

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

---

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

*Pursuant to Minn. Stat. 13.D.021, Public Works, Environment  
and Transportation Commission members, City Staff, and members of the  
public participated in this meeting electronically due to the  
COVID-19 pandemic.*

---

**1. Introduction / Roll Call**

Chair Wozniak 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 Joe Wozniak; Vice Chair Karen Huiett; and Members Jarrod Cicha, Stephanie Hammer, Michael Joyce, Shane Spencer, and Youth Commissioner Jana Lynch

**Absent:** Member Nancy Misra (Excused)

**Staff Present:** Public Works Director Marc Culver; City Engineer/Assistant Public Works Director Jesse Freihammer; and Environmental Specialist Ryan Johnson

**2. Public Comments**

None

**3. Approval of November 24, 2020 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.*

Vice Chair Huiett indicated on line 119, the sentence should be changed to read "net zero type of ~~reproach~~ approach".

**Motion**

**Member Spencer moved, Member Huiett seconded, approval of the November 24, 2020 meeting minutes as amended.**

**Ayes: 6**

**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 January 26, 2021.

Environmental Specialist Ryan Johnson updated the Commission on Partners in Energy.

Member Spencer asked if the meetings Mr. Johnson has attended for Partners in Energy has been recorded or if any notes have been taken.

Mr. Johnson thought the meetings were recorded along with notes in order to be able to go back and review them. He noted the City does not have the videos, but he thought he could get them if needed.

Chair Wozniak explained the City Council approved the 2021 utility rates and chose option one for the water utility rates, which was not the option the PWETC recommended, it was the recommendation from the Finance Commission.

Mr. Culver explained the consultant recommended option one and he had asked for option two to be formulated.

Chair Wozniak indicated there were some emails Mr. Culver and he responded to regarding the Met Council' Bus Rapid Transit Line. He indicated the Met Council had a survey about different transit lines. He noted the survey is closed and this is a work in progress.

Chair Wozniak noted he received a letter from the City to start his siphon, so he does not have frozen water pipes this winter. He explained he receives this from the City every year.

Mr. Culver explained the Ramsey/Washington/Metro Water District Citizen Advisory has some openings if anyone in the City is interested. He noted there is information on this in the PWETC packet and on the City website.

Member Joyce indicated at the last City Council meeting he noticed the Youth Commissioners will not be able to vote on the Commissions, it was not approved.

Mr. Culver explained the Council conversation was that each Youth Commission member would be given the option to vote because there are some requirements for voting members.

#### **5. Recycling RFP Discussion**

Mr. Culver explained the City entered into a five-year comprehensive recycling agreement with Eureka Recycling starting on January 1, 2017 and ending on December 31, 2021. Staff and the PWETC initially discussed this on September 22, 2020 in order to get feedback on the 2016 Request for Proposal (RFP), and to determine what updates would be beneficial to have a robust and equitable 2021 RFP. He noted staff met with Ramsey County and Foth Env. several times since September and have a draft RFP for the PWETC to review and comment on.

Mr. Johnson reviewed the recycling RFP with the Commission.

Member Joyce asked how the City would handle cart damage by vendor versus cart damage by resident and who would be responsible for sending the carts out to residents if the City elected City owned carts.

Mr. Johnson explained for the initial roll out the City would have to hire a contractor to get all of the carts out to the residents. When it comes to replacing carts, if something is damaged or not working the service contractor would be responsible for that. Damage information would have to be given to the City from the contractor.

Chair Wozniak asked how old the carts are that the City currently has.

Mr. Johnson explained the carts are from 2014.

Chair Wozniak thought the carts were probably halfway through their lifespan. He wondered if there was the option of the City buying the used carts.

Mr. Johnson indicated that staff did talk with Eureka about this possibility but Eureka is not interested in selling the carts if they do not win the next contract.

Mr. Johnson continued with the presentation on Recycling RFP.

Member Spencer asked what the reason the City was thinking about owning its own carts is cost.

Mr. Johnson explained that is one aspect. It could potentially cost less, but it is also one more capital expense the City will have and will need to manage it as well. It also gives the City a little more flexibility and better pricing because the City would not need to worry about the cart roll out or swapping out carts. On the downside, the managing and tracking of carts will be needed.

Mr. Culver noted City owned carts also give them the flexibility to add the City logo to the carts for a more customized look.

Member Spencer asked if the numbers in the RFP taking into consideration three different sizes of carts. If Roseville purchased carts and provided them, would there be only one size available.

Mr. Johnson indicated staff would have to look at the different options and the cost listed in the RFP should be on the high side. This basically takes into consideration having a buffer.

Chair Wozniak asked if staff is seeing a trend in cities purchasing their own recycling carts.

Mr. Johnson thought it was the preference of each city. He explained Shoreview did this in their last RFP and St. Paul bought all of theirs. Maplewood decided not to purchase carts after going through its RFP. As of right now it is a little more split of who wants carts.

Vice Chair Huiett indicated that regardless of who owns the cart, might there be an alternative type of program where the resident and recycler have an option to contribute and purchase an additional cart. She thought another cart might be needed if the resident wanted to separate their recyclables by type. She wondered if that option or alternative has been explored.

Mr. Johnson explained this has not been looked at. Currently what is done with Eureka is if a resident wants another cart the resident can request one and there is no cost associated with it. This is the model he had in mind but Vice Chair Huiett brought up an interesting topic that he has not thought about. He noted managing that would add another layer.

Mr. Culver explained the only problem with a resident using different carts for different recycling products is that the recycling products still end up in the same hopper on the truck.

Chair Wozniak indicated he wanted to look at the scoring slide because he had a few questions about it. There has been some information brought forward about scoring, diversity, equity and inclusion and he saluted staff and Philson Ibrahim with Ramsey County for including this in the contract. He thought this was really progressive and visionary on a number of levels. He was very interested in seeing the response received from the vendors out there for this section. He was also curious about how this will be scored. Given that the diversity, equity, and inclusion is fifteen percent, and the community values is thirty percent so the scoring will be almost half of the value of the response in this area. He thought that was a lot and wondered if any of the Commissioners had concerns about how

much that is or does staff feel they will have enough information to be able to score the responses on this.

Mr. Johnson believed staff has adequate information once they look at the entire packet of items. This small section shows community values and DEI. There is also a large attachment at the end of the RFP which goes into more detail about the DEI. He thought this will be much easier to score in comparison to what staff was looking at in 2017.

Vice Chair Huiett thought the work staff has done in the scoring section is excellent and she thanked staff for their work. She thought the scoring rubric was spot on and descriptive enough but also open enough to allow for a range of options and alternatives, including creative ones. For meeting and addressing those values are clearly evident in the scoring for Roseville. She thought this was really fantastic and was thrilled to see the work done here.

Member Joyce asked how the City handles multi-unit housing and complexes. He asked if there was something in the RFP to address that. He also wondered if there was anything for commercial as well or is this strictly residential only.

Mr. Johnson explained per City Code, all of the residents do recycling through the City. Single unit, multi-unit, and multi-unit complexes will have strategic places on the premise where the recycling carts will be located. A lot of the times the recycling carts will be in the parking structures and get pulled out on recycling day. This is all residential and the City does not do anything with commercial or organizations unless those places opt into the City's program, which there is an option to do that.

Mr. Culver asked what the Commissions thoughts were on pricing, such as weekly or bi-weekly because staff is not sure how this will come in yet in the RFP and the community survey has not really shown a strong preference to move to a weekly service, but he would imagine that as the City evolves with recycling and material selection, hopefully people will put more in the recycling bin than their waste bin. He wondered how the Commissioners personally deal with bi-weekly recycling and he asked if the Commission found challenges with the capacity of their bins and does any Commissioner have more than one cart.

Member Spencer explained he had the middle size of recycling cart but that pandemic recycling there are some weeks where the cart is very full but pre-pandemic, one cart was plenty for his family.

Member Hammer indicated she has a family of five with two containers since the pandemic started and it is consistently full. She noted she works for a retailer and the trends with retail are the digital purchasing which is going to continue to trend up. She thought that might be another metric to look at and certainly the pandemic is a factor, but she thought this will continue to trend.

Mr. Culver asked if Member Hammer would be willing to pay more in recycling fees for weekly recycling and one cart.

Member Hammer thought if the alternative were two and every other week without paying more than she would keep two carts.

Member Joyce explained he just looked into this himself and certainly eating all meals at home adds more recycling and deliveries, but he thought for frequency, if the frequency is increased he thought the bin size would decrease but he thought for him the constraint was the size of the cart and handling it for some people. He noted the 96-gallon cart is hard to handle and even hard to get through a gate, which is a constraint he had. He noted he sometimes leaves things out of the recycling for the next time due to not wanting to overload the cart or make it too heavy to handle. He indicated two small carts are easier to handle for people who have challenges.

Vice Chair Huiett indicated she has a family of three and even before the pandemic her standard sized cart would always be full. She explained from a personal standpoint if she knew the contamination rate was lower and the end result was greater environmental justice, she would be willing to pay more personally because it matches her values. She would also welcome more frequent pickups.

Chair Wozniak explained he lives in a house built in 1968 with a tuck under single car garage and he is challenged for space. He thought this could be a challenge for people to find a place just for the carts they already have. He was not sure there was an easy answer for this and probably not one solution to all of the issues that will be out there in the community. He thought the system the City has is working pretty well and the community is under unique constraints right now with purchasing habits. He thought it will be interesting to see what kind of response the City gets from vendors with pricing. He thought it would be easier for people to switch from every other week to weekly collection.

Mr. Johnson noted 672 properties in the City have more than one cart which is approximately seven percent.

Mr. Culver stated the whole concept of weekly versus every other week is not going to be as simple as just the cost. Currently half of the City has a recycling truck on it every week. If the City went to weekly, the entire City would have a recycling truck on it. That recycling truck would probably be heavier than it is right now or there would be more trucks. There are more factors to it than just cost and the frequency of service.

Mr. Culver explained scoring was discussed and a few of the members thought it was good. He wanted to make sure all of the members had input on the scoring and will be a big topic with the Council.

Chair Wozniak asked Mr. Culver to expand a little bit on how the City planned on scoring the community and racial equity values.

Member Cicha indicated he would support the fifteen percent DEI within the scoring because he thought it was really important to show that the City is committed to including this with everything that is done in Roseville. He was curious about the previous scoring which had the community values at ten percent and has been boosted up to thirty percent, which is a pretty big jump, so he was curious what the thought process was behind that.

Mr. Culver explained the price was dropped down from forty to twenty-five percent, which is a pretty significant drop of fifteen percent and the past performance of other cities was dropped down from fifteen to five percent. Staff figured it was unlikely there will be a negative survey. He thought last time there were four or five proposals and there are really that many providers in the area that will provide the City with service and for the most part all do a pretty good job. Staff did not see a lot of variation in the past performance side and even the value added, there was very little that the contractors were doing extra. He saw a lot of the value-added stuff shifting to the community value side of it.

#### **6. Items for Next Meeting – February 23, 2021**

Discussion ensued regarding the February PWETC agenda:

- Sustainability Super Meeting #2/PiE Update

#### **March Meeting Agenda**

- Railroad Quite Zone Study

Chair Wozniak wondered if the City Council will have a joint meeting with the PWETC because he noticed the City Council had a joint meeting with the Park and Recs Commission.

Mr. Culver indicated the Park and Rec Commission had a couple of pretty pertinent topics that needed Council feedback so that was kind of the driving force for the joint meeting. He would imagine the next PWETC meeting would be in June or July.

#### **7. Adjourn**

##### **Motion**

**Member Joyce moved, Member Hammer seconded, adjournment of the meeting at approximately 8:18 p.m.**

**Ayes: 6**

**Nays: 0**

**Motion carried.**