

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

Agenda Item

Date: May 24, 2022

Item No: 3

Item Description: Approval of the April 26, 2022 Public Works Commission Minutes

Attached are the minutes from the April 26, 2022 meeting.

Recommended Action:

Motion approving the minutes of April 26, 2022, subject to any necessary corrections or revision.

Move: _____

Second: _____

Ayes: _____

Nays: _____

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

Tuesday, April 26, 2022, at 6:30 p.m.
City Council Chambers, 2660 Civic Center Drive
Roseville, Minnesota 55113

1 **1. Introduction / Roll Call**

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

4
5 **Present:** Chair Bryant Ficek; Vice Chair Michael Joyce; and Members Jarrod
6 Cicha, Nancy Misra, Shane Spencer, and Edwin Hodder.

7
8 **Absent:** Member Mike Collins (Excused)

9
10 **Staff Present:** Public Works Director Marc Culver; City
11 Engineer/Assistant Public Works Director Jesse
12 Freihammer; Civil Engineer Stephanie Smith, and
13 Environmental Specialist Ryan Johnson
14

15 **2. Public Comments**

16 Chair Ficek indicated the Board received a couple of emails about some events
17 coming up. One email was also received from the Roseville Area Progressives
18 Club.
19

20 **3. Swearing in of New Commissioner Edwin Hodder**

21 Chair Ficek administered the Oath of Office to Commissioner Hodder.
22

23 Chair Ficek thanked outgoing Chair Joe Wozniak for his service on the
24 Commission. He also mentioned the Roseville Area High School did a walk out on
25 March 25th to bring attention to climate change. He explained he did attend and
26 thought it was a good event and appreciated the activism of the students.
27

28 **4. Approval of March 22, 2022 Meeting Minutes**

29 *Comments and corrections to draft minutes had been submitted by PWETC*
30 *commissioners prior to tonight's meeting and those revisions incorporated into the*
31 *draft presented in meeting materials.*
32

33 Chair Ficek indicated on line 36 his name is misspelled.

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
74
75
76
77
78
79

Motion
Member Joyce moved, Member Cicha seconded, approval of the March 22, 2022 meeting minutes as amended.

Ayes: 6
Nays: 0
Motion carried.

5. Communication Items

City Engineer Jesse Freihammer provided a brief review and update on projects and maintenance activities listed in the staff report dated April 26, 2022.

Public Works Director Marc Culver updated the Commission on shredding day on May 21st. He noted the City is finding it difficult to get contractors that are willing to do this event at the scale the City needs it to be done for the demand that is out there. He was not sure how much longer the City will be able to do this event with costs increasing and the difficulty of getting contractors. He explained this is a nice free event but there are many private market options for this service as well.

Mr. Culver explained staff had a really good meeting with the City Council on the Civic Campus predesign project and a couple of residents attended and provided some good and honest input from their perspective. The City continues to be aware of the impact this proposal may bring to the neighboring residents and the community as a whole.

Member Spencer inquired about the clean up day and how much was recycled.

Mr. Freihammer indicated he would report that information at the May meeting. All of the data has not been tabulated yet.

Member Spencer asked about the cable median on Snelling and inquired about the reasoning for it.

Mr. Freihammer explained similar to other locations in the Metro, it is more of a safety improvement so there are not any crossovers between the lanes. Some of it was to prevent the illegal U-turns that are present. As part of that, there are a couple of minor improvements in that area as well. He reported the improvements to the Commission.

Chair Ficek indicated regarding the Lexington Water Main if the turn lane will be removed to make it one way each direction, he wondered how that will affect access.

Mr. Freihammer explained traffic will be shifted to the east and southbound traffic will use the old center left turn lane. The City is working with Ramsey County for

80 both signal lights at Woodhill and County Road C. This will probably be under split
81 phasing. Left Turns will still be able to work even though the signal will not be as
82 efficient but it still should work. The only access will be into The Point or Amara.
83 The apartment building across the street will still have full access other.
84

85 Mr. Freihammer addressed Commission questions regarding construction issues.
86

87 Mr. Culver indicated at the end of April the Mayor's Emergency Declaration for
88 virtual meetings is going to expire. He indicated starting with the May meeting all
89 Commissioners will be required to attend the meetings in person, in a public space.
90 He believed the hybrid meetings will continue to allow the public to view and
91 respond remotely.
92

93 **6. Regional Bike Plan Review and Discussion**

94 Mr. Culver introduced Jesse Thorsen, Senior Pedestrian, Bicycle, ADA Planner
95 for the Minnesota Department of Transportation who made a presentation on the
96 Pathway Master Plan. The Commission is asked to consider and recommend future
97 action for the City.
98

99 Chair Ficek asked Mr. Thorsen to expand on how MnDOT can work with
100 Roseville if the City were to move forward with some sort of bike plan. He
101 wondered what MnDOT's role would be in that.
102

103 Mr. Thorsen reviewed the steps that would be taken to coordinate highway
104 crossings, alignment of upcoming work as well as coordination along roadways.
105

106 Chair Ficek asked if it is a benefit to MnDOT if the City has a bike path plan.
107

108 Mr. Thorsen indicated there would be a benefit.
109

110 Member Misra indicated in the MnDOT prioritization maps it shows major
111 corridors where the priority lies, the major traffic areas, but in the design graphics
112 it is looking at lower speed, lower volume traffic areas. She wondered how are those
113 two combined.
114

115 Mr. Thorsen indicated MnDOT is focusing on the trunk highway for the
116 prioritization so part of having all of those different facilities within the design
117 guide is to recognize that they want to make sure they are adequately planning for
118 the safety of people crossing the trunk highway network. Understanding that there
119 are minor streets that intersect with the trunk highways. Being able to plan for those
120 adequately and also the design manual is not just for MnDOT to use, often times it
121 can be a guide for other municipalities to look at if they are having questions about
122 planning transportation needs. It is mostly a guide to be used.
123

124 Mr. Scott Merrick, Ramsey County Senior Transportation Planner, provided a
125 presentation on the Ramsey County All Abilities 2050 Plan.

126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171

Chair Ficek asked regarding the County Hierarchy slide, will more money be allocated to people who walk then money will be allocated to people who bike and down the line. He asked for Mr. Merrick to expand on the information.

Mr. Merrick explained it is not necessarily more money because the physical infrastructure of roadways is quite a bit more than building a trail or sidewalk, it is more about how they look at designing a roadway. He gave the Commission an example and explained they first look at what the biking and walking needs are in the corridor and how can they best accommodate those needs. He noted this is for a full reconstruction of a roadway.

Chair Ficek indicated what he envisioned under that guideline is the County could induce some vehicle congestion in order to make the crossing safer for pedestrian traffic.

Mr. Merrick explained those are discussions that do take place and those decisions are made on a project-by-project basis that involve, often times, the City that the County is working with. They also look at balancing those vehicle needs with bicycle and walking needs.

Member Misra explained in Roseville there are so many major thoroughfares so the City does not have a lot of authority unilaterally to impose speed limits or change certain traffic parameters. It seems to her that with an increased emphasis on pedestrians and bikes going forward that maybe that is up for consideration on some of the existing and proposed projects.

Mr. Merrick explained the issue of speed does come up in a lot of the corridors. Speeds on County corridors are set by Minnesota Statute, which requires that MnDOT conducts a speed study and whatever the eighty-fifth percentile is of people driving in the corridor is what the posted speed is along the County road. He indicated the County Board is very interested in this topic and are having ongoing discussions about looking at some creative ways they could look at posting speeds in certain County corridors different than what he just described. The County is working with its traffic engineer and the County Board to do some pilot studies in the coming years.

Mr. Culver explained the PWETC will likely be talking about speed limits at the local level before the end of the year. City's do have the ability to set speed limits based on some engineering studies on its own. He explained it is a tough authority to have because the City has to make sure it is done in the right way and the biggest difficulty is the enforcement.

Mr. Culver indicated he wanted to find out what the Commission thinks as far as what Roseville should be looking at for further action on a bike network plan and if the Commissioners had any other input on Mr. Merrick's slides. Should the City

172 be extending the Pathway Master Plan to include some additional details for a bike
173 network plan. Should the City put together a whole separate plan.

174
175 Chair Ficek explained if the City went down the road to a separate bike plan, what
176 would Mr. Culver see as the goal and how would that be different from the Master
177 Plan.

178
179 Mr. Culver indicated he was looking for some input from the Commission, if there
180 is any input. He noted the City does not necessarily have a budget right now for a
181 separate bike plan but some things could be shuffled around to hire a consultant to
182 help with that. He thought the City needed to work towards a network where they
183 are promoting the use of certain roadways for bike travel.

184
185 Member Hodder explained from his perspective when he was Finance Chair, one
186 of the things that helped ground him, when he would make decisions was how
187 would it be connected to the community vision for the process that the citizens laid
188 out. How is this driven toward that end.

189
190 Mr. Culver explained whether this is a supplement to the existing Pathway Master
191 Plan or a whole new plan, it is directly connected to the City's overall
192 Transportation Plan, which is a chapter within the City's Comprehensive Plan,
193 which is a very community driven document.

194
195 Member Misra explained to Commissioner Hodder's point, that is the kind of
196 thinking that the City, County and even the State seem to be moving forward with
197 its plans, a kind of aspirational vision towards the community.

198
199 Chair Ficek explained his opinion is what he is hearing from the County and State
200 is that it would be a benefit if the City had this and it would help with their
201 investments and something to point to and say the City is dedicated towards it. He
202 also thought, given the little knowledge he has of the Comprehensive Plan, it would
203 be easier to change a bike plan if it were a separate item rather than having to go
204 back and do an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan. He could definitely see
205 some benefit towards having a separate plan. He thought it would be a good thing
206 to have.

207
208 Mr. Culver thanked the presenters for addressing the Commission.

209
210 Chair Ficek also thanked the presenters for their presentations.

211
212 **7. Items for Next Meeting – May 24, 2022**

213 Discussion ensued regarding the May PWETC agenda:

- 214 ■ Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) Annual Meeting
- 215 ■ Update on Storm Sewer Projects
- 216 ■ June: City Council July Joint Meeting preparation

217

218 Chair Ficek indicated he would like to change the Commission name to “The
219 Sustainability and Infrastructure Commission”. He thought it would be more
220 succinct with what the Commission does. He noted there are other cities that have
221 gone this route with sustainability commissions.
222

223 Mr. Culver commented the Public Works, Environment and Transportation
224 Commission, as with all the other Commissions in the City are set in City Code.
225 Changing a name actually requires action by the City Council and it is an important
226 change which would require a public hearing to make that change. It is not to say
227 the name change cannot be done but he wanted the Commission to understand the
228 process it would take. The Commission could make a recommendation to the City
229 Council to consider changing the name of the Commission. He would suggest the
230 conversation to be at the June meeting.
231

232 Chair Ficek indicated he would be looking for that recommendation if the
233 Commission was in agreement.
234

235 Mr. Culver reviewed “No Mow May” with the Commission.
236

237 **8. Adjourn**

238

239 **Motion**

240 **Member Misra moved, Member Joyce seconded, adjournment of the meeting**
241 **at approximately 8:24 p.m.**
242

243 **Ayes: 6**

244 **Nays: 0**

245 **Motion carried.**