches in diameter will normally be
22 considered oversized. The result of said subtraction will be the cost to be
23 assessed. This will be divided by the total number of assessable feet to establish
24 the assessment rate ~~for said presently utilized parcel.~~

25 ~~(e)~~(d) New development property, or property which has altered its land use within the
26 past three years, shall be assessed at 100% of the city's expense for the
27 improvement.

28 ~~(d)~~(e) Water services shall be assessed on a per service basis at 100% of the city's
29 expense for such services.

30 ~~(e) — All side lots or multiple frontage parcels shall be determined to have 25~~
31 ~~assessable feet for the first 150 feet of said side or second frontage of the parcel~~
32 ~~and shall conform to Paragraphs b) and c) of sections 5 & 6.~~

33 ~~6-8.~~ Pathway Construction: There shall be no assessments for the construction of off road
34 pathway ~~constructions that are included as a priority segment in the City's Pathway~~
35 Master Plan.

36 ~~7-9.~~ Streetlight Installation:

37 (a) Shall be assessed on a front footage basis and as follows:

38 (b) All properties within 150 feet (street frontage) of each light shall be considered
39 for assessment.

40 (c) City staff shall determine the number and locations of lights that could have been
41 installed under the "standard street light" section of the City's Street light policy.
42 The maintenance cost for these lights will be deducted from the overall project
43 cost.

44 (d) 100% of the additional costs for an "enhanced street light" project shall be
45 specially assessed. The additional costs for an "enhanced street light" project

shall include; cost of installation of enhanced streetlights, cost of operation & maintenance (pro-rated for 25 years), administrative costs, minus “standard street light” maintenance cost (if applicable)

- (e) At the end of 25 years, the City will evaluate the maintenance needs for the “enhanced street light” areas. A reconstruction project will be considered where the new operation and maintenance costs for the next 25 years will be proposed to be assessed to the benefiting properties.
- (f) In new development and redevelopments, the operation and maintenance costs for an “enhanced street light” installation shall be paid for by the property owners in the new development in perpetuity. These costs shall either be paid for up front by the developer or assessed to the property owners. The total cost shall be the “enhanced street light” operation and maintenance cost minus the City’s “standard street light” contribution. The City’s basic contribution shall be determined based on the procedure outlined in section IV. B. of the City Street Light policy.

8-10. Definitions

- (a) Assessable frontage: Property frontage on a segment of infrastructure scheduled for improvement. If a parcel is a corner lot or has multiple street frontages, the parcel frontage shall only be calculated for the side abutting the infrastructure scheduled for improvements.
- (b) Enhanced Street Light: When the location, design, or spacing for requested lights does not meet the “Standard Street Light” qualifying conditions, property owners may request that the City undertake an “Enhanced Street Lighting” project.
- (c) Long side: On a corner lot or multiple frontage lot, the frontage of a property that is longest.
- (d) Private Driveway: A driveway or road that serves as a primary access for one or more property owners that is not maintained by the City of Roseville, MnDOT or Ramsey County.
- (e) Required drainage: Drainage improvements necessary because of an improvement project. This can be the result of meeting City, watershed or wetland requirements. Includes rate control, water quality treatment, infiltration, and wetland mitigation.
- (f) Roadway Reconstruction Project: This type of project involves removing and replacing the existing roadway bituminous, more than 50% of the concrete curb, the base materials, and oftentimes performing utility work (water, sewer, etc.) at the same time.
- (g) Roadway Maintenance Project: Performing a Reclaim and Overlay, Mill and Overlay, or sealcoating of city streets.
- (h) Short side: On a corner lot or multiple frontage lot, the frontage of a property that is shortest.
- (i) Standard Street Light: street light installation that meets the location, design and spacing of the City street light policy qualifying conditions described in section IV. B. of the City Street Light policy.
- (j) Total Project Cost: Project costs include actual construction cost plus all associated overhead costs. The total cost of the associated overhead for a public

1 improvement project would typically include city administration, engineering,
2 fiscal, legal, capital interest, right of way acquisition and contingencies.

Roseville Public Works, Environment and Transportation Commission

Agenda Item

Date: July 24, 2012

Item No: 7

Item Description: Complete Streets Policy Discussion

Background:

At the May 22 meeting, the commission discussed developing a complete streets policy for the City of Roseville. Comments regarding the policy centered on finding a policy that was consistent with Ramsey County, MnDOT and our surrounding communities.

In addition, the commission asked for more information on other policies. There was discussion about members completing their own online searches to assist in this discussion. To help out, here are some helpful links:

- Ramsey County Policy: Does not have a Complete Streets Policy. The County has adopted Context Sensitive Design as their guiding principle for County infrastructure projects. http://contextsensitivesolutions.org/content/topics/what_is_css/
- State of Minnesota Policy: <http://www.completestreets.org/webdocs/policy/cs-mn-legislation.pdf>
- Minnesota cities and links: <http://www.mncompletestreets.org/policy.html>
- Complete Streets Toolbox: www.completestreets.org
- Portland Oregon- www.portlandonline.com. Complete streets policy consists of the following policies/ laws: Bicycle Bill (1971), State Transportation Planning Rule Goal 12, Portland Transportation Goal, Street Classifications Policy, Bicycle Policy, and Public Facilities Policies.

Attached to this report is a draft Complete Streets Policy for the City of Roseville. It is based on the City of Falcon Heights policy that was reviewed last month.

Recommended Action:

Discuss Complete Streets Policy

Attachments:

A. Complete Streets Policy- Draft

City of Roseville Complete Streets Policy

The City of Roseville is committed to developing and maintaining a safe, efficient, balanced and environmentally sound transportation system and supports integrating physical activity into daily routines through actions such as biking, walking, or taking transit.

Roseville will enhance safety, mobility, accessibility and convenience for all corridor users including pedestrians, bicyclists, transit riders, motorists, commercial and emergency vehicles, and for people of all ages and abilities by planning, designing, operating, and maintaining a network of complete streets.

This policy applies to all corridors under the City of Roseville jurisdiction. The city will work with other transportation agencies to incorporate a complete streets philosophy and encourages the State of Minnesota, neighboring cities, Ramsey County and regional organizations to adopt similar policies.

Given the limited number of new streets constructed in Roseville, flexibility in accommodating different modes of travel on existing streets is essential to balancing the needs of all corridor users. The city will implement complete streets in such a way that the character of the project area, the values of the community, and the needs of all users are fully considered. Therefore, complete streets will not look the same in all settings, and will not necessarily include exclusive elements for all modes.

As part of any transportation project, incorporation of complete street elements will be considered. These elements include, but are not limited to:

- Pathways, both on-road and off- road
- Stormwater drainage
- Trees and other landscaping options
- Lane widths
- Lighting
- Public transit facilities
- Bicycle facilities
- On-street parking

Applicable design standards and best practices will be followed in conjunction with construction, reconstruction, changes in allocation of pavement space on an existing roadway, or other changes in street corridor. The planning, design, and implementation processes for all transportation corridors will:

- Involve the local community and stakeholders
- Assess the current and future needs of corridor users
- Incorporate a review of existing system plans to identify complete streets opportunities.
- Consider the function of the road
- Integrate innovative and non-traditional design options
- Consider transitway corridor alignment and station areas
- Include documentation of efforts to accommodate all modes and all users

The City of Roseville will implement complete streets unless one or more of the following conditions are documented:

- The cost of including complete street elements is excessive in relation to overall project cost.

- The street jurisdiction (Ramsey County or the State of Minnesota for non-city streets) does not support suggested elements.
- Lack of community support.
- There are safety risks that cannot be overcome.
- The corridor has severe topographic, environmental, historic, or natural resource constraints.

For the purposes of this policy, “Complete Streets” are defined as:

“A complete street is designed to be a transportation corridor for all users: pedestrians, cyclists, transit users, and motorists. Complete streets are designed and operated to enable safe continuous travel networks for all users. Pedestrians, bicyclists, motorists and bus riders of all ages and abilities are able to safely move from destination to destination along and across a network of complete streets. Transportation improvements, facilities and amenities that may contribute to complete streets and that are considered as elements of a "complete street" include: street and sidewalk lighting; pedestrian and bicycle safety improvements; access improvements, including compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act; public transit facilities accommodation including, but not limited, to pedestrian access improvement to transit stops and stations; street trees and landscaping; drainage; and street amenities.”

Roseville Public Works, Environment and Transportation Commission

Agenda Item

Date: July 24, 2012

Item No: 8

Item Description: Look Ahead Agenda Items/ Next Meeting August 28, 2012

Suggested Items:

- Comprehensive Surface Water Management Plan Review Cont'd
-

Recommended Action:

Set preliminary agenda items for the August 28, 2012 Public Works, Environment & Transportation Commission meeting.