

Roseville Public Works, Environment and Transportation Commission Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, July 24, 2018, at 6:30 p.m.
City Council Chambers, 2660 Civic Center Drive
Roseville, Minnesota 55113

1. Introduction / Roll Call

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

Present: Chair Brian Cihacek; Vice Chair Joe Wozniak; and Members Michael Joyce, Martin Kors, Michael Kruse, Nancy Misra and Thomas Trainor.

Absent: None.

Staff Present: Public Works Director Marc Culver; City Engineer/Assistant Public Works Director Jesse Freihammer; and Civil Engineer Luke Sandstrom

2. Public Comments

There was no public comment.

3. Approval of June 26, 2018 Meeting Minutes

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

Motion

Member Wozniak moved, Member Trainor seconded, approval of the June 26, 2018 meeting minutes as presented.

Ayes: 7

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

4. Communication Items

City Engineer Jesse Freihammer provided a brief review and update on projects and maintenance activities listed in the staff report dated July 24, 2018.

Member Trainor asked how the 35W closure on the four weekends will affect local traffic. Mr. Freihammer stated if going into Minneapolis it may be difficult but local traffic should not be directly affected.

Public Works Director Marc Culver noted there was something missing from the Communications Items. He stated he called out an article from the *StarTribune* regarding recycling, published Monday July 23rd but did not attach the actual article to the packet. He indicated he would send the article out to the group Wednesday morning and it will be added to the packet for future agenda purposes.

Mr. Culver stated it is not a surprise to them as they have been hearing the story from Eureka during the annual report over the last few years, but this is just starting to hit the market as far as pricing for the recyclable materials.

Member Joyce asked if the market collapses is there a clause in their segment contract. Mr. Culver stated if the market collapses Eureka will not be able to continue operations as currently laid out even with the contract. He noted it will not just be Eureka, this is a regional issue. He stated he did not know what is going to happen in terms of recycling in general if this continues. He stated staff will keep an eye on it and keep the Board posted if anything changes.

Mr. Culver stated an item that has been added to their list of activities this week is the funeral procession for the slain prison guard. Staff is working closely with the Police Department on providing traffic control and barricades. The route will go down Snelling Avenue from Hwy 36 to Larpenteur and then to Roselawn Cemetery.

Member Michael Joyce asked regarding recycling what is the difference between dirty and clean and what determines that. Mr. Culver stated it was a matter of the amount of residual materials that is within the recyclable materials. Plastics have a lot of co-mingling and are not being sorted properly.

Member Joe Wozniak stated the sorting equipment has its limits and people put in materials that they think can be recycled because it is plastic. It can exceed the capacity of the sorting equipment or sorters to effectively remove it and can cause contamination and China has become fed up with the amount of contamination.

5. Pathway Master Plan Update

City Engineer/Assistant Public Works Director Freihammer provided an update on the Pathway Master Plan, noting it had been presented to the City Council on July 9, 2018, and overall, was well received. The City Council discussed and made comments on two areas in the scoring criteria. The first area was a suggestion for increased scoring around schools. However, staff looked into changing the rating but found there were minimal pathway segments remaining near schools and changing the ranking would have minimal impact to those scores.

Mr. Freihammer explained the second area the City Council discussed was to ask the PWETC to look at how the scoring system considers existing pathway on one side of a road. They discussed whether segments should get a bonus for not having any pathway currently or possibly deducting points if there was a pathway on one side of the road. Mr. Freihammer noted since the scoring system is a project preference list, staff felt the best way to deal with pathway scoring was to leave the scoring as is but highlight the segments that were high volume arterial roadways with no off-street pathways currently constructed.

Mr. Freihammer showed the Commission the project preference list. He indicated the list is not in order of which project will be done first. Chair Cihacek asked if the Council considered the routes based on traffic volume. Mr. Freihammer stated staff did this list on the trail roadways and did not look at the smaller volume roads. He noted they decided they were only going to look at the dual sided approach on an arterial roadway.

Public Works Director Marc Culver stated if the Commission looks at the functional classification system he did not think they had any collectors that are over 4,000. They have some collectors that are between 3,000 and 4,000. He stated Mr. Freihammer stated the list was based on 4,000 ADT which would mainly be at an arterial level. He noted this does include all the County roadways within the City.

Member Trainor asked if Victoria was considered an arterial roadway. Mr. Culver stated it is north of County Road B. From County Road B to County Road D it is considered an arterial and is a County facility in that area. South of County Road B, it is a City roadway and a major collector. The volumes drop percipiently between the two. It is under 4,000 south of County Road B and over 4,000 north of County Road B.

Member Wozniak indicated he sent an email with corrections to the Master Plan and noticed they were not made. Mr. Culver apologized and indicated they would get them changed for the next presentation to the Council. He stated he did receive the email and thought they addressed a couple of the concerns.

Member Wozniak stated he reviewed the plan in length and his review could have went beyond some of the topics the City Council brought up at the Joint meeting. It occurred to him that this seems weighted toward transit and less so to City Amenities like parks. You get up to five points if near Snelling Avenue and that is the only category of any of the category codes up to five points. There are other categories where they could get to five or higher by adding components that are part of the scoring system but that is a solid five point and kind of skews some of the scoring toward transportation network.

Chair Cihacek asked if that is because of how transportation is extended out. Mr. Culver stated between their last conversation with this, in the Council meeting on

July 9th they did add a component to the constellation connections which did enhance some of the scoring for those park connections to level the playing field a little bit between the transit and the park. The Parks have their own Master Plan which does include some additional trail connections within parks for a more recreational perspective whereas this document is really focusing in on it from a transportation network and serving that multi-purpose.

Member Wozniak indicated he understood that, but he also knew part of the Pathway Masterplan focuses on parks and it seems it down plays them a little bit. The only scoring they have for parks is item six, connecting high density residential to transit parks. Mr. Freihammer stated item one also indicates it connects multiple destinations so if it is a park or an open space it is an additional point.

Member Wozniak stated with respect to item six, it is only high density and does not include single family and only goes to two. It stated it is only two points for every hundred units. It seems to him that is downplays residential connections to parks which he thought was important. It is one thing to have the Parks Master Plan to address trails within a park, but he thought they want to get people to the parks and in some cases, they need trails to do that.

Chair Cihacek asked if Member Wozniak had any comments on the two items that were presented. Member Wozniak replied he was leaning towards a point for more school connections than what they have now. He thought there was a movement underway to try to get school children to take a more active role in getting to school. Less bussing, more biking and walking.

Member Kruse thought it was good that the policy allows for flexibility and looks for opportunities. He thought it was a good thing to have that flexibility.

Chair Cihacek thought no additional points are needed for schools or for the other criteria, so when those come up they have the opportunity to get more financing for school pathways and other pathways which means they have an opportunity to connect them. He also thought it was fine to make a policy change to state it is their priority to put at least one side as a pathway. He did not think they need to make a change towards that. In the future when they bring this back up, five or seven years, there might be something more to evaluate based on the information at that time. The same is true for looking at this from a different perspective in parks or other sort of elements based upon what occurs between now and then because they are adding more parks and what the environment and geography will look like as a City in five years. Some adjustments will need to be made to account for that.

Member Misra asked for clarification on what is planned for the green highlighted segments. Mr. Freihammer replied those were highlighted to show which arterial routes do not currently have a sidewalk on either side. Offhand, nothing right now is planned but based on their proposal they would highlight that. If the Commission

or Council thought they should add a point to those criteria or change the scoring criteria, those would be the ones impacted. Mr. Culver stated to expand on that, of the top four the second item has 23 points and item nine and sixteen each have 22 points.

Member Misra asked which section of Lexington is being discussed. Mr. Culver indicated from County C to County Road D they have a trail on the west side but on the east side through that stretch there is not a trail. Items nine and sixteen do not have a trail or pathway on either side. If they want to apply for some Federal funds or some other grant opportunity, they should focus on a green segment versus a non-highlighted section. He looked at it as a tie-break or allowing them some additional information as they are looking at that list.

Member Misra stated that is a part of Lexington that she brought up before between County Road C and County Road D where Woodhill crosses and north is a T intersection but there is nothing until County Road D. Mr. Culver noted there is a flasher system at Dairy Queen between Josephine Park and the Dairy Queen otherwise there is only the signal at Woodhill and County Road D. She thought it was interesting that the scoring system ends up prioritizing that as much as it does given that there is nothing there whereas the other side has the park and the lake and the residential areas which she thought was probably a fluke in the scoring system. She did not know why that would take any sense of priority over some that are scored quite a bit lower. Mr. Culver stated that is why it is a preference list rather versus a set priority list because they are going to get some ambiguity and some discretion among those sections. They wanted to make sure it was on the list because as one of their policies, Lexington has well over 4,000 cars per day on it and can be a very busy road, there being a 40 mph stretch through the area being discussed, and there is not a controlled crossing between County Road C and County Road D so from a policy perspective staff still thinks there should be a pathway on both sides and as opportunities arise they will complete that gap but it should not take priority over some of the other areas that don't have anything on either side.

Member Misra asked if it was possible that by putting a sidewalk there they are encouraging people to cross there. She thought the current crosswalks were appropriate given where the housing is located. Mr. Culver stated there are people who are walking along County Road C2 on the east side of Lexington that cannot cross safely, or a controlled manner. Given that type of roadway and the functional classification, there should be a separated pathway on both sides of the roadway ultimately.

Member Joyce asked if there was room with the wetland. Mr. Culver stated there is room on the east side. Mr. Freihammer stated it is tight in a few spots but there is room. He stated they do not look at the feasibility or the cost to construct at this point. The scoring does not rank cost at all.

Chair Cihacek stated this is a preference list and the City Council can allocate funds to whatever project they like. This gives some sort of objective process to decide if a recommendation were asked. These projects will likely change as more information comes in and data changes, businesses develop, as houses get built the geography will change as this goes on and that is why he is not concerned about it because he realizes that in five to ten years this will change. This is a starting position for them and good information to have.

Member Kors wondered if pedestrian bridges were included in this. Mr. Culver stated there has been discussion about pedestrian bridges across Highway 36, around Snelling, across Snelling and County Road B. He thought there was one segment along Hwy 36 that must be a pedestrian bridge and that is connecting into Rosedale but otherwise some of the connections shown could be construed as some sort of pedestrian bridge. Pedestrian bridges are generally very costly and given ADA requirements, there has been some discussion about establishing some pedestrian crossing across Snelling south of Hwy 36. The feasibility of that is challenging given current rights of way and the frontage roads there, that would be a challenging thing to do. Those are not addressed specifically.

Chair Cihacek stated the Commission had some great comments on the two items. They are adding a point for schools and a revision of policy for one versus two sides with paths. He asked if the Commission wanted to indicate there would be no additional points for schools and respond to data at that time with a policy change. He wondered if this would work for everyone. The Commission agreed.

6. Met Council I&I Grant Program Application

Civil Engineer Luke Sandstrom explained the Metropolitan Council Environmental Services (MCES) is currently requesting proposals of the Inflow and Infiltration (I&I) Demonstration Program Grant. The focus of the grant is on projects that demonstrate the effectiveness of I&I rehabilitation techniques that focus on reduction of I&I from private infrastructure, namely sewer service laterals that connect homes and businesses to the municipal sewer systems and improperly connected sump pumps.

Mr. Sandstrom noted one large requirement of this grant is the ability of the recipient to provide pre-rehabilitation and post-rehabilitation monitoring to quantify and document the achieved flow reduction. City staff has been documenting sewer flows throughout the City for two years now and has the equipment to complete pre-rehabilitation and post-rehabilitation monitoring.

Mr. Sandstrom stated staff believes a sanitary sewer service lining project in the City of Roseville would meet all the requirements and be a good candidate for this grant program, which is for up to \$500,000 and requires a 100% match from the grantee.

Member Kruse asked if those were narrow diameters services and do they line it up. Mr. Sandstrom stated they have not aligned it, typically it is six inches on right of way and then goes down to four inch in the front yards. They would have to figure out if they would do to the right of way all the way to the house. It would most likely be the right of way if there was the pinch point.

Chair Cihacek stated total possible award is one million dollars with the Council and the Commission. This would be approximately \$5,000 per house for 200 homes. He wondered what that would look like in one of the territories, how much that impact really changes or shifts something like 16A or 14, or 6, is that a large enough sample that does something impactful, or is it not that large. Mr. Freihammer thought if they did the full amount of the grant they would have a very impactful amount and would get measurable results and he thought that was why the grant is as large as it is. They would be able to cover one or two of the sections. They would target one of the areas that peak very high, that way if lining does eliminate INI the results would show much clearer than some of the smaller areas, so they would target one of the pink or orange segments on the list.

Member Kors asked how this applied to the type of condition the pipe is in. He wondered if this will be cast in place like the mainline. Mr. Sandstrom stated this would be the same technology as the CIP. It would be a different contractor because it is a whole different operational lining the surfaces versus the main but would be the same technology. Mr. Freihammer stated if they end up doing this, they would have to work out the criteria. If some homes opt in, they would have to decide if they do it to everyone. They would have to decide what their criteria is and work through details.

Chair Cihacek asked if there would be potential additional costs or is that cost included. Mr. Freihammer stated depending on how it is formulated they could include the costs because they would need to televise a line before you can line it. It is all part of the process. Mr. Sandstrom stated the technology at this point for lining sewer lines from the main back, everyone is a custom one for each house. Each house gets a custom liner so that would be a part of the project.

Member Kors asked if the pipes slope more as they get to the main line. Mr. Sandstrom indicated if the main line is deep there are risers on it. Lining up a riser can be tricky and that is why everything would be televised ahead of time. They can then determine if it wasn't going to work ahead of time, so they would not waste a liner on something that cannot be done. Member Kors thought if it is sloping more, they would have a smaller diameter and more capacity than the service coming out of the house. Shrinking it will still have the capacity that it had before. Mr. Freihammer stated even a four-inch pipe is marginal and loss is not significant enough where it would cause an issue.

Member Wozniak asked if this will be applied to a residential service or is it also a nonresidential one. Mr. Sandstrom stated the Grant outline is private, they will be

looking at residential right now. Mr. Freihammer stated if it was in a neighborhood that had mixed use they would do both. He thought it was more the quantity than the type of use. Most services are six inches regardless unless the business is large then they may have a bigger pipe.

Mr. Kruse asked if they would need agreement from the property to do this because they go onto private property. Mr. Freihammer stated that is another detail. One option would be to line it within the right of way. That is a detail they would have work through to figure out what exactly to do. They would have to look at the private property and if they make this an assessment. He explained they have a fifty percent grant opportunity, so they could potentially tell the homeowner they could get the service lined and it would cost the homeowner half of what it normally costs. That is one option they could look at and there are a couple other options which they need to explore.

Mr. Sandstrom stated they know in the future this will be a big topic and because it is widespread, the legality will need to be figured out. But they know that this is kind of the future, so this grant is kind of a pilot project basically.

Member Joyce asked how they stack up against other cities in the seven-county metro as far as getting a successful award of this grant. Mr. Sandstrom indicated there are only a handful of communities he knows that own their own meters like Roseville does. They do have a couple years of data, which is good, and they are looking for one big project because one grant will be awarded. He thought they could bring that to the table where smaller communities may not be able to commit half a million dollars for the match. He thought they would be a good candidate for this grant. Mr. Freihammer stated with the work they have done over the past years, they already have baseline data and do not need to study the baseline before they establish it. They already have that set up so he thought they would do well, but they are not guaranteed it.

Member Trainor stated to get the density for results they are looking for, he would not be too quick to go down the assessment route. He thought people would be very resistant because it takes a while to get up to speed on what is involved and understand how people are contributing. He thought there would be a lot of resistance.

7. City Campus Solar Installation Proposals

Mr. Culver reported staff has been working with Ideal Energies on rooftop and ground mount Solar PV installation proposals. Staff currently has layouts and economics for City Hall, Public Works, Fire Hall, and Skate Center that incorporates rooftop solar.

Mr. Braeden Solem, Ideal Energy, stated they have been working with the City preliminarily to look at doing solar across the City buildings. He stated they have looked at all the buildings and identified what would work. The ground mount

installation is proposed to be on the slope between City Hall and County Road C with the actual location and layout to be determined.

Mr. Solem explained that rooftop installations are shown to maximize savings given the City's usable space and building energy consumption. The economics included in the proposals show the revenue and costs associated with the arrays were a 40-year timeframe with a buyout option at year 18. iDeal Energies had provided other buyout scenarios for review and staff included the 10-year option as an example.

Mr. Solem stated if approved, the City would sign a Power Purchase Agreement (PPA) with iDeal Energies for the solar arrays. There would be no cash required up front and all operations and maintenance would be fulfilled under the PPA by the financier/developer. After the City exercises the buyout option, it would receive all the energy produced and assume operation and maintenance.

Mr. Solem noted the ground mount system is shown as an Xcel Energy Solar Rewards, which provides incentives to customers who install grid connected arrays. Xcel would purchase the power at a predetermined value and include a future escalator. He explained the City has the option to purchase the system at year 13 and the Solar Rewards option could be applied to any rooftop option, with a maximum array size of 40kW.

Chair Cihacek asked what the assumed inflation rate is for the utility. Mr. Solem stated over the last ten years it has been about 4.5 percent, over twenty years it has been 3.3 percent. He stated this one is at 4.5 percent because when they do a solar rewards project it is a 13-year agreement and when they do the larger projects that is an 18-year agreement, so they use the 3.3 percent inflation rate to represent a longer term.

Chair Cihacek stated the one thing that stuck out to him was because the roofs are older and may need future roof maintenance, would there be space to move the arrays around to accommodate maintenance without losing solar power. It was noted the rink roof array appears to be using the entire roof space which in turn means there may be a slight reduction in terms of the financial benefit because at some point, they will have to take some off line to do roof replacement or they would need to downsize that array to allow or shift some of the arrays for maintenance. Mr. Culver stated that is something he was going to follow up with Ideal Energy on because they have had previous discussions with other developers as far as trying to build in a two-month period where they could take the system off line. It was noted Ideal Energy would work with the City on removing and replacing the arrays.

Mr. Solem stated they do have optional agreement where if it is in a shorter amount of time, they can agree upon that process up front so it is not a surprise.

Member Joyce asked what kind of impact does that have on staff to monitor this and make sure it is functioning. Mr. Culver stated during the actual PPA period the developer or operator is responsible for all operations and maintenance. The City would own the system but would be leasing to them, so they are responsible for the O&M. There should be very little impact theoretically on his staff. After they own it, they would have to enter into some sort of maintenance agreement for that which would be included in the finances.

Mr. Solem explained when they own a long-term power purchase agreement with larger arrays, how much you pay is based on how much it produces. You only pay for the energy it produces. When they model this, they model their own income off it based off the array producing off peak power. If it is not producing exactly what they say it is going to produce, then they are also losing money for both the small and large arrays.

Member Kors asked what kind of mechanical function the arrays have and if they follow the sun. Mr. Chris Psihos (person from the audience) stated they sit at a static ten-degree angle and from the ground they would sit at a thirty-degree angle.

Member Kors asked if there were variations depending on the time of year. Mr. Solem stated they do not adjust any angle throughout the year. Production is affected in the winter, but they do not change anything about the array. They are essentially optimized for Spring, Summer and Fall production.

Chair Cihacek asked if they never want to take ownership could they set up a long-term capital lease program. Mr. Solem stated no matter what fee title owner day one, but the lease could be run full term. Chair Cihacek stated one of their City Councilmembers has stated the concern is the actual ownership because then they must take care of it and get rid of the assets. In looking at that, he thought they may want to review the way this is structured.

Member Misra asked if there would be any other changes, such as landscaping, that would need to be taken care of. Mr. Solem stated the only other possible issue would be the ground outside of City Hall. They would want to position it in a place where it is the most environmentally less invasive and to make sure the array is not being shaded during the term of its life.

Member Joyce asked about the reason for the ground mount system at City Hall. Mr. Solem replied it was a way to maximize the energy production and savings at City Hall. Mr. Culver stated Councilmember Willmus suggested it be placed on the slope at City Hall which will help maximize the benefit of the arrays.

8. Snow Event Parking Restrictions

Mr. Culver explained that at the May 14, 2018, Work Session, the City Council discussed the possibility of modifying the current Snow Event Parking Restrictions as set in City Code. This discussion was in response to some consistent complaints

of vehicles not being moved during snow events, resulting in snow removal challenges.

Mr. Culver noted the current City Code, Chapter 602.09, restricts parking “on any street for a period of 48 hours commencing immediately after any two inches or more continuous snowfall or until snow removal has been completed on any street, whichever occurs first.” He stated the meeting packet included the February 9, 2018 edition of “*One Chief’s Perspective*” in which Roseville Police Chief Rick Mathwig details the Police Department’s practice and procedure for enforcing the “snowbird” parking regulation and gives examples of when they did and did not issue citations this past winter season.

Mr. Culver explained this topic was last discussed by the City Council in April of 2007 when they considered some requests for additional parking restrictions including seasonal overnight parking restrictions but made no changes to the policy at that time.

Mr. Culver stated staff published a small article in the most recent City Newsletter soliciting feedback from residents on this topic. Several comments were received and have been included in the meeting packet.

Mr. Culver stated one of concerns brought up with this is that there are several areas within the City that have high density apartment building complexes with a significant amount of on-street parking surrounding those developments. They also need to recognize the fact that these apartment buildings generally serve a lower income population and demographic so there also might be an equity issue in trying to implement a change in the parking restrictions.

Mr. Culver stated if they are going to do this for the 2018-2019 season, the City Council will need to discuss and implement in September so there is time for outreach and communication on the changes.

Member Joyce thought that any snow event could require snow removal, so all vehicles should be off the streets. He asked whether there is any responsibility of the apartment building owners to provide parking. Mr. Culver replied there is and when apartment buildings are constructed, they must meet code for a certain number of parking spaces per apartment building. The only exception has been with Sierra Green where they were allowed to use on-street parking as part of their approval parking. That would be one area staff knows for sure would be problematic in providing parking.

Member Kors stated he has lived in Minneapolis and St. Paul and this, by far, is the easiest rule to understand. Member Joyce indicated the police is also forgiving and he has not seen anyone tagged. Mr. Culver stated a lot of the comments from residents are that it would work better if it was enforced better. He stated there is a comment by Roseville Police regarding this, noting the Chief did a good job in

writing up on how they handle that during a typical snow event. Just because a citation is written, it does not mean the vehicle is being moved. They have 12 hours to move the vehicle before the vehicle is towed. They feel towing is a burden to everyone, including the City. There are pros and cons to this.

Mr. Joyce stated it is not that big of a concern with a wider street but if the street is narrow there are other issues besides removing snow from where the vehicle is parked. There are issues of vehicles parked on both sides of the street with snow impacted and people trying to get out and move around their vehicles.

Member Kors asked if there was a way they could deal with repeat offenders. Mr. Culver thought they could do a better job with that issue.

Member Joyce wondered if it would help to have odd/even parking on streets during snow events. Mr. Culver stated that might help. Chair Cihacek stated they would need to zone areas “snow emergency” and the problem with that is there is not a uniform problem around the City. There are problem segments and pockets around the City which makes creating a policy difficult. He was not sure this was a large enough problem to do anything right now.

Mr. Culver stated how the snow events unfold dictates whether it is a problem or not from a parking perspective. This was discussed at the City Council level in May which was a few weeks after the late-April large snow fall after which the streets were plowed three times because it snowed Friday-Sunday. The way the ordinance reads, the vehicle needs to be off the street either 48 hours after or the street has been cleared, whichever occurs first. After the second time the City plowed, people figured plowing was done and the vehicles went back to parking on the street. That is the issue, when is the City done plowing for the snow event. He stated there will always be an issue of interpretation for the people that want to park on the street unless there is a flat-out ban indicating no parking between 2am-6am but that does not mean they will only plow at night. There are instances where they have had to plow in the morning or during the day to get emergency vehicles through. He believed the current policy states if six inches of snow or more occurs in one event, they will plow no matter what time of day or night.

Chair Cihacek stated if the City is not going to enforce the policy or they are not going to tell them then it doesn't really matter the time of day to plow. He stated if they are not going to increase enforcement of the current ordinance, then he did not see a rationale for change because it is not going to change anything else in these circumstances. Mr. Culver stated he did not want to advocate one thing over another because he saw pros and cons to every one of them. He did see one of the arguments for the overnight ban, whether all year or seasonal, is that it is a clear message and something the police can enforce.

Manager Joyce asked if the no parking requirements would require signage to be placed. Mr. Culver indicated it would not. He explained most cities that have

overnight bans have signs placed at certain entry points to the City indicating that. Signage at entry points is the common way that cities indicate parking bans to people driving into the City. They would need to educate the residents if any changes were made to the ordinance through a newsletter and mailings.

Member Joyce wondered what would happen to vehicles at Sienna Green where they need to park on the roadway. Mr. Culver stated there would be certain zones where they are exempt from that and the City would need to work with those areas. He noted it is easier to do some targeted communication and education efforts in those areas.

Member Wozniak asked what the City's main concern was with snow removal. He wondered if it was emergency vehicle access or trying to minimize plowing in cars or inconveniencing the owner of the car. Mr. Culver stated it all comes down to magnitude. Depending on how long the snow is on the street, it can impact the drainage, melting, and ice can pool up. If there are multiple ones on alternating sides it could become an issue of access for larger emergency vehicles. For them, it is difficult to plow in front of Sienna Green on a regular basis and they usually have to bring in a smaller vehicle just to make sure they can maintain emergency vehicle access.

Member Joyce asked how many two-inch snow falls they get in a year. Mr. Freihammer reviewed annual snow events with the Commission. Chair Cihacek stated it snows a lot but to get two inches of accumulations it takes a while because early in the season the snow hits the ground and melts off. Part of this consideration is it seems like they get a lot of snow, which they have, but this past year there were a lot of late-season snow events which had large accumulations. However generally, they get a consistent snowfall throughout the season. Mr. Culver stated depending on the time of the season they are more concerned whether they get the areas cleaned up. If they get a significant snowfall and a significant snow pack in late December, early January, they are more concerned with getting the snow removed due to the build up of ice and cold temperatures. If the snowpack turns to ice, then the City is fighting it throughout the season which can become difficult to maintain.

Member Kors asked how much of the budget is reserved removing snow. Mr. Culver stated the budget for snow events in Roseville or other cities comes down to paying employees to be at work eight hours a day. With significant snow events, employees are being paid overtime and even when there is a normal snow event they are probably not paying the employees overtime because they will come in at midnight and go home at 8 a.m. unless it is on a holiday. Fuel consumption and salt plays a part in cost as well and that is where they get the budget hits. He explained it is difficult to pinpoint where money is spent for snow removal. They are probably not spending a lot in the budget for clean-up efforts.

Member Trainor stated if they had the luxury of writing a policy from scratch, he thought the seasonal, no overnight parking would be a great idea. But since that is not the case, he thought it would be complicated and not worth the effort to change anything. The Commission agreed.

9. City Council Joint Meeting Review

Mr. Culver reviewed that on July 9, 2018, the PWETC held a joint meeting with the City Council to discuss and make comment on several items, in particular Organics Recycling and Tiered Water Rates.

Mr. Culver asked the Members to indicate whether there were any follow up tasks and establish a preliminary list of topics for consideration over the next calendar year.

Chair Cihacek stated his first impression was the many things the Council is requesting the Commission to do, such as investigate Solar Energy for City buildings, has been done or they are currently doing. He reviewed what the Commission has done as far as the organics programs and noted that a City program is still years away because there is no organic infrastructure in place or market for organics. He noted that takes out a lot of things they discussed at the meeting.

Member Wozniak thought there was still support among the member of the City Council for some type of organics program, noting they are looking at curb side and the City is not ready for that yet. He thought that drop off sites are an interim solution to get people used to the idea of separating out these things. It is good to have a place to take them.

Chair Cihacek stated there has been some question on water rates and recycling. He explained there are a few things he would like staff to follow up on such as Green Step Cities and the urban canopy.

Member Kors asked if there was a similar project. Mr. Culver stated they are currently giving the property owner the opportunity to have their sewer service replaced within the right-of-way during a mill overlay on the road. A letter was sent out to all residents in the area prior to the project that indicated the cost before bid. The homeowner has the option of having it done or not and they would be assessed for five years.

Chair Cihacek reviewed the requirements for the program so he did not feel the Commission should redo the work when it has already been done. He thought the Commission was effective, doing their job well, and have been able to anticipate many of the Council's concerns or questions. He was not sure if they wanted to pick up the private warranty program again or not. He indicated he would rather put into other conversations about water rates or rate structures generally and how they can help people do that.

Mr. Culver stated the entire solar grant and the City being proactive with lining the sewer services is kind of a conflict with the insurance program. There is really no reason to be proactive if subscribed to the insurance program because if there was a problem it would get fixed. Of course there are deductibles, but the insurance program covers issues that occur in the system.

Member Joyce stated the Met Council knows how much water the City uses from the meter but asked how are they determining the I&I. Mr. Culver replied there are charts that show flow data of the meter. There are spikes when it rains and it is very clear to see where the water is coming from using the Met Council resources.

Member Kors wondered if the reimbursement for sewer backups was still in the works. Mr. Culver stated the City's current policy for that is if a resident experiences a sewer back up regardless of what the issue is, the resident can be reimbursed up to \$5,000 for clean-up. The city does not pay for restoration costs, that would be the individual homeowner's insurance.

Chair Cihacek noted that according to the City Council the Commission should keep doing what they have been doing. The items the Commission has not addressed they will begin to address shortly. The Commission will be discussing water usage and conservation and they still need to review organic recycling and composting.

Member Wozniak indicated he heard the Council state the Commission has not yet brought forth a recommendation for a drop off site for organics. Mr. Culver stated that is one of those communication items. Staff has some conflicting messages coming from different Commissions as far as that recommendation for the compost site. They need to do a better job of communicating what they want to do whether it be to the Council or outside of that. Mr. Culver stated if staff gets into the practice of sending a quick summary of the meetings and whatever recommendations were made, then the Councilmembers could see it, read it directly, and bring it to a Council meeting.

10. Items for Next Meeting – August 28, 2017

Discussion ensued regarding the August PWETC Agenda:

- Maintenance Facility Study / Tour
- Snow Event Parking Regulations
- Community Solar Garden Subscription
- Water Utility Rates
- Water Rate Incentives

Mr. Culver indicated the snow event item can be scratched because it was on this agenda and he thought the Commission was done discussing it. Chair Cihacek thought staff could bring this back in September or October for further discussion, if needed. But even then, it would not be implemented for a year because they would need to educate the residents of the changes.

Chair Cihacek asked if the Community Solar Garden Subscription was submitted to the Council. Mr. Culver indicated it would be presented at the August 13, 2018 meeting. Chair Cihacek suggested that item be added.

Mr. Culver stated there are two tracks for discussion as far as water rates. There has been discussion on this Commission on a regular basis and there has also been discussion on the Finance Commission and he was not sure when the Finance Commission was planning to talk about it again. Mr. Freihammer thought it would be in September, but staff would need to confirm that. Mr. Culver asked if there was any desire to guide the Finance Commission's discussion by having another focused discussion and recommendations from this Commission.

Member Trainor stated they have talked about the water utility rates quite a bit and he thought through the Commissioner's questions, staff has generated some interesting data that maybe expanded their understanding of how things are playing out. He thought it would be good to be more efficient, based on the work staff has done, and to make a recommendation so the Commission has something to work from and be more effective. Mr. Freihammer stated staff will look at this and whether they can bring additional data to the Commission.

The Commission asked for more data on water usage per household.

Member Wozniak stated the City Council suggested the Commission look at incentives for using water. Mr. Culver stated they can look at this at the August meeting.

Member Wozniak stated he would like organics to be on the September agenda so the Commission can provide a recommendation to the City Council. Mr. Culver stated that would be possible.

11. Adjourn

Motion

Member Trainor moved, Member Misra seconded, adjournment of the meeting at approximately 8:45 p.m.

Ayes: 7

Nays: 0

Motion carried.