

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

Agenda Item

Date: November 23, 2021

Item No: 3

Item Description: Approval of the October 26, 2021 Public Works Commission Minutes

Attached are the minutes from the October 26, 2021 meeting.

Recommended Action:

Motion approving the minutes of October 26, 2021, subject to any necessary corrections or revision.

Move: _____

Second: _____

Ayes: _____

Nays: _____

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

Tuesday, October 26, 2021, at 6:30 p.m.
City Council Chambers, 2660 Civic Center Drive
Roseville, Minnesota 55113

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; Vice Chair Bryant Ficek; and Members Jarrod
6 Cicha, Shane Spencer and Mike Collins.

7
8 **Absent:** Member Nancy Misra and Michael Joyce (Excused)

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

12
13 **2. Public Comments**

14 None.

15
16 **3. Approval of September 28, 2021 Meeting Minutes**

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

20
21 **Motion**

22 **Member Ficek moved, Member Wozniak seconded, approval of the**
23 **September 28, 2021 meeting minutes as presented.**

24
25 **Ayes: 5**

26 **Nays: 0**

27 **Motion carried.**

28
29 **4. Communication Items**

30 City Engineer Jesse Freihammer provided a brief review and update on projects
31 and maintenance activities listed in the staff report dated October 26, 2020.

33 Member Ficek asked regarding the local sales tax going to the Legislation by the
34 Council, will there be a limit on the number of years or will it be indefinite.

35
36 Mr. Culver indicated the time period could be up to twenty years, but essentially
37 once enough money is collected to pay for the projects identified then the sales tax
38 would stop.

39
40 Member Ficek asked regarding the railroad crossing item, will this be a quiet zone
41 or just a couple day work zone.

42
43 Mr. Freihammer indicated this would be a two-day work zone replacing the gate.

44
45 Chair Wozniak asked if Tamarack Park was one of the six pathway approved.

46
47 Mr. Culver indicated Tamarack Park was one of them. He explained there was a
48 lot of conversation about that park and Eustis Park. Staff is going to communicate
49 with the neighborhood as fast as possible and staff will be putting together an
50 estimate of what it would cost to do an alleyway type of facility adjacent to the
51 pathway. Given the fact that there is a wetland there, either the City would have to
52 fill in a wetland or they would have to go around the wetland through park property.
53 The latter probably is not a feasible option because the City would not give up park
54 land. There would be a significant cost to it, given some of the geometric and
55 topographic issues through the wetland as well as the environmental impact to also
56 consider.

57
58 **5. 2022 Proposed Utility Rates**

59 Mr. Culver explained each year City staff proposed utility rates for the following
60 budget year. The rates are for all City utility funds including water, sanitary sewer,
61 storm sewer and recycling. The Commission is asked to provide feedback on the
62 proposed utility rates.

63
64 Vice-Chair Ficek wondered about the water, there was a big change to go to the
65 usage fee, and he wondered if that changed any behaviors.

66
67 Mr. Culver explained what is interesting is the first year under the new rate structure
68 the State went through a drought. They actually saw a substantial increase in the
69 amount of irrigation, at least early in the summer. The City also implemented
70 watering restrictions as well in August. There was a significant drop in water usage
71 between July and August due to suggested watering restrictions. He explained 2021
72 was not a good year to gauge that by.

73
74 Vice-Chair Ficek indicated material costs went up substantially. He wondered
75 when the calculations were made and is the City thinking about inflation and how
76 that comes into play and whether the estimates are higher or lower on the capital
77 costs across the board.

78

79 Mr. Culver did not know if the City saw substantial increases in construction costs
80 this year but next year could be very interesting.

81
82 Mr. Freihammer explained that every year when staff does its budget CIP they
83 project out twenty years on the Capital Replacement and try to keep it up to date,
84 especially for the lift stations, to see what they are currently paying.

85
86 Vice-Chair Ficek asked if the City should look at figures to see if an increase to the
87 stormwater fund to try to build a surplus and try to plan for improvements in the
88 future.

89
90 Mr. Culver indicated they have not. There has been internal discussion but nothing
91 has been looked at. He indicated staff should look at this because they will end up
92 spending the capital dollars in the future. For next year's CIP process they should
93 probably bump up the expenditures in some of the out years, looking five years and
94 beyond.

95
96 Member Collins indicated he had a question about the storm sewer system. He
97 understood staff has not pinpointed all of the problems yet, but he wondered if staff
98 had an idea of where they would start if they had to.

99
100 Mr. Culver explained one of the big liabilities out there is the ponds. Staff knows
101 they have a lot of ponds that need dredging. Unfortunately, a lot of the costs related
102 to that is the disposal of the material. It needs to be tested for contamination and
103 then it would need to be placed in a landfill, which is very expensive. Staff has a
104 decent idea about the cost. The other side is staff is seeing some sink holes and
105 outlet structures that are separating from the pipe that are very difficult to get to.
106 Staff has a growing list of known issues that will need to be taken care of. Staff
107 does not have a handle on the magnitude of that at this time, particularly the pipes
108 themselves underground.

109
110 Mr. Freihammer indicated on the storm sewer system the City is very reactionary
111 and when the City does a road mill and overlay the only thing that might be
112 upgraded is the catch basins because there are usually inspections done on those
113 and, if failing, they get replaced. Very rarely is the mainline pipe excavated and
114 replaced.

115
116 Chair Wozniak asked if there is any relationship between how much the City spends
117 on stormwater management and how much precipitation the City gets in a year.

118
119 Mr. Culver explained what is interesting is with the changes in climate there are
120 more intense rainfalls and rain events and that does actually have an impact on the
121 stormwater system. A lot of the requirements the City has for new developments
122 and redevelopments or even reconstruction are because of that. The City recognizes
123 that the current stormwater system is under designed for today, and certainly for
124 tomorrow, as the rain events become more intense. It is not that the City is getting

125 more water annually, it is that they are getting more water in one event and the
126 stormwater system then becomes surcharged and it cannot handle that and the pipes
127 overflow. He asked how they handle that and delay the water from getting into the
128 storm water system and that is why they see all the new rain gardens and basins and
129 underground storage systems, which is great but there is a capital cost to install
130 those and there is a growing capital expense to maintain those. The City water
131 system and sewer system are pretty much staying the same. The stormwater system
132 is growing and the City is adding more components to the system, not necessarily
133 pipes but what they call best management practices, retention devices, rain gardens
134 and basins, which all require some sort of maintenance or at some point
135 reconstruction.

136
137 Vice Chair Ficek asked if staff knew how the increased proposed tier for recycling
138 compares to previous years.

139
140 Mr. Culver indicated there was a pretty substantial increase and shift in the rate
141 structure. All of the other utility rates have pretty much only increased by five to
142 six percent. The recycling fee has probably been the most volatile from that
143 perspective because when the City was paying on the revenue structure or cost share
144 structure and making one hundred thousand a year to paying in an additional
145 seventy thousand dollars a year, the City had to make some pretty dramatic changes
146 to the fee structure there.

147
148 Chair Wozniak indicated when they were talking about the recycling fee and slides
149 about increasing the rate to \$13.00 or \$14.00 per quarter from \$12.60, he liked the
150 idea of starting a fund to support purchasing carts several years from now and he
151 would be willing to make that recommendation as a part of an action the
152 Commission makes on these utility rates. He indicated he would not go much
153 beyond \$13.30 per quarter for 2022, however, he would suggest going to \$15.00
154 for 2023 and even \$17.00 for 2024 because it is not that big a jump from \$13.00 or
155 \$13.30 to \$15.00 and then \$15.00 to \$17.00. He did not know how much money
156 would be raised but it could not hurt to look at the numbers and see how that works
157 out. He explained he would support increasing the rate to start generating a fund
158 to purchase carts at the end of the current contract and he would look at modifying
159 some of the numbers shown and increase it more in the second and third years. As
160 part of that, he would try to find out if staff can get some figures on how much the
161 City might save by having their own carts compared to having a vendor's carts.

162
163 Member Cicha agreed that the numbers do make sense to increase the recycling to
164 build up that kind of capital. He indicated the whole concept of recycling is
165 sustainability and bringing in all these new carts into the system, does that concept
166 work together and is there any way they can try to offset the purchase of the new
167 carts with some other type of sustainable action.

168
169 Mr. Culver explained they would be looking at current numbers which is around
170 sixteen thousand carts plus some percentage for stock. The carts that are out there

171 now, Eureka purchased this batch of carts in 2013, that was when the City moved
172 from the bins to the carts. There are some new carts out there that needed replacing
173 but the bulk of them are going on ten years old so the question would be, how long
174 will Eureka keep the carts out there before replacing them and what could the City
175 do with those old carts. He indicated if the City purchased their own carts he
176 thought Eureka might attempt to repurpose those as much as they could with some
177 of their existing customers because they are not branded for Roseville. That is a
178 very good question from a sustainability perspective.

179

180 **Motion**

181 **Member Ficek moved, Member Spencer seconded, to recommend the**
182 **increases in the rates as proposed to the City Council with a larger fee for the**
183 **recycling fee to start building up a surplus for future use and to add the study**
184 **for potential cost impacts using City owned carts versus vendor owned carts.**

185

186 **Ayes: 5**

187 **Nays: 0**

188 **Motion carried.**

189

190 **6. Introduction to Crosswalk Treatments**

191 Mr. Culver explained the Commission is asked to provide feedback about the use
192 of crosswalks on City roadways. He reviewed the information with the
193 Commission.

194

195 Member Spencer indicated with the construction at Rosedale and the apartments
196 coming in, have they looked at upgrading more of the crosswalks in that area.

197

198 Mr. Freihammer explained all of those are on county roads. The County is
199 upgrading all of the crossings and putting updated ADA ramps as well as upgraded
200 countdown timers as well as the APS system. There are no current plans to add
201 more crossings.

202

203 Chair Wozniak thought people are using trails more than previously and, given that
204 and they have not seen or heard of crashes with pedestrians, he thought the
205 markings were doing what they are supposed to do and that is drawing attention to
206 drivers to let pedestrians cross where they legally can.

207

208 **7. Items for Next Meeting – November 2021**

209 Discussion ensued regarding the November PWETC agenda:

210

- 211 ■ Public Works 2021 Work Plan
- 212 ■ Continuation of Crosswalk Treatments Discussion
- 213 ■ Discuss Super Meeting
- 214 ■ Public Works Tour

215

8. Adjourn

216

Motion

217

**Member Ficek moved, Member Cicha seconded, adjournment of the meeting
at approximately 8:28 p.m.**

218

219

220

Ayes: 5

221

Nays: 0

222

Motion carried.

DRAFT