

Roseville Public Works, Environment and Transportation Commission Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, July 23, 2019, 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 Stephanie Hammer, Karen Huiett, Michael Joyce, and Nancy Misra

Absent: Member Shane Spencer (Excused)

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

2. Public Comments

None

3. Approval of June 25, 2019 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 Huiett moved, Member Joyce seconded, approval of the June 25, 2019 meeting minutes as presented.

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 July 25, 2019.

Chair Cihacek inquired if the Fairview Underground Reuse System Project would be rebid due to the bids being higher than anticipated.

Mr. Freihammer indicated the city will not be proceeding with that project because staff did not think it was feasible at this price point and will be removed from the Capital program and looking at other options for other stormwater improvements in the area.

Public Works Director Marc Culver explained staff has come to the conclusion that the site is a bad site for what the city is trying to do and that is a combination of a park being there with a lot of trees and it is trying to be confined to a small footprint as well as the fact that the storm sewer system the city is trying to tap into is on the other side of Fairview. There are some issues with elevation and that forces the system to be deeper than it really needs to be to be functional.

Member Huiett asked if there was similar bid participation the second go around as the first go around.

Mr. Culver recalled in 2015 the bids started high and went down, but he thought there were three bids the first time and four bids the second time. He indicated it was not for lack of number of bids.

Chair Cihacek asked staff if the bids seemed to be accurate or were the bids put in at a high price to reflect some desired need.

Mr. Culver thought staff felt the climate, with so much going on, contributed to the high prices. He did not know if the project were bid this fall for next spring if the city would receive any lower bids. The cost of materials is higher, labor is higher as is supply and demand for the labor market.

Mr. Freihammer explained the low bid contractor spoke with staff and explained the site constraints are very difficult and they do not have a lot of room to store material and other issues.

Mr. Freihammer continued with his update on projects and maintenance activities.

Vice Chair Wozniak asked how far away staff thought the Organic Site Project was from being done.

Mr. Culver indicated because this site is within the existing fence there will not be any screening done. He noted the slab that was poured is for the dumpsters and he thought some paving would be done. Because it is such an abstract site, a yard waste site, there will not be any real defined trail through there but there will be a paved surface to the pad from where the people would enter in.

Vice Chair Wozniak asked what the timing looked like for completion.

Mr. Freihammer thought with concrete getting poured this week, next week asphalt paving can be done and then the equipment would need to be placed on site.

Mr. Culver expected this to be completed by the end of August and operational.

Vice Chair Wozniak asked if the city was working with the County on bag distribution.

Mr. Culver indicated that will need to happen with getting sites at city hall and a few other places for people to get bags.

Mr. Freihammer continued with his update on Public Work activities.

Member Misra asked if the Lexington Resurfacing was going to be completed in a few days as noted in the update.

Mr. Freihammer explained the county is doing a mill and overlay from County Road C2 all the way to County Road E.

Vice Chair Wozniak asked if staff knew when the section south of County Road C2 would be redone because it is starting to get bad.

Mr. Freihammer noted it was originally supposed to go with this project and the County backed off and wanted to coordinate with a couple other projects and staff hopes it will occur in 2020 but staff has not received a confirmation on that. The county has some federal funding to do improvements at Lexington and County Road B2 with the signals and may be trying to coordinate it with that project.

5. City Council Joint Meeting Review

Mr. Culver stated on July 8th the PWETC held a joint meeting with the City Council. Several items were discussed including potential new commissions/subcommittees, Youth Commissioners, engaging Met Council, reviewing the Recycling Contract, and Sustainability topics.

Chair Cihacek thought the first item the Commission should discuss is the option to appoint two Youth Commissioners. He thought this made sense and was a good opportunity for early engagements. This will not cost the Commission anything so anything the Commission gets from the Youth Members would be a benefit to the Commission. It also helps to expand the Commission and helps connect the Commission to a deeper part of the community. He thought if there were two Youth's that were interested, he would invite them to come on board.

Member Joyce asked how the Commission would market for the Youth Commissioners.

Mr. Culver indicated that is always tricky but there are two other Commissions that will be seeking youth members, the Parks Commission and HRIEC Commission are seeking members. Those two Commissions are holding off on recruiting and will advertise for that once those Commissions hear from the PWETC Commission if members are wanted.

Member Misra asked if it would be the City Council that would select the Youth Commissioners.

Mr. Culver explained the city code indicated the City Council could but from what he understood the Commissions do all of the interviews and then recommend the Youth Commissioners to the City Council who then appoints those individuals on their Consent Agenda.

Motion

Member Misra moved, Member Hammer seconded, Authorizing City Staff to advertise for up to two Youth Members for a one-year term.

Ayes: 6

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

Chair Cihacek explained another item that a lot time was spent on at the Joint Meeting was making consideration about ways to reconfigure the current Commission. There was discussion about forming a different task force, a subcommittee, and even an entirely new committee to deal with Environmental Policy by itself. The Council asked the Commission to come up with a plan and he, as Chair, thought it would be good to come up with a couple of different options of how it would be done along with making considerations to think about ways to work jointly with other Commissions.

Chair Cihacek suggested the Commission could overlap items and pull the Chairs and Executive Board the Commissions for an agenda setting meeting so the Commissions could still work independently but greater visibility across the Commissions, what the initiatives are, what might come across of significance at different times. He did not know if that would be particularly productive because that could be transitioned to staff in the first place, if needed.

Chair Cihacek indicated another way to look at this is the Commission could spin off the Green Steps, which is a logical workgroup because it focuses directly and only on the environment and Green Steps. The logistical responsibility with that is there would need to be additional staff resources. There may also be some additional work from this Commission as well. The way he understands the Code is that the subcommittee can be composed of people separate from this committee, but this Commission would still have to receive the report from the subcommittee.

Chair Cihacek indicated if there was a very specific issue a task force could be appropriate. There would also be staffing concerns with this as well and another question would be how it would actually get done within the current constraints of space, staff, time and engagement.

Chair Cihacek thought the City Council would not be interested in making a brand-new Commission until the other types of committees were tried. He thought it made sense to make a subcommittee focusing on basically the green team as defined in the Green Steps Program and the Commission would have to define that better.

Mr. Culver asked for clarification on what the subcommittee would be formed of.

Chair Cihacek thought there would need to be clarification from City Code because he did not know that it says it has to be formed from this Commission. He thought the Commission could solicit for subcommittee members.

Mr. Culver read Chapter 201.06 of city Code, indicating the Commission could go out and solicit members to be on the subcommittee and would need to go before the City Council for approval.

Chair Cihacek thought the Commission could form a committee by themselves and powered by the City Code or could go back to the City Council and explain the Commission wanted to expand out that subcommittee and then create a new subcommittee, which is sort of bordering on forming a new subcommittee but the difference is structurally that committee would simply report to the PWETC and there would be a portion of the PWETC serving on that committee.

Mr. Culver indicated he has been giving this item a lot of thought and how this Commission can get more input from some people who perhaps are more knowledgeable on the environmental issues without creating an official commission or subcommittee. How can the City of Roseville engage people who are perhaps already organized or organizing to provide the city with some input and recommendations without necessarily being a formal city committee, subcommittee or commission.

Vice Chair Wozniak thought during the public comment period of each meeting a specific topic could be addressed that the Commission was interested in getting more information on.

Mr. Culver thought there could also be a time in the meeting when a presentation about a certain topic could be made by a specialist or someone with some expertise on the topic.

Chair Cihacek thought public comment period was for short statements and community concern from the public rather than long presentation format. It might be easier to invite any interested groups to come and make a presentation into the

Commission meeting as a part of the public meeting and agenda setting process, which is a way to engage them or try to co-partner again with the Watershed District and sit in that environment and co-host both meetings for greater engagement. He noted another option would be for the Commission to change the calendar structure so one month is more environmental focused, one month is transportation focused, one month is Public Works focused so people will have a better sense of when topics of their concern come up which might encourage more public conversation.

Member Misra asked what staff saw as an advantage to putting another group of citizens between staff and City Council.

Mr. Culver did not know if he saw it that way, he would see it as working with a group of engaged citizens that are not necessarily appointed and are not an official committee or subcommittee of the city. The group would not necessarily get assigned a staff liaison or have staff time but would give some additional perspective, ideas and maybe have done some additional research for staff that staff does not necessarily have time to do. Maybe bring some new ideas to staff and the Commission. He would not place the group between staff and the Council he would say staff is still between them and the Council.

Member Misra asked if there are examples of citizen groups that work with some staff that is completely separate from the Commissions.

Mr. Culver stated he was trying to think of a group and the one he thought came close to that is Friends of Roseville Parks. This is a very organized group of citizens that are separate from the city and have several events raising money for parks and also bring ideas and lists of improvements the group would like to see in the parks. He thought there were a couple of different groups that do that for parks.

Member Misra asked if public participation meetings could be held without the Commission.

Mr. Culver indicated a group could. The Commission is an official body because of appointment as representatives of the city. With that appointment comes rules as to how the members can meet and when the meetings can occur, public notice and quorums. A different group that has interest in sustainability efforts within the City of Roseville that have ideas and meet on their own with their own structure but were not appointed by the city can certainly work offline and research ideas to bring forward to the city in an organized meeting format.

Chair Cihacek asked if staff develop a calendar with all of the mandatory topics the Commission must do and see if there is a natural clustering of these areas, things that are reappearing each year and how those items are currently scheduled to see if that would build itself into a natural calendar.

Mr. Culver explained on the last page of the current agenda staff has started that with a preliminary 2019-2020 calendar and he has filled in some of the more traditional, regular topics the Commission discusses each year. The big one that is pretty well set is the MS4 meeting because it is a public hearing and he thought staff did a good job of coupling that with EUREKA and the Green Team annual meeting. He indicated June is the joint City Council meeting but did not need to be the entire meeting. Beyond that the different months could be targeted to focus on certain topics.

Member Huiett asked Chair Cihacek if a separate subcommittee would allow the structure to be a little more fluid to gain that information and to study the topics.

Chair Cihacek thought it might open the door as a new committee. The committee would serve as an advisory or expert committee and would not have any reportability, unless the ownership moved elsewhere. He was not sure if that was the best thing to do because he did not know if the committee could maintain a consistent meeting schedule on mandatory topics so it might not be monthly. He thought Green Steps might be the ideal committee to look to because he noted the city is at step three and there is nothing else for the Green Steps committee to do but to monitor to get to step four. He was not sure if this Commission should form a subcommittee, maybe have other Commissions help to form a subcommittee so each Commission is sending a delegate in on these broad topics to start developing a framework for conversation and addressing.

Member Huiett indicated she was liking that direction more than just a separate peel out of a few of the Commissioners on this Commission. She thought the more voices is definitely more helpful and there is a lot of interconnectivity and she did not like splitting it up. She thought the direction mentioned of greater participation from other Commission Members in the formation of that committee seems far more relevant to her than just a few of the PWETC.

Member Misra thought it would be worth thinking about instead of conducting all of the business reacting to what is already on the Commission's plate, to open up a meeting regarding, for example energy, and design it to have some public involvement, design it to generate a list of questions for staff or experts outside to come in and provide some input on, and then pick that up again at the next meeting. Part of what her sense is, on environmental topics, the Commission is designed to think about projects that need to get done but from the public view, there is a lot more that needs to be done and maybe a way to open the door for some of that to become part of the work the Commission does.

Chair Cihacek indicated as part of the November work planning meeting he suggested to open up a space for people to bring ideas forward that the community wants the Commission to get done.

Chair Cihacek did not think from discussion that there was any desire from the Commission to make a subcommittee, task force or increase what the Commission is already doing but there may be ideas to form a sub-committee when sending a delegation to an additional meeting for specific topics.

The Commission agreed.

Chair Cihacek thought the topic to start with that made sense was Forestry because the Commission has already identified it. He explained the Commission would have to spread the word to the Planning and Parks Commissions to set up a sub-committee or task force to look at forestry at the Policy level and see what those commissions response is as a first step.

Mr. Culver summarized the Commission would invite the other commissions to appoint one or two of their members to the task force and the task force would meet and organize on their own and would not necessarily need any staff presence or intervention.

Chair Cihacek thought staff would only be needed to get space for the task force to meet. He noted he would describe this as a Forestry Study Group on Policy.

Mr. Culver stated he would discuss this with staff to bring forward to the other Commissions for feedback.

Mr. Culver asked if the Commission wanted to talk about the next couple of months agenda items. He noted it is possible there may be a timely topic for August. Staff is in conversation with EUREKA about the current contract and the current costs for recycling because the costs are running higher than anticipated. There may be some information to bring back to the Commission to get input on in August.

Mr. Culver reviewed the pricing and possible increase in fees with the Commission. He noted this will possibly come back to the Commission in August for review so the Council can see it afterwards.

Mr. Culver thought the August meeting could consist of the EUREKA conversation, maybe have some Youth Commission interviews or an update on that process. He noted to use September as a backup as the topic of irrigation. He wondered if the Commission wanted to set January as the sustainability month.

Member Huiett indicated Earth Day happens in April and might be another logical grouping.

Vice Chair Wozniak thought the EUREKA update and Green Team meetings as well might be a good fit for April if trying to compress and theme the meeting.

The Commission discussed a possible timeline for topics throughout 2020.

Mr. Culver proposed for September inviting the Planning Staff or group to talk about the sustainability efforts within Building Code as well as some of the incentive with some funding offered.

The Commission indicated that was a good idea.

Chair Cihacek asked staff to extend an invite to the Met Council to come to the PWETC meeting sometime.

Chair Cihacek asked staff to plan to put on the May agenda the Public Works orientation because that is when new members will be seated.

6. Public Works Department Overview

Mr. Culver provided a presentation with an overview of the department and the major divisions and responsibilities of the department.

7. Items for Next Meeting – August 27, 2019

This item was discussed and set in item 5 above.

8. Adjourn

Motion

Member Misra moved, Member Joyce seconded, adjournment of the meeting at approximately 8:24 p.m.

Ayes: 7

Nays: 0

Motion carried.