



**Planning Commission – Comprehensive Plan Update Meeting
City Council Chambers, 2660 Civic Center Drive
Minutes – Wednesday, January 24, 2018– 6:30 p.m.**

1. Call to Order

Chair Murphy called to order the regular meeting of the Planning Commission meeting at approximately 6:30 p.m. and reviewed the role and purpose of the Planning Commission.

2. Roll Call

At the request of Chair Murphy, Community Development Director Kari Collins called the Roll.

Members Present: Chair Robert Murphy; Vice Chair James Bull; and Commissioners Chuck Gitzen, Julie Kimble and Peter Sparby

Members Absent: Members James Daire and Sharon Brown

Staff/Consultants Present: Senior Planner Bryan Lloyd, and Community Development Kari Collins; and, Erin Perdu, WSB Consultant; Becky Alexander, LHB Consultant

3. Approval of Agenda

MOTION

Member Bull moved, seconded by Member Gitzen to approve the Agenda as presented.

Ayes: 5

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

4. Review of Minutes

Commissioners had an opportunity to review draft minutes and submit their comments and corrections to staff prior to tonight's meeting for incorporation of those revisions in to the draft minutes.

a. November 29, 2017, Comprehensive Plan Update Meeting

Ms. Collins referred to line 13 and requested Senior Planner Bryan Lloyd's name be spelled correctly.

MOTION

Member Gitzen moved, seconded by Member Bull, to approve the November 29, 2017 minutes as amended.

Ayes: 5

Nays: 0
Motion carried.

5. Communications and Recognitions:

a. From the Public: *Public comment pertaining to general land use issues not on this agenda*

James Mulder, 1021 West Larpenteur, highlighted his education and vocational history, and noted he previously served on the Planning Commission. He expressed concern in four areas: 1) the general Comprehensive Plan Process; 2) the draft of the Roseville Plan; 3) the Comprehensive Plan versus the zoning code; and, 4) specifics with the Lexington/Larpenteur area.

Mr. Mulder reported the Comprehensive Plan is mandated by the Metropolitan Council and some key goals are to prevent urban sprawl, along with diffusing ethnic and economic concentrations. The members of the Metropolitan Council and the Chair are appointed by the Governor. The Chair is independent of the Council and is responsible for hiring all staff. The Metropolitan Council requires that each community have their share of affordable housing and measures income and ethnic diversity in each City. The Metropolitan Council dictates how communities should be planned and maintains final approval of a local plan. A fatal flaw is that it can withhold grant and aid to cities with unapproved plans. Cities hire consultants to write Comprehensive Plans and community meetings are held for citizen input, but the draft plan does not have a lot of room for changes. Everything has been predetermined by the Metropolitan Council using a mathematical matrix that determines the share of affordable housing for each City. He questioned why they even go through the process if it is already predetermined. He referred to the “iron triangle” where the Metropolitan Council staff talks with the consultants who then talk to City staff.

Mr. Mulder commented the Comprehensive Plan draft is poorly written. They began with the result they want and then created the statistics to back it up. Good research begins with a good study first. He stated it seems dishonest that the Comprehensive Plan will be different than the zoning code. In the Lexington/Larpenteur area, the traffic counts are at capacity and if a mixed use is added, it will increase. The density will be an out layer from the neighborhood because there will be no buffer area from the north, which is all single family. He also expressed concern with the schools and their capacity. The new bond issued does not consider additional capacity in the area.

Mr. Mulder requested the Commission consider if this is what the plan should be for the City of Roseville, or if it is being adopted in order to get money from the Metropolitan Council. He recommended a medium density scale and intensity in the Lexington/Larpenteur area.

Member Bull commented if an area is guided as a high density, they do not anticipate that every piece of property will be filled to the maximum. The number will be

higher, but it is hard to say what it will be. Regarding the Comprehensive Plan, they do receive guidance from the Metropolitan Council for numbers to help control allocations to the cities metro wide. The practice of developing the Comprehensive Plan is to help plan the City's policies and procedures to meet future goals. He agrees they do have some strong guidance from the Metropolitan Council, but believes they also have flexibility in listening to the residents and try to meet their priorities as well through the City's policies.

Mr. Mulder stated the Metropolitan Council guidelines are a mandate of what cities must do. Two staff members told him if they do not go to high density in this area, the City will not be able to meet the Metropolitan Council's numbers. Community planning is supposed to be about the community.

Ms. Collins commented for the next 10 years, they are required to plan for a certain number of affordable housing units and have certain densities in order to get the Comprehensive Plan approved. They need to make land available for someone who may want to develop on these sites. It does not mean these areas will be developed anywhere near the stated densities, or at all. They need to guide land appropriately to make sure land is available for housing.

Mr. Mulder stated the plan should reflect what they actually think should happen on those sites. He does not believe anyone will think the Lexington/Larpenteur site is good for high density housing.

Chair Murphy thanked Mr. Mulder for his comments. He also noted that he does not consider a missed edit by a consultant of the City's name to be of concern. They have requested input from the residents of Roseville on several occasions and it is hard to get people involved. They do not submit their plan to other cities for review. It is submitted to the Metropolitan Council and is then distributed to other cities. Roseville will also get to see other cities plans. The City staff is making a good faith effort to work within the system that has been established, and if it is changed, they will continue to do so.

Mr. Mulder agreed the City is making a good faith effort. However, the Metropolitan Council has made it impossible for the City to do local planning and zoning and to create a Comprehensive Plan that focuses on the City of Roseville. In response to Member Sparby, he explained the State law gives the Metropolitan Council the authority to do regional planning. The Metropolitan Council has decided how it is done, and they withhold funds if cities are not compliant.

Member Sparby commented as Commissioners, they are working with the City Council in good faith with the residents and the Metropolitan Council to come up with an agreeable plan. He takes his role as a Commissioner seriously and they have made earnest efforts to receive input from the residents.

Member Kimble stated they are part of a greater metropolitan area and while they system may not be perfect, there are reasons for some oversight by the Metropolitan Council.

Mr. Mulder stated there is a belief that diffusing areas of poverty and ethnic concentration will make communities more successful. However, it has not worked, and it does not make sense to force cities to adhere to these policies.

Member Kimble noted the area of Cedar/Riverside has been successful. It has not been a diffusing of a population, but rather a coming together of a population.

b. From the Commission or Staff: *Information about assorted business not already on this agenda, including a brief update on the 2040 Comprehensive Plan Update process*

Ms. Collins announced on February 12, the City Council will receive a presentation on the Rice/Larpenteur gateway visioning plan, which will also include the Urban Land Institute recommendations.

Member Gitzen inquired if the first meeting in February will be a Comprehensive Plan meeting and when they can expect to see a draft plan.

Senior Planner Lloyd stated they are waiting to see if they will have information available before they make a decision on the February meeting. They are scheduled to review the draft plan at the February 28 meeting, and public review will take place before then when the document is ready.

Member Gitzen noted it may be hard to get through the draft in one meeting and it will be important to have the entire Commission present when they make their comments.

Mr. Lloyd agreed, and stated they hope to have Planning Commissioner's comments and basic corrections prior to the meeting. They can also schedule more review time, if needed.

Erin Perdu, WSB Consultant, stated they are also planning to bring one or two chapters to the meeting on February 7 to lighten the load for the meeting on February 28. The Commission will have already seen and commented on everything presented on February 28.

Chair Murphy requested a paper copy of the draft plan.

6. Project File 0037: 2040 Comprehensive Plan Update

a. Follow up on Items from Previous Meetings

None.

b. Resilience and Environmental Protection Chapter: *Review draft of chapter based on previous Planning Commission feedback.*

Mr. Lloyd reported the Public Works Commission met last night to review this section of the Comprehensive Plan.

Chair Murphy inquired if there was a summary of their comments.

Becky Alexander, LHB, stated she will provide those comments later in the meeting. She introduced the Resilience and Environmental Protection Chapter, and noted it addresses Environmental Protection, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Resilience, Renewable Energy, and Environmental Education and Outreach. The overall approach of this chapter is to set goals, identify specific actions or create an action plan, and leverage existing plans.

Ms. Alexander reported they received feedback from community members and previous Public Works, Environmental and Transportation Commission (PWETC) members. They provided a list of proposed climate, resilience and renewable energy goals, and these were derived from the goals presented by the Alliance for Sustainability. These goals align with the intent of the goals in the draft chapter but used stronger language and had more aggressive targets.

Member Bull disagreed that the goals presented met up with the City's goals. It was one groups opinion, was very aggressive, and was not sensitive to the funding restrictions that communities have. The goals were very extreme compare to what the City wants to try to achieve and it cited studies they could not validate.

Member Kimble inquired if the draft document has been changed to reflect the feedback.

Ms. Alexander stated this feedback came from community input while the draft chapter was being written. A couple of changes were made to the tree section and local solar goals. She confirmed there have been no changes made since the PWETC met last night.

Member Sparby inquired if the Commission had received a copy of the public feedback. It is their job to take that feedback, balance it, and draw conclusions.

Mr. Lloyd stated he is unsure but will look into it. He will send it out to the Commission tomorrow morning.

Ms. Alexander commented as they go through the plan, she will call out where the feedback language was incorporated. The feedback also included a list of specific strategy goals. At the PWETC meeting last night, the following conclusions were made regarding the Resiliency and Environmental Protection Chapter: 1) They did not identify major gaps or issues with big picture goals; 2) They support the idea of

greenhouse gas emissions goal; 3) They support the idea of City leadership (energy efficiency, renewable energy, electric vehicles for City's buildings and fleets); and, 4) They provided detailed comments on many of the policies. They also suggested more robust policies under the Environmental Protection goal and discussed the feasibility of the solar goal (generating 30 percent of City operations electricity on City property).

Member Bull inquired how they will measure the effect on the climate. They are looking at greenhouse gas emissions and renewable energy, but not climate.

Ms. Alexander pointed out in the Resilience section they are looking at climate related risks, and these are reference under Greenhouse Gas Emissions background.

Member Bull stated they need to focus on what they are trying to manage, and they are not trying to manage the climate. They are trying to control the factors that may have an impact on it, such as greenhouse gas emissions, renewable energy, and carbon.

Ms. Alexander suggested Member Bull identify ways it is misrepresented as they proceed through the draft.

Mr. Lloyd agreed that the PWETC focused on specific items and did not take a broader view to see if they were including all the categories.

Chair Murphy inquired when they will see the next draft with the included comments from the public and PWETC.

Ms. Collins noted they will find a time in February for the Commission to see a draft, so they are not seeing the changes for the first time at the final draft stage.

Member Kimble requested the changes be redlined so they know what changes have been made

Ms. Collins suggested they find a word to use other than climate, such as community environmental health. They all want to include goals and objectives that lead to a healthy environment and there is a big difference between climate and weather.

Member Bull commented it would help to have a reference that is backed up when they make certain statements in the draft.

Ms. Alexander agreed it is a good idea to find the areas in the draft that would benefit from a reference.

Member Sparby referred to the third paragraph, second sentence. He stated residents may have a hard time comprehending what they are talking about in that sentence and suggested it be removed.

Mr. Lloyd explained that sentence communicates there are goals and policies geared toward slowing down or reducing the impact of the community on the environment. The chapter also addresses what they are doing in response to more extreme weather patterns.

Member Sparby stated it is understood that the community has an impact on the area, both positive and negative. He does not understand what climate mitigation means.

Mr. Lloyd stated attempting to reduce greenhouse gases is a form of climate mitigation. Having alternative energy sources would mitigate the effect of greenhouse gases.

Member Sparby suggested they be more direct and state they are trying to reduce greenhouse gas emissions instead of talking about climate mitigation.

Mr. Lloyd stated someone might ask why the City is trying to reduce greenhouse gases and why it is included in the Comprehensive Plan.

Member Sparby stated they need to include scientific reasoning to show the correlation between reducing greenhouse gases and what the goal is.

Member Bull stated Roseville's impact on the global greenhouse gas emissions is so minute that they really would not have an impact. It is politically correct to include it, but when they set policies and procedures, they are spending the citizen's money.

Mr. Lloyd commented if they are going to have goals and policies about reducing greenhouse gases, they need to justify the purpose because they are spending money. He acknowledged they may not make an impact globally, but they are doing things with the goals and policies of the plan that are designed to contribute to efforts.

Member Bull suggested they have a symbolic contribution to reaching the goals at the State.

Ms. Alexander suggested the paragraph be changed to "...it includes aspects of both reducing the negative impacts that the community has on the environment in addition to recognizing and preparing for upcoming environmental shifts."

Member Sparby commented he also has an issue with "negative impacts" and they should include the positive impacts residents have on the environment. That line should be removed, and they should focus on improving citywide resilience. They do not need to define objectives on what needs to be solved in the climate. Preparing the City for dealing with the environment is a better way to go.

Ms. Alexander stated they also need to continue to promote environmental stewardship because it is an environmental protection.

The Commission agreed to remove the sentence.

Chair Murphy inquired what the phrase “equitably strengthening” means, as stated in the last sentence of the third paragraph.

Mr. Lloyd explained if they only look at the cost in a financial sense, they could easily miss an opportunity to make sure facilities are located in an equitable way across communities. In an attempt to be good stewards of money, the City has not always been good at treating all parts of the community fairly.

Member Kimble suggested they remove the word equitable and change the wording to “strengthening the local economy for everyone...”

Chair Murphy concluded they will leave the comments for staff to ponder and the word can be left in if it adds something that is needed.

Page 1 – Citywide Goals.

Member Sparby referred to item No. 2 and commented he did not like the use of “negative human impacts.” He suggested it be changed to “Focus on conservation of energy and reducing pollution.”

Ms. Alexander explained these Citywide Goals are from a structure that she does not know the background on.

Ms. Perdu stated the Citywide Goals were copied from the first chapter of the plan. They can be edited but are very general and were agreed upon at the very beginning of the process.

Member Sparby stated residents can get behind conservation of energy and reducing pollution, regardless of what type of energy they have access to. He suggested it also be tied back to chapter one.

Pages 3 through 6 – Goals and Policies.

Member Bull noted the goal references water, land, air and wildlife, but the headings are water, land, trees, and pollinators.

Ms. Alexander stated this goal is copied verbatim from the last Comprehensive Plan and it can be changed to reflect either list for consistency.

Member Bull suggested the goal be changed to “...water, land, trees, and pollinators.”

The Commission agreed.

Under *Land* (page 3), Member Gitzen suggested they include the acronym (MPCA) after Minnesota Pollution Control Agency because it is used further down in the paragraph.

Member Kimble referred to *Goal* (page 3) and inquired if they should keep “air” in the list because of greenhouse gas emissions.

Ms. Alexander responded no, because it is a separate goal in the document.

Member Bull referred to *Current and Past Initiatives* (page 4) and noted in the phrase “Tax increment financing can be...” the word “can” should be changed to “is.” In the next sentence, “Cities can also create...”, the word “can” should also be changed to the proper tense.

Ms. Alexander confirmed she understood the issue.

Chair Murphy inquired if the City has a current TIF policy and if this statement goes along with it.

Ms. Collins explained in 2016 the City adopted a public financing and business subsidy policy that includes TIF financing as a possible tool and identified goals and objectives within that policy.

Under *Trees* (page 4), Member Gitzen referred to the third paragraph, and noted he does not feel like the Planning Commission is overseeing the tree Preservation and Restoration Ordinance as it states.

Mr. Lloyd pointed out the Planning Commission is the body that would make a recommendation about amending, since it is in the zoning code.

Member Kimble suggested they change the word “oversee” to “administer”.

Member Bull suggested they add the City Arborist under *Trees* as well. The Commission agreed.

Member Gitzen referred to the top of page 5, and stated he is not comfortable referencing the Capstone project, when he has not seen it. He inquired if the City Council has approved the Capstone project.

Mr. Lloyd commented this section was written by Environmental Specialist Ryan Johnson, and he has reached out for feedback from the City Arborist but has not heard from her yet.

Member Gitzen suggested the Capstone project be used more as a reference versus using specific data from it.

Ms. Alexander stated they could remove Policy 1.1 and inquired if Policy 1.4 was acceptable.

Member Gitzen responded Policy 1.4 is acceptable because it is only referencing the Capstone project.

Member Sparby agreed and inquired if they are giving preferential treatment to the University of Minnesota by having them listed in the document.

Mr. Lloyd commented they can provide a link to the sourced material throughout the document. The Capstone project information is available for review and was later in coming than he had expected.

Chair Murphy and Member Gitzen commented they were comfortable keeping in the University of Minnesota, after they have reviewed the Capstone project document. Member Sparby agreed.

Member Kimble inquired if any governing body or leadership had reviewed the Capstone project document.

Mr. Lloyd stated he does not know if there has been any formal acceptance of the study. During the project this past fall, several members of City staff including the City arborist, were present in early discussions with the Capstone project teams. They have had input and there has been some approval of it.

Member Kimble stated as a Planning Commission Member, she does not feel she has to read every line of the Capstone project document. In some cases, she needs to rely on other people in the City. It would be good enough if someone else had adopted or approved it.

Chair Murphy commented the Planning Commission has not seen the document, nor has it been approved by any department.

Community Development Director Collins stated she is unsure if the document will receive any sort of approval. There were nine different projects, each one had a staff liaison, and halfway through the project, there was a check in with staff to make sure they were going in the right direction. There was a lot of communication throughout the project and the recommendations did not come as a surprise to City staff.

Member Gitzen inquired if it would weaken what they were trying to say by removing it from the draft document.

Chair Murphy suggested item 1.1 be changed to “Finalize park land and streets. Refer to recommendations from the Capstone Project.”

Member Bull stated the goal is to implement a plan and manage it, and they can refer to the Capstone project.

Member Kimble stated she thought they wanted more substantiations. She inquired why they would not include the Capstone project if that is what provided the information to develop the recommendations.

Member Bull responded they do not know what the document says.

Member Sparby stated they can include credit later if they end up utilizing the recommendations after they have been fully vetted.

Chair Murphy noted item 1.1 should be changed to “Finalize and implement a management plan on park land and streets.”

Ms. Alexander summarized she will word items 1.4 and 1.5 similarly but keep the reference to the Capstone project under *Current and Past Initiatives*.

Chair Murphy referred to item 1.2 and requested a definition of a tree canopy survey and what it would look like.

Mr. Lloyd commented the survey quantifies tree coverage in areas of the City, in addition to species and size of the tree. He is unsure what a tree canopy survey would look like.

Ms. Alexander stated the language comes from the written feedback from community members. She suggested they get a full definition of what it would entail before they include it in the draft document. In the bulleted list above the policies, one of the recommendations provides a cost-effective way to provide a survey by using volunteers.

Member Bull inquired if they should also include the removal of invasive species. The City is undertaking an aggressive program in trying to do that. He agreed it should be included under *Current and Past Initiatives* as well as in the *Policies*. The Commission agreed.

Mr. Lloyd mentioned there may be some discussion regarding invasive species in the Parks Master Plan.

Under *Pollinators* (page 5), Member Bull suggested the paragraph state “Examples of pollinators are...” instead of “Examples of animals that are pollinators...” The Commission agreed. He also suggested they add the word species so it will state “...over 350 Minnesota bee species...”

Under the same section, Member Gitzen suggested they reference how they came up the information.

Under *Policies* (page 6), Member Sparby stated he does not know what it means to “Develop stronger policies...” He suggested it be changed to “Continue to develop policies and practices to better protect pollinators.”

Ms. Alexander stated this area was also highlighted by the PWETC. They recommended looking at the cited resolution and including specific language from it if possible.

Member Bull referred to page 6, second paragraph, and suggested it be changed to “...seeds, fruits, and nuts that will later be consumed.” He also noted that 30 percent of the world's food of fruits and vegetables by volume are attributed to pollinators.

Member Gitzen noted that statistic will need to be referenced.

Pages 6 through 9 – Greenhouse Gas Emission Reduction.

Member Gitzen suggested they include the acronym GHG for greenhouse gas since it is referenced that way later in the document. Under *Goals* (page 6) he inquired what “through leadership in city operations” meant.

Ms. Alexander explained it refers the operations of City facilities or vehicles. She suggested it be changed to “...through leading by example in city operations...” The Commission agreed.

Member Sparby inquired if they would still need to support the Minnesota Next Generation Energy Act if it was repealed in the future and this information was in the Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Alexander stated the State law does not require cities to do anything to support this.

Member Sparby suggested it be changed to “Endeavor to support Minnesota’s Next Generation Energy Act...” Since participation is voluntary, he does not want it to put constraints on the City if they are unable to support it in the future.

Member Bull commented he thinks it is fine as stated because they are supporting Minnesota’s goal, but not committing Roseville to do any percentage. The Commission agreed to leave it as stated.

Chair Murphy noted the emissions in Roseville do include cars traveling through the City on Highway 36 and Interstate 35W.

Ms. Alexander commented the PWETC wanted more information on the Next Generation Energy Act. Under *Goal* (page 6) she will include the baseline year indicated in it. It will be changed to “...goal of 80 percent reduction in community-wide greenhouse gas emissions from 2005 levels by 2050...”

Chair Murphy inquired if there would be goals before 2050 that would be more particular for this plan.

Ms. Alexander reported there are intermediate goals of a 30 percent reduction by 2025. She stated this goal could be added under *Background* (page 7), and she also plans to quote the Minnesota statute as well. The Commission agreed.

Under *Background* (page 7), Member Gitzen stated the last sentence of the first paragraph would be better as two sentences.

Ms. Alexander stated they can also use an example different than the landfill one that is used.

Member Bull commented he did not think nuclear power was considered a fossil fuel.

Ms. Alexander stated nuclear power is a carbon neutral fuel and it would be an acceptable energy resource.

Under *Current and Past Initiatives* (page 8), Member Gitzen inquired what B3 Benchmarking was and if others would know.

Ms. Alexander suggested they add detail that states it is a Minnesota-based program that enables public buildings to track their energy and water use. The Commission also agreed to use “Greenhouse Gas Action Plan” in place of “Climate Action Plan.”

Member Gitzen referred to page 9 and suggested the third bullet be rewritten because it was wordy.

Member Sparby referred to page 9 under the second bullet, and noted it ties the City’s emission reduction to goals of the Next Generation Energy Act. He reads that support of the goal means that the reduction standards have to align with it.

Ms. Alexander stated by using the word “support,” it communicates that it helps contribute to it. It is not a commitment.

Other members of the Commission indicated they were agreeable with the wording as stated.

Pages 9 and 10 – Resilience.

Under *Background*, (page 9), Member Gitzen noted the first sentence should be referenced. He also referred to the end of the second paragraph where it states, “In the last ten years...” and suggested they should define the time frame it is referring to.

Member Bull stated he would also like to see that statistic be meaningful to Roseville, and not just Minnesota and the Midwest.

Under *Goals* (page 9), Member Kimble inquired why vulnerable populations are called out and not all City residents.

Mr. Lloyd commented the City is prioritizing new infrastructure to accommodate more extreme weather patterns. There may be equity reasons to prioritize a certain area over another place that may be less expensive to address.

Ms. Alexander explained the vulnerability aspect is important in this section.

Member Kimble suggested they add more to the sentence to make it understood more clearly.

Chair Murphy stated they should define what the vulnerability is.

Ms. Alexander noted it is further addressed in the *Background* section on pages 9 and 10. It refers to “climate conditions that affect the quality of life and life safety of communities – particularly those populations especially sensitive to climate impacts...Climate impacts also exacerbate economic challenges that can directly impact the ability of at-risk populations...” She noted the PWETC also indicated vulnerable populations needs to further be defined.

Member Bull pointed out these examples are weather impacts, not climate impacts.

Mr. Lloyd stated they are weather events but are related to the climate change they are experiencing.

Ms. Alexander pointed out the relationship between weather and climate is described in the last paragraph on page 9.

Member Sparby commented vulnerable populations include City residents. They should not call out certain groups because it leaves it open to interpretation.

Member Kimble stated she thought there were more components to Resilience than just climate.

Ms. Collins commented there is a section in the local planning handbook for the Metropolitan Council where it talks about guidelines that address environment and community health in terms of environmental and social considerations. These include access to groceries, transportation, and others. These are covered in the policies identified in other areas of the Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Alexander referred to page 1, third paragraph, and pointed out other chapters reference social and economic resilience, but this chapter addresses environmental resilience.

Member Gitzen commented they do talk about vulnerable populations so there is a tie in to the language included under *Goal* (page 9).

Member Sparby suggested they exclude ambiguous language. Vulnerable population can mean a lot of different things and it can be construed as giving certain groups preferential treatment. He sees this group included in City residents, and all residents need to be taken seriously.

Mr. Lloyd explained the vulnerable population does change depending on the conditions. In hot weather, the elderly are particularly vulnerable.

Member Gitzen stated they could end the sentence under *Goals* after “residents” because the vulnerable population is brought in under *Policies*.

Member Bull stated there are different policies that the City could approve to address weather-related claims.

Mr. Lloyd stated a critical reader may read about the Population Vulnerability Assessment and wonder why it is there. There are no goals related to vulnerable populations.

Ms. Alexander commented they talked about equity, and if they want to include that, the sentence should be kept as written, using the phrase “especially for vulnerable populations.” They could change the words “vulnerable population” to “especially for those that would be disproportionately impacted by these risks.”

Member Bull inquired if the *Policies* under this section only refer to vulnerable populations, or the entire population.

Ms. Alexander stated it is referring to the entire population. She noted this section was also pointed out by the PWETC as an area that was overly wordy and confusing, and she will consider revising it.

Member Kimble commented equity is a huge issue in many communities right now but may be a new issue for people reading this document. She suggested they include a definition of equity in the draft, so people understand what it means.

Mr. Lloyd suggested the definition be included in one of the introductory chapters.

Member Gitzen commented he likes the idea of including a definition.

Ms. Collins agreed they should identify it early on in the document because they are trying to look at each chapter with an equity lens. She also suggested including the graphic of kids looking over a fence to provide a visual of what they mean by equity when delivering municipal services.

The Commission discussed having the sentence under *Goals* (page 9) state, “Take action to equitably reduce climate-related risks to City residents.” The definition would then be included early on in the draft.

Member Sparby stated he would prefer to keep equitably out in order to have a clear and concise statement of what the goal is.

Chair Murphy stated they will not include it until they have other text to review. He then referred to *Background* (page 9), and suggested they include documentation of Roseville's tornados that took place in the '80s, and then they can expand to Minnesota and the Midwest.

Member Bull stated tornadoes occur every year and they could include data that shows how they have increased commensurate to the climate change.

Member Gitzen referred to *Policies* (page 10) and suggested it be changed to, "Using the Population Vulnerability Assessment and Climate Adaptation Framework, develop an Adaptation Implementation Plan." He also pointed out under *Current and Past Initiatives* (page 10), that is refers to a draft document.

Ms. Alexander stated the draft document should be finalized with a different date.

Chair Murphy inquired if there will be a list of references at the end of each chapter.

Mr. Lloyd noted it would be a more stable resource than a hyperlink.

Member Bull referred to the first full paragraph on page 10 and stated he does not like any of it. It has a negative tone and affecting the quality of life could be positive or negative. Extending the pollen allergy season is also extending the season where people can be outside and enjoying the parks and trail systems. He inquired if the "life safety of communities" was part of the vulnerability study that will identify people who are sensitive to climate impact.

Ms. Alexander responded life safety is related to air quality that can impact health, vector-borne diseases, and heat exhaustion.

Member Bull stated having the weather patterns change is not all negative. There could be less snow or warmer temperatures, and not everyone hates that.

Ms. Alexander stated the idea is that they do not need to be preparing for the things they will benefit from. Rather, they need to be preparing for things that will present risks.

Member Sparby stated they have risks all over the place and he also picked up a lot of negativity rather than proactive concern and awareness. He recommended they strike the entire paragraph.

Member Bull noted he likes the next paragraph regarding strengthening community resilience. Any kind of climate induced impacts will have trade-offs, and it is hard to

set goals related to it. It also does not address the issue of being resilient with energy conservation or greenhouse gas.

Chair Murphy stated if they agree with the *Goal* and *Policies*, they can edit the *Background* and delete the paragraph in question.

Member Bull referred to *Policies* (page 10) and inquired what an Adaptation Implementation Plan was.

Member Sparby suggested they could call it a Resiliency Plan. The Commission agreed.

Ms. Alexander explained generally, resilience is used more for bouncing back from short-term shocks and adaptation refers to adjusting to long-term stressors. She agreed it would be appropriate to call it the Resiliency Plan.

Member Kimble inquired if the adaptation strategies in the Population Vulnerability Assessment and Climate Adaptation Framework have been approved by someone.

Member Gitzen noted he previously suggested that sentence be reworded. They will use the assessment and framework to develop the plan.

Ms. Alexander confirmed the Population Vulnerability Assessment and Climate Change Adaptation Framework was one document and agreed it should be in italics, since it is a title.

Chair Murphy summarized the changes discussed for this section. The Commission agreed to remove the first full paragraph on page 10.

Pages 10 through 14 – Renewable Energy.

Under *Background* (page 10) Member Bull suggested they use “fossil fuels” instead of “conventional fuels” to keep it consistent throughout the document.

Under *Background* (page 11), Member Gitzen suggested the paragraph just above the table end with “...and 0.6% of natural gas.”

Member Gitzen referred to the Roseville Solar Potential Map and suggested the background of the aerial overlay be removed, and just use the street map with the coloring. They should also include a legend to describe what the map is showing.

Chair Murphy referred to the Solar Energy Resource section and inquired if the Metropolitan Council estimate is representing if a person’s roof was taken today and solar replaced it, and if it includes updates to roofs that would need to take place to handle the solar.

Ms. Alexander stated the estimate is looking at the economically feasible rooftop area within the City boundaries.

Member Gitzen commented he thinks it is based on sunlight available for a certain period of time and it has nothing to do with what the roof is made out of.

Chair Murphy suggested they include caveats with the number to further explain it because not every roof can handle solar upgrades.

Member Bull noted Tesla has solar shingles they began using this year to replace asphalt shingles.

Ms. Alexander suggested they include the generation potential of the 10 largest solar access rooftops to provide more detail. If all the rooftops are equal to 61 percent of Roseville's electricity consumption, the top 10 is six percent of the total electricity. This would show they would not need hundreds of small roof solar installations to achieve their goal.

Chair Murphy inquired what the top 10 rooftops in Roseville were. He agreed the list does not belong in the draft but has a personal interest in knowing.

Ms. Alexander confirmed she could provide the list to the Commission. She noted Rosedale was two of the top 10 buildings. She also explained the Wind Energy Resource section is written in a way that discourages it and inquired if there was potential to have wind turbines above 30 meters.

Mr. Lloyd stated airports are one area the Metropolitan Council must pay attention to, but he does not believe there are any practical limitations. Generally, Roseville does not have a good wind resource. They could indicate the Roseville is willing to have a wind energy resource if the community is willing to accept the height of the facilities.

Member Kimble stated it seemed factual to communicate it that way. They would need to also include a statement that it would require residents to accept what goes along with it.

Member Gitzen noted they should consider how many turbines they would need to make it worthwhile.

Chair Murphy inquired if they should also consider how to store the wind energy. There may be wind energy available, but it may not be feasible for the City.

Member Kimble inquired if they can just say it is available, but it would require large turbines. It is included as a section and they have made some assumptions about it. They could just add the facts about it and what it would require.

Ms. Alexander stated the *Goal* (page 10) statement specifically addresses protecting access to sunlight and supports the development of local renewable energy installations, which would include wind. In the *Policies* (page 14), there is a specific statement related to solar and a more general one related to renewable energy. She suggests including all the resources Roseville has available, but not calling wind out as a strategy, and leaving renewable energy language in the draft.

Member Sparby stated the community is better suited for solar because of its more urban posture. They can keep the wind component in there as a renewable energy source, but it seems more realistic to promote solar energy.

Member Gitzen stated they would just need to include the obstacles to wind energy in a separate paragraph, but it would not be a policy. It would let the public know they did consider it.

Member Bull stated he does not know if there are any properties in the City that would conform to having a wind turbine installed. He also noted they may need to include an environmental impact for bird kill.

Member Gitzen referred to *Policies* (page 14), item 1.3, and inquired if the goal by 2030 is spelled out in solar energy.

Ms. Alexander responded the 2030 goal is in alignment with the State solar energy goal. Under item 1.2, she added "...with a minimum 30 percent on-site generation at City properties" in response to community feedback. The PWETC asked what that would look like with having the ice arena as a big energy user. After consideration, 30 percent is a feasible, but aggressive number.

Chair Murphy stated he agrees with the 10 percent solar electricity by 2030. He inquired why they are stating a 2030 goal in the 2040 plan.

Ms. Alexander explained it is related to the State's goal, which is 10 percent by 2030. She suggested they reword it to clarify it is Minnesota's goal and timeline.

Chair Murphy suggested a reference be included with item 1.5 and SolSmart Bronze Level.

Mr. Lloyd noted the Bronze level was proposed by the Public Works Director and they may already be most of the way there.

Member Bull stated he would like to see something that is either requiring or supporting dual fuel for reconstruction or new construction under the *Policies* (page 14). This will help the migration from fossil fuel to renewable energy sources.

Ms. Alexander questioned whether it should be included at the policy level and suggested it be on the list for the greenhouse gas action plan for further evaluation. The Commission agreed.

Page 14 and 15 - Environmental Education and Outreach.

Under *Policies* (page 15), Member Gitzen inquired if they should include County as a government agency under item 1.1.

Ms. Alexander commented at the PWETC meeting, it was suggested they “partner with other government entities to sponsor or host resilience education and environmental stewardship programs.” They called out watershed and conservations districts as more helpful than school districts. The Commission agreed with the suggestion.

Under item 1.2, Member Kimble suggested they change “communication avenues” to “communication channels.”

Under item 1.1, Member Bull suggested “Blue Thumb” have a reference tied to it.

In reference to the charts provided, Ms. Alexander reported everything on the charts is specific to Roseville except for the waste data, which is County-wide and pro-rated.

Chair Murphy noted a population graph covering the same time-period would also be helpful. The water usage shrunk, but it is unclear what the population numbers were during that time. He stated he would rather see the total water use than the water use per capita each year.

c. Implementation Chapter: *Review draft of Implementation Chapter*

Ms. Perdu suggested they she introduce the chapter and bring it back for a more thorough discussion at a later date.

Member Sparby suggested they consider this item and item 6(d) at the February 7 meeting.

Member Gitzen provided a general comment on this chapter. He noted under “who”, they need to define that the ultimate responsibility is with the City Council. They should list the four departments: Roseville Economic Development Authority, Community Development Department, Parks and Recreation, and Public Works. They can then identify the Commission associated with each department. They only need to list the department with the understanding they are also talking about the Commission.

Ms. Perdu stated more of the “when” column and Resilience Chapter will be filled in by the next meeting and an updated document will be sent out before the meeting.

Member Bull inquired if the “when” column identifiers of short term, long term, and ongoing was sufficient.

Member Kimble stated there was also a medium term, and suggested they use hyphens in these words. She pointed out there is a key on page 2 to identify what each one means.

Member Gitzen suggested long terms be “over 10” instead of “10-20 year completion.”

Ms. Perdu explained Ongoing refers to things the City is doing now and anticipates continuing in the future. She requested Commissioners provide any additional feedback for consideration before the next meeting.

Due to the time, Commission agreed to defer items 6(c) and 6(d) to the meeting on February 7, 2018 for further discussion. The Commission agreed.

d. Future Land Use Change Open House Feedback Report

This item will be discussed at the February 7 Planning Commission meeting.

7. Adjourn

MOTION

Member Sparby moved, seconded by Member Kimble adjournment of the meeting at approximately 9:50 p.m.

Ayes: 5

Nays: 0

Motion carried.