

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

---

Tuesday, January 23, 2018 at 6:30 p.m.  
City Council Chambers, 2660 Civic Center Drive  
Roseville, Minnesota 55113

---

---

1       **1. Introduction / Roll Call**

2       Chair Cihacek called the meeting to order at approximately 6:30 p.m. and  
3       announced the Public Works, Environment and Transportation Commission has  
4       three open seats. At his request, Public Works Director Culver called the roll.  
5

6       **Present:**       Chair Brian Cihacek; Vice Chair Joe Wozniak; and Members,  
7       Duane Seigler and John Heimerl  
8

9       **Absent:**       Kody Thurnau and Thomas Trainor, excused; and, Nancy Misra  
10

11       **Staff Present:**       Public Works Director Marc Culver and Environmental  
12       Specialist Ryan Johnson  
13

14       **2. Public Comments**  
15

16       **3. Approval of November 28, 2017 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       Mr. Culver noted under item No. 9, Adjournment, it shows seven ayes. There were  
22       only four members present, and the minutes will be changed to reflect this.  
23

24       **Motion**

25       **Member Wozniak moved, Member Seigler seconded, approval of the**  
26       **November 28, 2017 meeting minutes, as amended.**  
27

28       **Ayes: 3**

29       **Nays: 0**

30       **Abstain: 1 (Heimerl)**

31       **Motion carried.**  
32

33       **4. Communication Items**

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

Public Works Director Culver provided a brief review and update on projects and maintenance activities listed in the staff report dated January 23, 2018. He noted that Xcel Energy will begin changing the City’s lights with LED fixtures. The City will receive a slightly reduced lease rate and save several thousand dollars annually. These savings will stay in the General Fund.

Members inquired about a news story regarding the City hiring private contractors to do the plowing, where vehicles are towed, and if there were any lessons learned from this snow event.

Public Works Director Culver responded he was not aware of the City hiring private contractors to do snow removal, unless they are hiring them for some parking lots. He will follow up with the Commission on this item. He explained when they sent the plows out around 2:00 p.m. they realized they were not going to be able to keep up with the snow. They went to a full City plow and finished around 9:30 p.m. with a plan to begin again at 3:00 a.m. They do not tow vehicles during the snow event. Vehicles are ticketed and then have 12 hours to move their vehicle before they are subject to towing. The police handle the towing and he is not aware of any vehicles being towed. He acknowledged the City’s Street Superintendent and the maintenance staff for doing a great job during snow events.

**5. Eureka Park Recycling Pilot Program Review**

Mr. Culver reported they wanted to investigate increased recycling in City parks and worked with Eureka to develop a pilot program in 2017. Eureka will discuss their findings with the pilot program and provide recommendations.

Chris Goodwin, Communications Manager with Eureka Recycling, explained recycling in parks is a challenge with most cities. They chose the largest park in the City, collected from all types of containers, and keep track of tonnage collected, contamination issues, and impact on the trails and visitors.

Mr. Goodwin reported they first met with the Parks staff and asked what they think would go wrong, and then built a plan around that. Throughout the entire season, there was not any negative impact on the trails made by the truck that collected the recycling. They also tracked the volume in the containers to determine how much material is out there. This information was also very helpful in determining a recommendation for the City.

Mr. Goodwin provided a chart on all the containers and the volume of material collected to help them determine the different types of collection requirements for the different types of uses. They learned that the containers at the pavilions require a higher level of service, and carts along the path require less. Containers at ball fields and tennis courts require more seasonal collection and was greater during the summer months.

79 Chair Cihacek inquired if the numbers in the chart adjust for contamination in the  
80 carts.  
81  
82 Mr. Goodwin reported the contamination issues were very infrequent and spread  
83 out over many containers.  
84  
85 Member Wozniak inquired where the pilot program took place.  
86  
87 Mr. Goodwin responded it took place all around Lake Bennett, on both the Victoria  
88 and Lexington sides. The carts east of Lexington were part of a different contract.  
89  
90 Member Seigler inquired if empty carts meant that people just threw away their  
91 recycling in the regular trash or if there were truly no recyclables in that area.  
92  
93 Mr. Goodwin responded they did not have park staff do a composition of the trash  
94 and they did not report that garbage volumes had increased. The empty recycling  
95 containers were probably in areas where the trash volume was low as well and do  
96 not get a lot of use.  
97  
98 Environmental Specialist Ryan Johnson provided an aerial view map that showed  
99 where the high, medium, and low uses were. The containers near the pavilions and  
100 in parking lots were considered high uses.  
101  
102 Mr. Goodwin went over the locations where contamination was found, and noted it  
103 was so infrequent that it would not overwhelm the program or cause problems.  
104 They provided a trash container alongside the recycle container and believe that is  
105 why contamination was low. They have discussed with Parks staff about requiring  
106 a refundable deposit for people who rent out the pavilions. If they leave a mess or  
107 do not recycle properly, they could lose the deposit. Other cities have implemented  
108 this, and it has helped.  
109  
110 Member Wozniak inquired if there is anything on the carts that lets them know  
111 what is allowed in them.  
112  
113 Mr. Goodwin responded the carts are the same ones used in the residential program.  
114 They have a label on top in English that talks about what should go in there along  
115 with a yes/no list on the cart as well. The information is available in five other  
116 languages and there is probably opportunity for additional signage on the walls at  
117 the pavilions. He also provided a photo of the packer truck that is used on the paths  
118 and explained it is eight feet wide and fits on the paths, with a capacity of half a  
119 ton.  
120  
121 Mr. Goodwin provided the following recommendations:  
122 • Parking lots and recently added walk up carts – every other week collection.  
123 These could be added to residential routes to make it more cost effective.

124  
125  
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

- Trails – monthly plus collection during the summer. As Parks staff empties the trash containers, they can check the recycling containers. If they need attention, Eureka will take care of it.
- Food stations, tennis courts, and ballfields – every other week plus. Anytime Parks staff sees it is getting too full, Eureka will care of it.
- Pavilions – every other week or weekly (based on volume).

These recommendations do not yet have pricing and that will be negotiated between Eureka and City staff once the recommendations are approved.

Chair Cihacek inquired if they can do organics recycling.

Mr. Goodwin responded they currently cannot do this and it would depend on how the City chose to pursue an organics program.

Member Heimerl inquired if they would consider including phone contact information for people in the park in the event containers need attention.

Mr. Goodwin responded Eureka’s phone number is on the carts, but it does not direct people to call it. They could consider having a sign directing people to call a number if the carts are full. With the pavilions, there is only a certain amount of room for a few carts, and they discussed having empty carts accessible for Parks staff to swap out as needed.

Member Heimerl inquired if anyone called the number on the carts during the pilot program.

Mr. Goodwin responded Parks staff heard from a couple of people that thought it was great they were including recycling and they did not hear any complaints. They picked a perfect time on Monday morning to empty the containers. Timing is very important in parks so that they are not competing with the residents for trail space.

In response to Member Wozniak, Mr. Goodwin explained they do not do trail pickups in any other parks. Usually it is Parks staff that uses City vehicles to do the collections and dump them in a central location within the public works area for pickup. Most cities would prefer to find a more efficient way to do it, but it is challenging for a residential or commercial collector to deal with trail carts. When they consider doing this service for Roseville, they will use residential trucks when they can to cut down on cost. Since they are using the smaller truck that is used in St. Paul alleys for the trail collections, the cost is assigned to both uses. The versatility of the smaller truck helps to find a lot of uses, which in turn will keep the cost down by distributing it to all those uses.

Member Wozniak inquired if the smaller truck could collect organics, such as pet waste.

170 Mr. Goodwin responded it has not been discussed, but the truck may not be small  
171 enough to make it work. This type of collection could be done with a pickup truck  
172 or golf cart.

173  
174 Member Seigler commented it seems there are not a lot of people using the trails  
175 and it is expensive to go out on them for pickups. He inquired if it even makes  
176 sense to have a recyclable container on the trails.

177  
178 Mr. Goodwin responded if they take away the recycling containers, the recycling  
179 will go in the trash carts. They need to consider the benefit of collecting the  
180 recycling and the fact there is a lot of people that want recycling in the parks. They  
181 currently have one smaller truck and will acquire a second one in February.

182  
183 Chair Cihacek stated they are still trying to figure out what the right size is for  
184 collection frequency. The smaller truck is used for other purposes, so the cost is  
185 already lower.

186  
187 Mr. Goodwin stated they could also decrease the number of recycling containers  
188 along the trails, but they would need to make sure the lack of containers does not  
189 create litter problems.

190  
191 In response to Member Wozniak, Mr. Johnson explained the Parks staff collects  
192 trash along the trails once or twice a week and brings it to designated dumpsters but  
193 does not pick up the recycling.

194  
195 Mr. Culver responded that Parks staff is unable to do both with the amount of staff  
196 they have.

197  
198 Member Seigler commented if the City is collecting trash on the trails every week  
199 and more than 60 or 70 percent of the recycling containers are only one-quarter full  
200 or empty, it may not make sense to have trail pickup when compared to the cost of  
201 having that service.

202  
203 Mr. Goodwin stated they have to do the pricing analysis on what is needed and how  
204 much that will affect the cost. A lot of the carts are pulled in November and put  
205 back out in May. He noted they are also developing an app called Recollect that  
206 they were planning on offering to the City at no additional cost.

207  
208 **6. Organics Recycling/Collection**  
209 Mr. Johnson referred to the University of Minnesota Capstone Project, provided on  
210 page 29 of the meeting packet, highlighted the potential organics sites in Roseville  
211 and provided the following Capstone recommendations: 1) Co-Sponsor an organics  
212 recycling drop-off site; 2) Implement a source separated curbside cart program;  
213 and, 3) Utilize comprehensive outreach and education strategies. After evaluating  
214 accessibility, security, parking and traffic, site characteristics, and walkability, the  
215 Victoria Ballfields site came in first with a score of 10. Dale Street Soccer Fields

216 came in second with a score of 8.4 and Dale Street Leaf Recycling Center came in  
217 third with a score of 4.8. The Victoria Ballfields already have an existing dumpster  
218 used for trash, it is an easy location to get into and is located in a shaded area.  
219

220 Chair Cihacek inquired what the status of residential collection of organics is with  
221 Eureka.  
222

223 Mr. Goodwin stated the main limiting factor is transfer capacity. The processing  
224 facilities for compost are over 50 miles away. They need to get all the materials off  
225 the little truck, onto a bigger truck, and haul it. Ramsey County does not have a  
226 transfer station and a big issue is processing co-collection of yard waste and  
227 organics together. They should find out where the County is currently transferring  
228 this material. Both the County and St. Paul are considering using blue bags to  
229 collect organics, and these would be collected with the trash.  
230

231 Chair Cihacek summarized that one of limiting factors of the County is transfer  
232 capacity. Until that is addressed, residential collection is not feasible in the  
233 marketplace.  
234

235 Mr. Goodwin stated it is a good time for cities to voice their expectations since this  
236 is being looked at and will be decided in the next couple of years.  
237

238 Member Wozniak commented the drop off sites are seen as a transition to another  
239 program, such as the one using blue bags for organics. It seems more likely that  
240 the County would go to a blue bag system versus addressing the transfer capacity  
241 issue. The Recycling and Energy Center and the Board that oversees it will be  
242 issuing requests for proposals and bids for an anaerobic digestion facility  
243 somewhere in the metro area to handle source separated organics.  
244

245 Chair Cihacek stated it sounds like curbside collection is still years away, but they  
246 can attend public hearings and communicate preferences to decision makers, so it  
247 can be included in the planning process.  
248

249 Mr. Goodwin suggested the Commission look at a comprehensive compost report  
250 that Eureka did that looked at drop offs needed to attain certain goals and different  
251 ways of processing the material.  
252

253 Chair Cihacek noted they are not at a place to implement a curbside program. He  
254 stated they do support co-sponsoring an organics drop off site and inquired what  
255 action they need to take.  
256

257 Mr. Johnson stated now that they have the data, they should affirm the  
258 recommendation.  
259

260 Chair Cihacek stated he supports the report as information for decision makers of  
261 the City as they look to see if this issue is feasible.

262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307

Member Wozniak inquired if a specific place in the ballfield area was identified.

Mr. Johnson responded they did not provide a final location, but there is an area near the existing dumpster that is shaded.

Mr. Culver stated they would want to find a spot that is easiest to access and has no impact on parking. It makes sense to get as close to the dumpster as possible. The next step would be to discuss this with the Parks and Recreation Commission, do some public outreach for residents in the area, and then present it to the Council.

Chair Cihacek inquired if they could pull data on the Arden Hills yard waste site and determine what issues may come up with having a separate container in the yard waste site.

Mr. Culver agreed to look into it and Member Wozniak suggested they also look at the standalone sites as well.

Member Wozniak inquired if they have heard from the Parks and Recreation Department about the recommendations of this project.

Mr. Culver responded they have expressed concerns with odors, flies, and other similar nuisances, along with impacts to parking and operation of the ball fields while events are taking place.

Member Wozniak stated regarding odor, there is already an 8-yard trash container with no enclosure that smells bad in the summer. The City code requires commercial trash containers to be enclosed, and he does not understand why this one can be out in the open.

Chair Cihacek suggested they do a joint meeting with the Parks and Recreation Commission. They should also set up some type of outreach plan to ramp up for future source separated organics.

Member Seigler referred to a graph in the report that showed the average weight of organics recycled per participant from 2014 to 2016 in St. Paul was nine pounds per year. Because this is low, he suggested the City pursue another way for people to do this in their yard rather than collect it.

Mr. Culver stated the biggest issue with yard composting is that the temperature does not get high enough to break down certain foods. Industrial composting can compost much more, included some plastics.

Chair Cihacek stated part of the education plan should address how people can do some yard waste composting on their own until decisions are made on a larger County-wide program.

308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353

Member Seigler pointed out there is no medical recycling near Roseville and it would be nice to have.

Chair Cihacek suggested they look into what the process would be to pursue this in Roseville. With Roseville being an older population, they need to have this.

**7. Comprehensive Plan – Resiliency Chapter**

Mr. Culver reported the Resiliency Chapter is required by the Comprehensive Plan process. Staff has been working with the consultants and have come up with a draft for discussion. They have also received comments from the public and former PWETC members. He requested the Commission review the draft, provide input, and consider other items that should be included.

Chair Cihacek inquired who owns this chapter in the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Culver stated it is owned by both Community Development and Public Works, with some elements addressed by the Parks and Recreation Department.

Mr. Johnson noted the two main requirements from the Metropolitan Council are solar resource protection and solar resource development.

Member Wozniak noted he sent Mr. Culver a correction to language regarding the Ramsey Washington Recycling and Energy Center on page 12. He clarified energy is not generated in Newport and it is only a processing plant. He also inquired why some of the comments provided to them by former Commission members were not referenced in the draft.

Mr. Johnson agreed the comments may have been too specific for this area of the Comprehensive Plan but would be addressed later in the process.

Mr. Culver referred to page 5, and noted the comments had a different goal for greenhouse gas emissions than the draft.

Member Wozniak stated some of the targets for greenhouse emissions came from the Alliance for Sustainability and they were trying to enlist community support to incorporate them in the draft Comprehensive Plan.

Member Seigler inquired if the Resiliency Chapter is new compared to previous Comprehensive Plans.

Mr. Johnson responded the previous Comprehensive Plan had an Environmental Protection Chapter, and it has been blended to become a Resiliency and Environmental Protection Chapter.

Chair Cihacek suggested they go through the document page by page.



354 Pages 3 through 5 – Environmental Protection.  
355 Chair Cihacek noted there were four categories and one policy when there should  
356 be one policy for each category. TIF can address what can be done for land but  
357 cannot address what can be done for water, wildlife or air quality. He recommends  
358 they come up with additional policy frameworks for wildlife, water and air quality.  
359 He also pointed out that wildlife is not addressed in the background information.  
360  
361 Mr. Culver stated they could come up with a general policy for these things.  
362  
363 Under *Trees* (page 4), Chair Cihacek pointed out there are areas that are still blank  
364 and need to be filled in.  
365  
366 Member Wozniak stated they should include the issues they are having with the  
367 Emerald Ash Borers as part of the background, which is driving the inclusion of  
368 tree diversity.  
369  
370 Mr. Culver noted section 1.3 under *Policies* does address tree diversity.  
371  
372 Chair Cihacek stated the Emerald Ash Borers and Dutch Elm Disease should be  
373 included under Background to support section 1.3 as to why they should support  
374 increasing tree diversity.  
375  
376 Under *Pollinators* (page 4), Chair Cihacek inquired if the pollinator resolution was  
377 included. He stated the text from the resolution would automatically fill out the  
378 Policies section.  
379  
380 Mr. Culver stated it could be included as an attachment.  
381  
382 Member Seigler noted he would like to see what the policies are now and how they  
383 are going to improve.  
384  
385 Page 5 through 8– Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reductions.  
386 Chair Cihacek inquired if the Minnesota Next Generation Energy Act to reduce  
387 greenhouse gas emissions by 80 percent a law or a recommendation.  
388  
389 Mr. Culver responded it is a goal and not a mandate.  
390  
391 Member Wozniak referred to a document that states the goal is to reduce the  
392 emissions by 2040, and the draft states 2050.  
393  
394 Under *Current and Past Initiatives* (page 4), Chair Cihacek inquired if the City has  
395 a Geothermal Master Plan.  
396  
397 Mr. Culver stated when the geothermal system was installed by the skating center,  
398 the intent was to hook up other facilities to it. The fire station is connected to it and  
399 the plan suggested connecting the maintenance facility. This would require a

400 significant overhaul of the HVAC system, and they need to determine if it is worth  
401 it.

402  
403 Member Seigler inquired if they should include a policy in support of replacing the  
404 aging house stock with new built construction since they use substantially less  
405 energy.

406  
407 Chair Cihacek noted an older home with good windows, doors and insulation uses  
408 less energy.

409  
410 Mr. Culver stated there are programs for other types of improvements to homes and  
411 other cities provide rebates for energy efficient upgrades to homes. They can  
412 recommend these types of things be offered as an incentive.

413  
414 Member Wozniak suggested they also consider the non-residential sector, which  
415 uses two and a half times as more energy.

416  
417 Chair Cihacek commented it is not relevant to greenhouse gas emissions and can  
418 be addressed in another area.

419  
420 Member Wozniak referred to page 8, second bullet, and noted it suggests an 80  
421 percent reduction from 2005 levels by 2050 and references a statute.

422  
423 Mr. Culver noted they will confirm the baseline of either 2005 or 2018.

424  
425 Chair Cihacek suggested they include “develop a metric that will be used to track  
426 progress.”

427  
428 Member Seigler stated they should have the City develop a method to track its own  
429 progress.

430  
431 Chair Cihacek noted this is addressed under the first bullet on page 8. He also  
432 inquired how people know what Steps 3, 4, and 5 are in the Minnesota’s GreenStep  
433 Cities program.

434  
435 Mr. Culver suggested they cite the website and include a hyperlink.

436  
437 Pages 8 and 9 – Resilience.  
438 Under *Goal* (Page 9), Chair Cihacek stated they need to define vulnerable  
439 populations.

440  
441 Under *Policies* (Page 9), Member Seigler inquired what an Adaption  
442 Implementation Plan was.

443  
444 Mr. Culver explained there is a separate Populations Vulnerability Assessment and  
445 Climate Adaptation Framework draft document that identifies what the vulnerable

446 populations in Roseville are. This policy suggests using that document to develop  
447 an Adaptation Implementation Plan to provide recommendations on what is  
448 important. This process should occur outside of the Comprehensive Plan process  
449 and should be done within the next 10 years.

450  
451 Member Seigler stated they should define what the climate change risk is.

452  
453 Mr. Culver explained the whole point of the Resiliency Chapter is not to determine  
454 how they are going to avoid things, but rather how they are going to respond to the  
455 things they know are going to happen because the climate is changing. They can  
456 outline how they are going to take care of their vulnerable populations and what  
457 they are going to do to be more resilient.

458  
459 Member Wozniak pointed out in the first couple paragraphs on page 9, it talks about  
460 some of the risks. This include temperatures, allergies, flooding, insect vectors, air  
461 quality, etc.

462  
463 Member Seigler suggested they change the wording to climate risks instead of  
464 climate conditions.

465  
466 Under *Policies* (page 9), Chair Cihacek suggested it be changed to, “This policy  
467 will refine and apply the strategies outlined in the Population Vulnerability  
468 Assessment and Climate Adaption Framework. The City will complete the  
469 Adaptation Implementation Plan during the next Comprehensive Plan cycle  
470 (ending in 2030).”

471  
472 Pages 9 through 13 – Renewable Energy.

473 Under *Background* (page 10), Member Wozniak inquired what the City’s share of  
474 electric use is. One of the comments was to make efforts to have the City as a  
475 leader in resiliency.

476  
477 Mr. Culver noted the language on pages 10 and 11 is more of a narrative on what  
478 they have to include. If the City is going to be leader and encourage resiliency,  
479 under *Policies*, they need to determine how they are going to push themselves and  
480 what goals are they going to set for renewable energy. He suggested they consider  
481 the goals included in the document to make sure they are attainable.

482  
483 Under *Policies* (page 13), Chair Cihacek stated item 1.1 conflicts with the idea of  
484 a tree canopy. Under item 1.2, they should define what renewable resources are and  
485 how feasible is it that 100 percent of the electricity used for City operations come  
486 from them by 2030.

487  
488 Mr. Culver stated renewable resources include wind, solar, and geothermal energy.  
489 The biggest challenge with that goal is the amount of energy that is consumed at  
490 Roseville Skating Center and meeting the minimum of 30 percent can be very  
491 difficult. It would take a lot of effort and would be a long payback.

492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537

Member Wozniak inquired if having the ice center puts them in a different universe than most other municipalities for electric use and the number may not be feasible.

Mr. Culver noted it takes more energy to run the Skating Center than a typical ice arena, and they could include language that excludes it. They need to look at it closer and come up with a more reasonable number.

Chair Cihacek suggested the consolidate items 1.2 and 1.3. He also stated he does not understand item 1.4 unless the City is going to own the community's solar garden. He suggested it either be refined or taken out.

Mr. Culver suggested it be changed to, "Promote community solar participation within the city through outreach and education."

Chair Cihacek stated it is up to the power company to provide information on solar power to the residents.

Member Wozniak disagreed with Chair Cihacek and stated the idea of solar power could include something that is privately owned that a resident may want to support but may not have access to the information.

Chair Cihacek stated they should not promote resident buying into community solar garden, but rather have a general conversation about solar power and how it works. He suggested the language be changed to, "Educate and promote solar power."

Member Heimerl agreed with Chair Cihacek and stated they should not be telling people to put their money in certain private entities. Right now, community solar gardens may be good, but may not be in five years.

Mr. Culver stated they will be more vague with item 1.4 in promoting solar through outreach and education.

Chair Cihacek noted none of the other policies in this section address any other types renewable energy besides solar. He suggested they include a bullet point on an incentive for housing stock renewal.

Member Wozniak stated they could include building permitting approval. He inquired if there was something City staff would do to assist a resident if they were to come in with a proposal to add solar.

Mr. Culver commented the Metropolitan Council required them to specifically talk about solar. He noted under item 1.5, the SolSmart Bronze Level addresses providing resources and simplifying permitting processes for residents and businesses to install solar on their homes and buildings.

538 Chair Cihacek suggested they include a link or reference.  
539  
540 Member Seigler inquired if they should add something about holding energy in the  
541 house.  
542  
543 Mr. Culver stated they do not want to be that specific. They will keep item 1.4 more  
544 vague with renewable energies and emerging technologies.  
545  
546 Chair Cihacek commented this document is covering strategies and it will be  
547 addressed somewhere else.  
548  
549 Member Wozniak noted they can reference emerging technologies as a blanket  
550 statement, similar to transportation.  
551  
552 Page 14 – Environmental Education and Outreach.  
553 Under *Policies*, Chair Cihacek inquired why they included local school districts as  
554 a local unit of government and not the watershed district.  
555  
556 Mr. Culver stated the watershed districts could be included under regional  
557 governments agencies.  
558  
559 Chair Cihacek suggested it be changed to “Partner with other governmental  
560 agencies...” rather than name them. He also suggested they add more proactive  
561 strategies rather than simply communicating, such as, “Develop and plan education  
562 events regarding resilience and environmental protection...”  
563  
564 Mr. Culver suggested item 1.1 be changed to “Sponsor and/or host resilience  
565 education and environmental stewardship programs.”  
566  
567 Member Wozniak read some comments that were not included in the draft. Under  
568 building standards, it was suggested, “The City will lead by example to build and  
569 maintain structures that are energy efficient, accessible, have reduced maintenance  
570 costs, and that identify Roseville as a progressive sustainable City.”  
571  
572 Chair Cihacek stated this could be included as a separate bullet point under energy  
573 efficiency.  
574  
575 Mr. Culver noted this was more specific to anything the City builds or remodels in  
576 the future by pushing themselves to provide a higher standard.  
577  
578 Member Wozniak explained the new parks buildings are beautiful, but their design  
579 and orientation is not conducive to solar.  
580  
581 Member Seigler stated they could try to build them in compliance with LEED  
582 certification or Green Step Cities.  
583

584 Chair Cihacek commented they do not want that in the Comprehensive Plan and  
585 they should direct staff to look into it.

586

587 Member Wozniak encouraged Members to read the document attached to the  
588 suggestion for more specific policies and strategies. He went on to read other  
589 suggested changes:

590 • “The City will be a leader in promoting healthy lifestyles and settings for  
591 all residents, employees, and visitors.” He noted there was also a list of  
592 strategies included.

593 • “The financing of City services will be sustainable and not rely on the use  
594 of reserves, fees, and bonding without referendum.” Chair Cihacek noted  
595 they are not the Finance Commission and it does not relate to them.

596

597 Chair Cihacek stated if there are other comments or suggestions that people want  
598 to bring forward, they can make recommendations to the Council or look at passed  
599 resolutions and City policy. This may be more effective than including it in the  
600 Comprehensive Plan.

601

602 Member Wozniak noted a lot of the suggestions and comments are so specific that  
603 it may be something they can get to in terms of strategies. It would be nice to have  
604 a placeholder with the goals and policies where they can hang some of these as  
605 well.

606

607 Chair Cihacek suggested they wait and see what staff comes back with before they  
608 proceed with the comments.

609

## 610 **8. Items for Next Meeting – February 27, 2018**

611 Discussion ensued regarding the February PWETC agenda:

612 ▪ City Ordinance Updates: sump pump, sanitary sewer, grading permits, and right  
613 of way management

614 ▪ Utility Rates: water

615

616 Mr. Culver stated they would like to provide an update on the feasibility study with  
617 solar, given some of the changes with tax laws and the tariff that might be applied  
618 to Chinese solar panels.

619

620 Chair Cihacek inquired why there were working with a developer instead of a  
621 consulting firm.

622

623 Mr. Culver responded there is a cost to working with a consultant and they would  
624 still have to get RFPs from a developer. There are procurement procedures  
625 available to them under guaranteed energy savings guidelines that allow them to  
626 sole source. After the feasibility study is done, they will look at it and decide  
627 whether or not to present it to the Commission.

628

629 Chair Cihacek inquired when they will see the Maintenance Facilities Study. He  
630 suggested it be sent out earlier than the three-day notice period so that Members  
631 can provide written comment.

632  
633 Mr. Culver responded it may be presented in March, but it will depend what else is  
634 going on. He also noted they accepted an award on behalf of the City from the  
635 Capital Regional Watershed District as 2017 Watershed Partner of the Year.

636

637 **9. Adjourn**

638

639

**Motion**

640 **Member Wozniak moved, Member Heimerl seconded, adjournment of the**  
641 **meeting at approximately 8:34 p.m.**

642

643

**Ayes: 4**

644

**Nays: 0**

645

**Motion carried.**