

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

---

---

Tuesday, April 27, 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; and Members Jarrod Cicha, Nancy Misra, Shane Spencer, Bryant Ficek and Youth Commissioner Jana Lynch

**Absent:** Members Michael Joyce, and Karen Huiett (Excused)

**Staff Present:** Public Works Director Marc Culver; City Engineer/Assistant Public Works Director Jesse Freihammer; and Civil Engineer Stephanie Smith

## **2. Public Comments**

## **3. Swearing in of New Commission Member**

Chair Wozniak presented the Oath of Office to new Commissioner Ficek.

## **4. Election of Officers**

Chair Wozniak opened the floor for nominations of Chair of the Commission.

Commissioner Misra nominated Chair Wozniak to renew as Chair.

Chair Wozniak asked three times if there were any other nominations. He accepted the nomination.

## **Motion**

**Member Misra moved, Member Spencer seconded, to appoint Member Wozniak as Chair of the PWETC for 2021.**

**Ayes: 5**

**Nays: 0**

**Motion carried.**

Chair Wozniak opened the floor for nominations of Vice-Chair of the Commission.

Chair Wozniak nominated Member Huiett to renew as Vice-Chair.

Chair Wozniak asked three times if there were any other nominations.

**Motion**

**Member Wozniak moved, Member Misra seconded, to appoint Member Huiett as Vice-Chair of the PWETC for 2021.**

**Ayes: 5**

**Nays: 0**

**Motion carried.**

Chair Wozniak opened the floor for nominations for representative on the Ethics Commission. He noted last year Member Joyce was the representative.

Chair Wozniak asked if any of the members were interested in serving on the Ethics Commission. No one volunteered. He deferred the appointment to the May 2021 meeting to see if Member Joyce was interested.

**5. Approval of March 23, 2021 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 Spencer moved, Member Cicha seconded, approval of the March 23, 2021 meeting minutes as presented.**

**Ayes: 4**

**Nays: 0**

**Abstain: 1 (Ficek)**

**Motion carried.**

**6. Communication Items**

City Engineer Jesse Freihammer provided a brief review and update on projects and maintenance activities listed in the staff report dated April 27, 2021

Member Ficek inquired how the bids have been coming in on the Roseville projects.

Mr. Freihammer indicated the City has had very good bids which have been favorable to the City. He noted one bid was over-estimate, but the rest have been under.

Member Misra wondered if there is a plan for replacing all of the ash trees along the boulevards and in the parks and has there been any thought in creating a more intentional green space in the newly developed areas or wild areas in the City.

Mr. Culver explained the Park Department manages the Emerald Ash Bore program and is asking for some funding to accelerate the removal and replacement of the Ash trees. There are plans and desires and wishes to do that and the City is losing some of the heavily treed areas with some of the development. The City does have a very intensive replacement or landscaping plan for the ditch project area. The City will be starting with young trees and something the City is aware of.

Member Misra asked if the Commission could encourage tree replacement to the Parks Department in any way.

Mr. Culver indicated the Commission could do that. He thought a member of the Parks Commission might be able to come to a meeting to give a presentation of their proposed program for the Emerald Ash Bore removals and replacement.

Member Ficek wondered if the maintenance of boulevard trees would also include looking at sidewalks and trails and where the trees may interfere with pedestrian movements.

Mr. Culver asked if Member Ficek meant existing trees causing issues with heaving.

Member Ficek explained it could either be that or branches that hang low and impede pedestrians.

Mr. Culver explained that should be a part of the City's trimming program, which is usually winter work.

Member Ficek congratulated staff on the benchmarking award it received.

Mr. Culver expanded on the benchmarking award that was received.

Chair Wozniak indicated on April 8<sup>th</sup> he attended a webinar on mapping prejudice. This is an effort to try and look at racial covenants on property deeds. He noted this began in Hennepin County and has moved into Ramsey County. This is volunteer driven effort where volunteers are asked to look at property deeds to determine whether or not there are racial covenants, which restrict the sale of

property to anyone who is of color. He found the webinar very interesting and fascinating. He noted there is still a lot of work to be done on this.

## **7. Water Efficiency Rebate Program**

Civil Engineer Stephanie Smith provided a presentation of the Water Efficiency Rebate program.

Member Spencer asked if the three hundred dollar a one-time rebate on somebody's water bill or is it spread out across multiple bills. He wondered how that worked.

Ms. Smith indicated it would be as many water bills as it would take to equal that rebate amount.

Member Spencer asked what happens if all of the funds are not used. Would the money go back to the funding source or does it sit there longer until it is all used.

Ms. Smith indicated the funding from the Metropolitan Council and the Legacy Amendment would go back to them.

Member Cicha wondered what the overall cost is of the water sense smart controllers is. He also indicated Ms. Smith stated the rebate could also be used for replacing broken and misaligned sprinkler heads and he wondered if this would be applicable for people that would want to replace their old sprinkler heads with the old version or would the residents need to be upgrading to the smart type of sprinkler.

Ms. Smith explained the smart controllers have a wide range of prices, from \$100 and up. She explained as far as the sprinkler head repairs, they are requiring that any products that are purchased that would qualify for the rebate have that Water Sense label.

Youth Member Lynch asked if plumbers are involved in this.

Ms. Smith explained plumbers can do installation of irrigation as well as homeowners.

Member Misra wondered if this program is available to multi-unit buildings as well.

Ms. Smith explained HOA complexes could apply for this as well.

The Commission discussed with staff City irrigation fees.

Chair Wozniak asked if anyone from the public had any questions. No one wished to address the Commission. He thanked Ms. Smith for her presentation.

## **8. Proposed Updates to the Pathways Master Plan**

Mr. Freihammer made a presentation to the Commission on the Pathways Master Plan update.

Member Cicha indicating regarding the ranking system, connecting to the transit system it is showing based off of 1 to 3 rating, but he saw numbers higher than 3. He wanted to be sure that they are taking connects into transit and evaluating that very highly with what paths they think they should be preferring because he thought it was pretty well understood that those that are taking transit are walking there.

Mr. Freihammer explained he will have to take a look at that criteria. He did not look to much at the table but that was a big need. A lot of times when they get the connected transit, they are usually connecting to multi-family which usually goes hand in hand and build off of each other.

Member Spencer asked when looking at a path, understanding the City has concrete and asphalt, is there a set construction method for the paths. He wondered if there is some sort of standard that has to be followed when construction happens.

Mr. Freihammer indicated the City does have some set minimum standards. The City's informal preference is to do bituminous pathways first. One of the advantages of this is bituminous is easier to maintain and is also wider for maintenance is actually easier. This is also a lot smoother for bikers to use as well. He reviewed the City standards for concrete and bituminous sidewalk construction.

Member Spencer indicated an email was sent to the Commission by somebody who wanted the City to consider a path on Fairview and he wondered if staff was going to respond to the person or how this should be handled.

Mr. Freihammer explained there are some segments being built this year with the credit union and there are also come additional development that have some segments. Ramsey County is part of the B2 project and are going to make some of those connections. There will still probably be a gap north of there but that is a gap the City can look to fill in and complete.

Member Spencer indicated with the pathway going over the ditch, thinking about stuff like that and thinking about the pedestrian pathway over 35, he wondered if the City has every thought about partnering with companies to sponsor certain segments.

Mr. Freihammer explained he did not think staff ever discussed naming rights or any sort of cooperative thing with businesses or other property owners.

Mr. Culver noted the City could look at something such as adopt a trail program for litter control and maybe even snow control. This is something to consider.

Mr. Matthew Anderson, Anderson Law Group, PLLC, 1010 Dale Street North, Attorney representing residents of Roseville that live on McCarrons Boulevard. He indicated he wanted to talk about the Tamarack Trail Segment. He made a short presentation to the Commission about the residents' opposition to the proposed path.

Chair Wozniak thanked Mr. Anderson for the presentation.

Member Ficek asked if the homes have driveways on the McCarron's side or is this their only access to their garages.

Mr. Anderson was not sure, but he thought they all had McCarron's facing driveways. There is one homeowner that has lived in this area since before Roseville was incorporated and his first garage was the one in the back which he has been using consistently all of the years he has lived there. He noted there are a few properties he represent where the only way to access the back of their property is from Wagner Street.

Chair Wozniak asked what environmental harm Mr. Anderson is asserting that the pathway would cause that is not already present in the current land use.

Mr. Anderson explained when listening to the description of what goes into a pathway with at least six inches of base and then on top of that another two to three inches of asphalt and at least at eight feet wide, the City is filling a wetland and the City is losing wetland at a rapid pace as he showed in his presentation. He indicated the wetland is a thriving environment that the homeowners have respected and driven on the dirt road but have not dug anything up and replaced it with outside vegetation or class five rather than the native soil that belongs there.

Chair Wozniak asked if the proposed pathway then would not, essentially follow the current path taken by the homeowners.

Mr. Anderson explained when looking at the map, he believed the proposal is to go right over those tracks, but he was not certain. The plan would still have to dig up what is there and replace it with class five rather than native soil and then cut back whatever vegetation is within the eight feet wide area.

Member Misra asked who is maintaining the road currently.

Mr. Anderson indicated no one is maintaining it. The homeowners who use the road are making sure it does not fall into total disrepair. He believed someone mows it once a year. He noted the City does not plow it and he did not think the City mowed it. It was his understanding the homeowners have maintained that stretch to be able to get a truck through there. In the winter, the road is rarely used.

Mr. Culver indicated staff needed to present a couple of more segments before the meeting is over for the Commission to give feedback on.

Mr. David Booms, 300 South McCarron's Boulevard, explained he wanted to talk about Mr. Anderson's comments, specifically to access. The one photo he showed was a stairway leading down to South McCarron's was taken from his property. He indicated they are roughly 36 feet above the south McCarron's. He noted he has lived in the area since 1995 and that road, the alley way has been used by the residents routinely. The road is the most common way to get to their property. He explained his pontoon is parked in the back along with having a shed in the back. He stated they are also having some work done now with their roof as well as working on the deck and all of the materials being used are being brought up the back using the street pathway. He wanted to affirm that the residents do maintain the back area.

Member Cicha asked if putting a pathway in their limit access for the homeowners. He wondered what would stop the residents from using the pathway.

Mr. Culver explained once this becomes a pathway then the primary user is the pedestrian or person on a bicycle and from a safety perspective the City cannot have that mix of traffic on a regular basis. If a person is using a pathway they are not expecting a car to be on the pathway. The City does have some rules about that, and the Parks Department actually does have some provisions for allowing occasional access via a pathway to a rear portion of an adjacent property owners property for maintenance purposes or something like that, but there are rules, and the resident has to ask permission. This would not be an open access at that point and not something the residents could use whenever they wanted or needed. He indicated to provide some facts from the City side, this has been a use that has been going on for decades however, it is a roadway right-of-way and is not a road. It is not a built road; it is a private access currently on a public right-of-way. It does not meet City standards. If anybody were to build an access to their property that they were going to use on a regular basis where it results in rutting, as this clearly does, and needs some sort of maintenance, then that has to be paved. That is clearly in the City's Zoning Standards and Requirements. The City has made property owners pay portions of rear access to their properties because they were using it too often. That gets into erosion and general maintenance and environmental concerns as well.

Mr. Culver explained he was not even aware that this use was going on. Certainly, members of his staff knew, and he did not know who put that dead end sign up or when it went up. The City, as a whole, knew that this access was being used in that way for a long time. He did not know it was being used like that until there was talk about the pathway. If the City is going to allow that continued use then really the access needs to be upgraded to meet City standards. He indicated all of the neighbors get along fine right now but there is also some concerns because there is no actual legal access through the adjacent properties for these people to gain access

to their own properties. There really needs to be some sort of defined legal cross easement in order for that to continue in perpetuity because any one property owner can say they do not want anyone crossing their property to get to another's property.

Mr. Culver explained the City actually vacated a portion of the right-of-way that was shown on that map a few years ago on the northern end because there were some issues with shed placement and property lines, etc. That did not necessarily impact the roadway being talked about, but it does impact some of the neighbor's ability to access their own property through that area. The City staff still thinks it is a beneficial access for the general public, particularly on the west side of Tamarac Park because of that wetland those residents cannot get to the park unless they drive around the neighborhood.

Chair Wozniak thought the Commission needed to start discussion on recommended changes. He thought the Commission should start discussion on the C2 bridge connection. He asked for Commission comments or potential pathway preference.

Member Ficek asked what exactly the path is connecting because on the west side are car dealerships and on the east side are some companies. He wondered what the draw would be for that pathway connection.

Mr. Culver thought the original intent was to connect the neighborhood on the west side of Roseville ultimately to the rest of Roseville across 35W. He noted this connection has been in the City Pathway plans for a long time.

Chair Wozniak thought Mr. Steve Jernigan had some very well thought out comments in his email and he encouraged the Commission to take a look at that. He was not sure how Mr. Jernigan found out about this being a topic at this meeting and he wondered how or if staff is asking for public comment about the Pathway Masterplan at this point.

Mr. Freihammer indicated some of the residents are much more in tune with all of Roseville's dealing so Mr. Jernigan may have caught that on an agenda. He indicated the City will reach out to specific impacted properties for the next meeting. He noted the City is in the community gathering phase and wants input from residents as well as the Commission.

Member Misra indicated she would be in favor of seeing something that would be helpful to pedestrians to cross Snelling.

Chair Wozniak asked the Commission to take a close look at the plan before the next meeting and look at what should be added and focused on. How these should be prioritized to make sure it still takes into account what they think it should, in terms of values and so forth, like transit. Also consider some of the concerns voiced

by people on McCarron's who might now have access to their house if a pathway goes in.

**9. Items for Next Meeting – May 25, 2021**

Discussion ensued regarding the May PWETC agenda:

- Recycling proposals
- MS4 annual report and public hearing

Mr. Culver commented June will be prepping for the joint City Council meeting and July will be a review of that joint meeting with possibly bringing back the Pathways Masterplan.

**10. Adjourn**

**Motion**

**Member Misra moved, Member Ficek seconded, adjournment of the meeting at approximately 8:30 p.m.**

**Ayes: 5**

**Nays: 0**

**Motion carried.**