

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

**Agenda Item**

---

**Date:** May 25, 2021

**Item No: 4**

---

**Item Description:** Approval of the April 27, 2021 Public Works Commission Minutes

---

Attached are the minutes from the April 27, 2021 meeting.

**Recommended Action:**

Motion approving the minutes of April 27, 2021, subject to any necessary corrections or revision.

Move: \_\_\_\_\_

Second: \_\_\_\_\_

Ayes: \_\_\_\_\_

Nays: \_\_\_\_\_

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

---

Tuesday, April 27, 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 Jarrod Cicha, Nancy Misra,  
6       Shane Spencer, Bryant Ficek and Youth Commissioner Jana Lynch

7  
8       **Absent:**       Members Michael Joyce, and Karen Huiett (Excused)

9  
10       **Staff Present:**       Public Works Director Marc Culver; City  
11       Engineer/Assistant Public Works Director Jesse  
12       Freihammer; and Civil Engineer Stephanie Smith

13  
14       **2. Public Comments**

15  
16       **3. Swearing in of New Commission Member**

17       Chair Wozniak presented the Oath of Office to new Commissioner Ficek.

18  
19       **4. Election of Officers**

20       Chair Wozniak opened the floor for nominations of Chair of the Commission.

21  
22       Commissioner Misra nominated Chair Wozniak to renew as Chair.

23  
24       Chair Wozniak asked three times if there were any other nominations. He accepted  
25       the nomination.

26  
27       **Motion**

28 **Member Misra moved, Member ?? seconded, to appoint Member Wozniak as**  
29 **Chair of the PWETC for 2021.**

30  
31 **Ayes: 5**

32 **Nays: 0**

33 **Motion carried.**

34

35 Chair Wozniak opened the floor for nominations of Vice-Chair of the Commission.

36

37 Chair Wozniak nominated Member Huiett to renew as Vice-Chair.

38

39 Chair Wozniak asked three times if there were any other nominations.

40

41 **Motion**

42 **Member Wozniak moved, Member Misra seconded, to appoint Member**  
43 **Huiett as Vice-Chair of the PWETC for 2021.**

44

45 **Ayes: 5**

46 **Nays: 0**

47 **Motion carried.**

48

49 Chair Wozniak opened the floor for nominations for representative on the Ethics  
50 Commission. He noted last year Member Joyce was the representative.

51

52 Chair Wozniak asked if any of the members were interested in serving on the Ethics  
53 Commission. No one volunteered. He deferred the appointment to the May 2021  
54 meeting to see if Member Joyce was interested.

55

56 **5. Approval of March 23, 2021 Meeting Minutes**

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

60

61 **Motion**

62 **Member Spencer moved, Member Cicha seconded, approval of the March 23,**  
63 **2021 meeting minutes as presented.**

64

65 **Ayes: 4**

66 **Nays: 0**

67 **Abstain: 1 (Ficek)**

68 **Motion carried.**

69

70 **6. Communication Items**

71 City Engineer Jesse Freihammer provided a brief review and update on projects  
72 and maintenance activities listed in the staff report dated April 27, 2021

73

74 Member Ficek inquired how the bids have been coming in on the Roseville projects.

75

76 Mr. Freihammer indicated the City has had very good bids which have been  
77 favorable to the City. He noted one bid was over-estimate, but the rest have been  
78 under.

79

80 Member Misra wondered if there is a plan for replacing all of the ash trees along  
81 the boulevards and in the parks and has there been any thought in creating a more  
82 intentional green space in the newly developed areas or wild areas in the City.

83

84 Mr. Culver explained the Park Department manages the Emerald Ash Bore program  
85 and is asking for some funding to accelerate the removal and replacement of the  
86 Ash trees. There are plans and desires and wishes to do that and the City is losing  
87 some of the heavily treed areas with some of the development. The City does have  
88 a very intensive replacement or landscaping plan for the ditch project area. The  
89 City will be starting with young trees and something the City is aware of.

90

91 Member Misra asked if the Commission could encourage tree replacement to the  
92 Parks Department in any way.

93

94 Mr. Culver indicated the Commission could do that. He thought a member of the  
95 Parks Commission might be able to come to a meeting to give a presentation of  
96 their proposed program for the Emerald Ash Bore removals and replacement.

97

98 Member Ficek wondered if the maintenance of boulevard trees would also include  
99 looking at sidewalks and trails and where the trees may interfere with pedestrian  
100 movements.

101

102 Mr. Culver asked if Member Ficek meant existing trees causing issues with  
103 heaving.

104

105 Member Ficek explained it could either be that or branches that hang low and  
106 impede pedestrians.

107

108 Mr. Culver explained that should be a part of the City's trimming program, which  
109 is usually winter work.

110

111 Member Ficek congratulated staff on the benchmarking award it received.

112

113 Mr. Culver expanded on the benchmarking award that was received.

114

115 Chair Wozniak indicated on April 8<sup>th</sup> he attended a webinar on mapping prejudice.  
116 This is an effort to try and look at racial covenants on property deeds. He noted  
117 this began in Hennepin County and has moved into Ramsey County. This is  
118 volunteer driven effort where volunteers are asked to look at property deeds to  
119 determine whether or not there are racial covenants, which restrict the sale of

120 property to anyone who is of color. He found the webinar very interesting and  
121 fascinating. He noted there is still a lot of work to be done on this.

122

### 123 **7. Water Efficiency Rebate Program**

124 Civil Engineer Stephanie Smith provided a presentation of the Water Efficiency  
125 Rebate program.

126

127 Member Spencer asked if the three hundred dollar a one-time rebate on somebody's  
128 water bill or is it spread out across multiple bills. He wondered how that worked.

129

130 Ms. Smith indicated it would be as many water bills as it would take to equal that  
131 rebate amount.

132

133 Member Spencer asked what happens if all of the funds are not used. Would the  
134 money go back to the funding source or does it sit there longer until it is all used.

135

136 Ms. Smith indicated the funding from the Metropolitan Council and the Legacy  
137 Amendment would go back to them.

138

139 Member Cicha wondered what the overall cost is of the water sense smart  
140 controllers is. He also indicated Ms. Smith stated the rebate could also be used for  
141 replacing broken and misaligned sprinkler heads and he wondered if this would be  
142 applicable for people that would want to replace their old sprinkler heads with the  
143 old version or would the residents need to be upgrading to the smart type of  
144 sprinkler.

145

146 Ms. Smith explained the smart controllers have a wide range of prices, from \$100  
147 and up. She explained as far as the sprinkler head repairs, they are requiring that  
148 any products that are purchased that would qualify for the rebate have that Water  
149 Sense label.

150

151 Youth Member Lynch asked if plumbers are involved in this.

152

153 Ms. Smith explained plumbers can do installation of irrigation as well as  
154 homeowners.

155

156 Member Misra wondered if this program is available to multi-unit buildings as well.

157

158 Ms. Smith explained HOA complexes could apply for this as well.

159

160 The Commission discussed with staff City irrigation fees.

161

162 Chair Wozniak asked if anyone from the public had any questions. No one wished  
163 to address the Commission. He thanked Ms. Smith for her presentation.

164

### 165 **8. Proposed Updates to the Pathways Master Plan**

166 Mr. Freihammer made a presentation to the Commission on the Pathways Master  
167 Plan update.

168  
169 Member Cicha indicating regarding the ranking system, connecting to the transit  
170 system it is showing based off of 1 to 3 rating, but he saw numbers higher than 3.  
171 He wanted to be sure that they are taking connects into transit and evaluating that  
172 very highly with what paths they think they should be preferring because he thought  
173 it was pretty well understood that those that are taking transit are walking there.

174  
175 Mr. Freihammer explained he will have to take a look at that criteria. He did not  
176 look to much at the table but that was a big need. A lot of times when they get the  
177 connected transit, they are usually connecting to multi-family which usually goes  
178 hand in hand and build off of each other.

179  
180 Member Spencer asked when looking at a path, understanding the City has concrete  
181 and asphalt, is there a set construction method for the paths. He wondered if there  
182 is some sort of standard that has to be followed when construction happens.

183  
184 Mr. Freihammer indicated the City does have some set minimum standards. The  
185 City's informal preference is to do bituminous pathways first. One of the  
186 advantages of this is bituminous is easier to maintain and is also wider for  
187 maintenance is actually easier. This is also a lot smoother for bikers to use as well.  
188 He reviewed the City standards for concrete and bituminous sidewalk construction.

189  
190 Member Spencer indicated an email was sent to the Commission by somebody who  
191 wanted the City to consider a path on Fairview and he wondered if staff was going  
192 to respond to the person or how this should be handled.

193  
194 Mr. Freihammer explained there are some segments being built this year with the  
195 credit union and there are also come additional development that have some  
196 segments. Ramsey County is part of the B2 project and are going to make some of  
197 those connections. There will still probably be a gap north of there but that is a gap  
198 the City can look to fill in and complete.

199  
200 Member Spencer indicated with the pathway going over the ditch, thinking about  
201 stuff like that and thinking about the pedestrian pathway over 35, he wondered if  
202 the City has every thought about partnering with companies to sponsor certain  
203 segments.

204  
205 Mr. Freihammer explained he did not think staff ever discussed naming rights or  
206 any sort of cooperative thing with businesses or other property owners.

207  
208 Mr. Culver noted the City could look at something such as adopt a trail program for  
209 litter control and maybe even snow control. This is something to consider.

210

211 Mr. Matthew Anderson, Anderson Law Group, PLLC, 1010 Dale Street North,  
212 Attorney representing residents of Roseville that live on McCarrons Boulevard. He  
213 indicated he wanted to talk about the Tamarack Trail Segment. He made a short  
214 presentation to the Commission about the residents' opposition to the proposed  
215 path.

216  
217 Chair Wozniak thanked Mr. Anderson for the presentation.

218  
219 Member Ficek asked if the homes have driveways on the McCarron's side or is this  
220 their only access to their garages.

221  
222 Mr. Anderson was not sure, but he thought they all had McCarron's facing  
223 driveways. There is one homeowner that has lived in this area since before  
224 Roseville was incorporated and his first garage was the one in the back which he  
225 has been using consistently all of the years he has lived there. He noted there are a  
226 few properties he represent where the only way to access the back of their property  
227 is from Wagner Street.

228  
229 Chair Wozniak asked what environmental harm Mr. Anderson is asserting that the  
230 pathway would cause that is not already present in the current land use.

231  
232 Mr. Anderson explained when listening to the description of what goes into a  
233 pathway with at least six inches of base and then on top of that another two to three  
234 inches of asphalt and at least at eight feet wide, the City is filling a wetland and the  
235 City is losing wetland at a rapid pace as he showed in his presentation. He indicated  
236 the wetland is a thriving environment that the homeowners have respected and  
237 driven on the dirt road but have not dug anything up and replaced it with outside  
238 vegetation or class five rather than the native soil that belongs there.

239  
240 Chair Wozniak asked if the proposed pathway then would not, essentially follow  
241 the current path taken by the homeowners.

242  
243 Mr. Anderson explained when looking at the map, he believed the proposal is to go  
244 right over those tracks, but he was not certain. The plan would still have to dig up  
245 what is there and replace it with class five rather than native soil and then cut back  
246 whatever vegetation is within the eight feet wide area.

247  
248 Member Misra asked who is maintaining the road currently.

249  
250 Mr. Anderson indicated no one is maintaining it. The homeowners who use the  
251 road are making sure it does not fall into total disrepair. He believed someone  
252 mows it once a year. He noted the City does not plow it and he did not think the  
253 City mowed it. It was his understanding the homeowners have maintained that  
254 stretch to be able to get a truck through there. In the winter, the road is rarely used.

255

256 Mr. Culver indicated staff needed to present a couple of more segments before the  
257 meeting is over for the Commission to give feedback on.

258  
259 Mr. David Booms, 300 South McCarron's Boulevard, explained he wanted to talk  
260 about Mr. Anderson's comments, specifically to access. The one photo he showed  
261 was a stairway leading down to South McCarron's was taken from his property.  
262 He indicated they are roughly 36 feet above the south McCarron's. He noted he  
263 has lived in the area since 1995 and that road, the alley way has been used by the  
264 residents routinely. The road is the most common way to get to their property. He  
265 explained his pontoon is parked in the back along with having a shed in the back.  
266 He stated they are also having some work done now with their roof as well as  
267 working on the deck and all of the materials being used are being brought up the  
268 back using the street pathway. He wanted to affirm that the residents do maintain  
269 the back area.

270  
271 Member Cicha asked if putting a pathway in their limit access for the homeowners.  
272 He wondered what would stop the residents from using the pathway.

273  
274 Mr. Culver explained once this becomes a pathway then the primary user is the  
275 pedestrian or person on a bicycle and from a safety perspective the City cannot have  
276 that mix of traffic on a regular basis. If a person is using a pathway they are not  
277 expecting a car to be on the pathway. The City does have some rules about that,  
278 and the Parks Department actually does have some provisions for allowing  
279 occasional access via a pathway to a rear portion of an adjacent property owners  
280 property for maintenance purposes or something like that, but there are rules, and  
281 the resident has to ask permission. This would not be an open access at that point  
282 and not something the residents could use whenever they wanted or needed. He  
283 indicated to provide some facts from the City side, this has been a use that has been  
284 going on for decades however, it is a roadway right-of-way and is not a road. It is  
285 not a built road; it is a private access currently on a public right-of-way. It does not  
286 meet City standards. If anybody were to build an access to their property that they  
287 were going to use on a regular basis where it results in rutting, as this clearly does,  
288 and needs some sort of maintenance, then that has to be paved. That is clearly in  
289 the City's Zoning Standards and Requirements. The City has made property  
290 owners pay portions of rear access to their properties because they were using it too  
291 often. That gets into erosion and general maintenance and environmental concerns  
292 as well.

293  
294 Mr. Culver explained he was not even aware that this use was going on. Certainly,  
295 members of his staff knew, and he did not know who put that dead end sign up or  
296 when it went up. The City, as a whole, knew that this access was being used in that  
297 way for a long time. He did not know it was being used like that until there was  
298 talk about the pathway. If the City is going to allow that continued use then really  
299 the access needs to be upgraded to meet City standards. He indicated all of the  
300 neighbors get along fine right now but there is also some concerns because there is  
301 no actual legal access through the adjacent properties for these people to gain access



302 to their own properties. There really needs to be some sort of defined legal cross  
303 easement in order for that to continue in perpetuity because any one property owner  
304 can say they do not want anyone crossing their property to get to another's property.  
305

306 Mr. Culver explained the City actually vacated a portion of the right-of-way that  
307 was shown on that map a few years ago on the northern end because there were  
308 some issues with shed placement and property lines, etc. That did not necessarily  
309 impact the roadway being talked about, but it does impact some of the neighbor's  
310 ability to access their own property through that area. The City staff still thinks it  
311 is a beneficial access for the general public, particularly on the west side of Tamarac  
312 Park because of that wetland those residents cannot get to the park unless they drive  
313 around the neighborhood.  
314

315 Chair Wozniak thought the Commission needed to start discussion on  
316 recommended changes. He thought the Commission should start discussion on the  
317 C2 bridge connection. He asked for Commission comments or potential pathway  
318 preference.  
319

320 Member Ficek asked what exactly the path is connecting because on the west side  
321 are car dealerships and on the east side are some companies. He wondered what  
322 the draw would be for that pathway connection.  
323

324 Mr. Culver thought the original intent was to connect the neighborhood on the west  
325 side of Roseville ultimately to the rest of Roseville across 35W. He noted this  
326 connection has been in the City Pathway plans for a long time.  
327

328 Chair Wozniak thought Mr. Steve Jernigan had some very well thought out  
329 comments in his email and he encouraged the Commission to take a look at that.  
330 He was not sure how Mr. Jernigan found out about this being a topic at this meeting  
331 and he wondered how or if staff is asking for public comment about the Pathway  
332 Masterplan at this point.  
333

334 Mr. Freihammer indicated some of the residents are much more in tune with all of  
335 Roseville's dealing so Mr. Jernigan may have caught that on an agenda. He  
336 indicated the City will reach out to specific impacted properties for the next  
337 meeting. He noted the City is in the community gathering phase and wants input  
338 from residents as well as the Commission.  
339

340 Member Misra indicated she would be in favor of seeing something that would be  
341 helpful to pedestrians to cross Snelling.  
342

343 Chair Wozniak asked the Commission to take a close look at the plan before the  
344 next meeting and look at what should be added and focused on. How these should  
345 be prioritized to make sure it still takes into account what they think it should, in  
346 terms of values and so forth, like transit. Also consider some of the concerns voiced

347 by people on McCarron's who might now have access to their house if a pathway  
348 goes in.

349

350 **9. Items for Next Meeting – May 25, 2021**

351 Discussion ensued regarding the May PWETC agenda:

- 352 ▪ Recycling proposals
- 353 ▪ MS4 annual report and public hearing

354

355 Mr. Culver commented June will be prepping for the joint City Council meeting  
356 and July will be a review of that joint meeting with possibly bringing back the  
357 Pathways Masterplan.

358

359 **10. Adjourn**

360

361

**Motion**

362

**Member Misra moved, Member Ficek seconded, adjournment of the meeting  
363 at approximately 8:30 p.m.**

364

365

**Ayes: 5**

366

**Nays: 0**

367

**Motion carried.**