

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

Agenda Item

Date: April 27, 2021

Item No: 5

Item Description: Approval of the March 23, 2021 Public Works Commission Minutes

Attached are the minutes from the March 23, 2021 meeting.

Recommended Action:

Motion approving the minutes of March 23, 2021, subject to any necessary corrections or revision.

Move: _____

Second: _____

Ayes: _____

Nays: _____

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

Tuesday, March 23, 2021, at 6:30 p.m.
City Council Chambers, 2660 Civic Center Drive
Roseville, Minnesota 55113

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

1 **1. Introduction / Roll Call**

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

4
5 **Present:** Chair Joe Wozniak; and Members Michael Joyce, Jarrod Cicha,
6 Shane Spencer, and Youth Member Jana Lynch

7
8 **Absent:** Member Nancy Misra, Karen Huiett, and Stephanie Hammer
9 (Excused)

10
11 **Staff Present:** Public Works Director Marc Culver; City
12 Engineer/Assistant Public Works Director Jesse
13 Freihammer; and Assistant Civil Engineer Stephanie Smith

14
15 **2. Public Comments**

16 None

17
18 **3. Approval of February 23, 2021 Meeting Minutes**

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

22
23 **Motion**

24 **Member Joyce moved, Member Cicha seconded, approval of the February 23,**
25 **2021 meeting minutes as presented.**

26
27 **Ayes: 4**

28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73

Nays: 0
Motion carried.

4. Communication Items

City Engineer Jesse Freihammer provided a brief review and update on projects and maintenance activities listed in the staff report dated March 23, 2021. He introduced Assistant City Engineer Stephanie Smith who is replacing City Engineer Luke Sandstrom.

Assistant City Engineer Smith introduced herself and provided the Commission with her background history.

Public Works Director Culver updated the Commission on the Climate Change and Forests in Minnesota presentation and noted the Commission can view the presentation at the link shown and indicated the link will be added to the online packet.

Chair Wozniak indicated he joined in the presentation on Climate Change and Forests in Minnesota several weeks ago and this is basically looking at what changes could be in store for the three different biomes in Minnesota, grassland, forest, and boreal forest due to rising temperatures and other changes in weather patterns over the next thirty to forty years.

Mr. Culver continued with his update on the Zoning Code.

Member Joyce asked in regard to the RFP for Recycling Services, he wondered if the eval. Panels for the RFP's strictly Roseville staff or are there other stakeholders that are in attendance on those.

Mr. Culver indicated the City just hired a new Equity and Inclusion Manager, but he has not started yet, but it may be possible to have him serve on the review panel to help, particularly with the DEI scoring. He did not recall if staff invited someone from Ramsey County to sit on the scoring panel or not. There will be a consultant to help with some analysis and maybe some financial analysis, but the consultant will not be a part of the scoring panel. It will be mostly staff.

Chair Wozniak indicated one concern related to stormwater projects, the St. Rose of Lima project is going to be a fairly sizeable one and this Commission has heard of and been briefed on a number of stormwater projects over the last several years and the necessity for them and the hoped effects they will have along with the impacts they will have on water quality but it seemed to him that it is pretty rare that they hear of any follow up on these projects in terms of if it did what the City wanted it to do, what it was expected to do.

Mr. Culver thought it was a good question and for some of the BMP's, such as what is being used at St. Rose of Lima, where it is mostly underground storage, there

74 will be some immediate and hopefully, at least noticeable, if not measurable
75 benefits of that from a localized flooding perspective. There are some areas that
76 have experienced localized flooding and staff is hoping and expecting that the
77 underground storage will help with some of that. As far as water quality
78 downstream, it is a little more difficult to perhaps measure that directly and from
79 these types of devices. He indicated staff is hoping that a large number of these
80 projects will have a measurable impact going into the ultimate water lines.

81
82 Chair Wozniak wondered if there will be a connection at any time from the B2
83 Pathway project to Lexington.

84
85 Mr. Freihammer indicated in the short term the answer is no. The connection will
86 go from the northbound ramp to the west to the southbound ramp which is pretty
87 much the connection. It does provide a pretty good connection to transit. One of
88 the bus stop currently stops at the ramp.

89
90 Chair Wozniak noted the Snelling signals, it seemed to him that many years ago
91 there was discussion about some requirements that adjacent signals have some
92 synchronicity in their timing. He wondered if this was correct and was there some
93 requirement that links consecutive signals together.

94
95 Mr. Culver was not sure there was a requirement for that. Certainly, the signals on
96 Snelling are coordinated, probably from at least Larpenteur through County Road
97 B, would be a coordinated system of signals and then County Road C through Lydia
98 would be a separate system, just because of distance.

99
100 Chair Wozniak indicated another question he had was in regard to the Benchmark
101 Study. There was a recent benchmarking event a couple of weeks ago, March 8th,
102 and he wondered what participation and interest there has been so far.

103
104 Mr. Culver thought there were two events so far with a third scheduled for April
105 8th. He indicated there is some mild interest in it.

106
107 Member Spencer explained on the western side of Lake McCarrons where the water
108 comes through the different step-down ponds to drop the contaminants before it
109 enters Lake McCarrons, and it looks like someone cleared out a bunch of trees and
110 other stuff and he wondered what that was for.

111
112 Mr. Freihammer indicated in Villa Park that series of wetlands and weirs is in the
113 City and staff does work a lot of that with Capital Region Watershed. He noted he
114 was not aware of any clearing that happened other than if there are fallen trees built
115 up on the weir, the City maintenance staff does remove those but in terms of
116 standing trees, if those are cleared then he did not know if that would be a parks
117 thing or not.

118
119 **5. Ramsey County Ditch 4 Project Overview**

120 Mr. Freihammer provided a presentation of the Ramsey County Ditch 4 Project, its
121 challenges, and its benefits.

122
123 Member Spencer thought this is one of the better projects seen in a while. Being
124 able to take something that, at this time, completely useless, other than carrying
125 water downstream and make it into something that is useful to the public. He
126 thought this was great for the City.

127
128 Chair Wozniak thought the City was getting a lot of bang for the buck. He thought
129 that was pretty amazing and was looking forward to seeing how this develops and
130 integrates with the new apartment buildings and other properties in the area and
131 how it links to other roads and trails.

132
133 Mr. Culver reviewed with the Commission the costs for the project and where the
134 money was coming from to do the project.

135

136 **6. Railroad Quiet Zone Study**

137 Mr. Culver presented the Railroad Quiet Zone Study.

138
139 Member Cicha asked if staff had any information on spatial distribution of noise
140 complaints for the trains. Is there a particular hot spot where people are finding the
141 rail to be noisy.

142
143 Mr. Culver explained staff has not mapped the complaints. He noted it has been a
144 while since staff has received specific complaints. The ones he recalled are
145 generally focused on the east side of Lake Owasso, where the trains run very close
146 to a number of homes in the area and the train noise travels across the lake.

147
148 Chair Wozniak asked if the study was City initiated.

149
150 Mr. Culver explained it was.

151
152 Chair Wozniak asked what the City paid for the Bollig report.

153
154 Mr. Culver believed it was in the twenty-thousand-dollar range.

155
156 Chair Wozniak indicated he had a lot of issues with that report. There is a lot of
157 missing information and a lot of unexplained things. There were some intersections
158 that were evaluated and did not indicate who the road authority was, even though
159 it is obvious to them, but he assumed the Roadway Authority would have some
160 responsibility for maybe contributing money toward this or is it all City funding if
161 the City decides to go for a quiet zone.

162
163 Mr. Culver explained several of the crossings are County Roads and Snelling is a
164 trunk highway and would be MNDot roadway. The City would be responsible for
165 some of the costs of the crossings to meet the standards necessary just to operate

166 traffic through there. They would not necessarily be responsible for any additional
167 standard to meet the quiet zone standard. It is something that would need to be
168 negotiated with the different agencies.

169
170 Chair Wozniak indicated this is a lot of money to spend for not frequent train trips
171 and he would have a hard time giving his approval on this. He indicated he was
172 not a big fan of the study because there is a lot of mistakes. He wondered what the
173 next steps are.

174
175 Mr. Culver reviewed possible next steps with the Commission.
176

177 **7. Items for Next Meeting – April through July 2021**

178 Discussion ensued regarding the April PWETC agenda:

- 179 ▪ Chair and Vice Chair selections
- 180 ▪ May Update on Recycling Proposals
- 181 ▪ May MS4 report
- 182 ▪ June prep for Joint meeting with City Council
- 183 ▪ July Joint Meeting with City Council
- 184 ▪ Future Field Trips

185
186 Mr. Culver indicated staff could organize a tour of the St. Paul Regional Water
187 System Water Treatment Plant. He noted this is an impressive site. He thought the
188 tour might be able to be done in April.

189
190 The Commission was interested in touring the water treatment plant.

191
192 Mr. Culver reviewed some other walking tours that the Commission could take.

193
194 Member Joyce suggested touring the Maintenance Facility for newer members.

195
196 **8. Adjourn**

197
198 **Motion**
199 **Member Spencer moved, Member Joyce seconded, adjournment of the**
200 **meeting at approximately 8:29 p.m.**

201
202 **Ayes: 4**

203 **Nays: 0**

204 **Motion carried.**