

Regular City Council Meeting

Monday, November 14, 2016

Page 2

1
2 Mayor Roe announced several upcoming events, including the upcoming SE Roseville
3 Community meeting regarding the best use of the former National Guard Armory build-
4 ing and property, following the City of Roseville and Ramsey County not exercising their
5 rights-of-first refusal to acquire the site; and now seeking community input on future zon-
6 ing of the property as it most likely goes on the market in the near future.
7

8 Further announcements made by Mayor Roe included the Fourth Annual Ovalumination;
9 volunteer opportunity to stack and drag precut Buckthorn at Cottontail Park; and the
10 Third Annual Roseville Area Business Exchange; along with logistics and contact infor-
11 mation for each event.
12

13 As City of Roseville representative to the Ramsey County League of Local Governments
14 (RCLLG), Councilmember Laliberte reported that city membership dues for 2017 would
15 remain unchanged.
16

17 **6. Recognitions, Donations and Communications**

18
19 **7. Approve Minutes**
20

21 **8. Approve Consent Agenda**

22 At the request of Mayor Roe, City Manager Trudgeon briefly reviewed those items being
23 considered under the Consent Agenda; and as detailed in specific Requests for Council
24 Action (RCA) dated November 14, 2016 and related attachments.
25

26 **a. Canvass Results of City Council Election**

27 City Manager Trudgeon referenced the updated final tally received from Ramsey
28 County after dissemination of the meeting packets, and provided as a bench
29 handout tonight.
30

31 Etten moved, Laliberte seconded, declaring the candidates elected to the office of
32 the Roseville City Council as follows:

<u>Name</u>	<u>Total Votes</u>
Jason Etten	10,683
Lisa Laliberte	10,173
Wayne Groff	6,964

37
38 **Roll Call**

39 **Ayes:** Willmus, Laliberte, Etten, McGehee and Roe.

40 **Nays:** None.
41

42 **b. Approve a Resolution to Accept the Work Completed, Authorize Final Pay-**
43 **ment, and Commence One-Year Warranty Period on the 2016 Sanitary Sew-**
44 **er Lining Project**

Regular City Council Meeting

Monday, November 14, 2016

Page 3

1 Mayor Roe noted that, while the final amount for this project was over the origi-
2 nal contract due to additions, it only resulted in an approximate 1% increase; and
3 thanked the Public Works staff for their efforts in keeping the project costs in line.
4

5 Etten moved, Laliberte seconded, adoption of Resolution No. 11373 (Attachment)
6 entitled, “Final Contract Acceptance – 2016 Sanitary Sewer Lining Project;” initi-
7 ating the one-year warranty and authorizing final payment in an amount not to ex-
8 ceed \$47,473.85.

9 **Roll Call**

10 **Ayes:** Willmus, Laliberte, Etten, McGehee and Roe.

11 **Nays:** None.

12
13 **c. Twin Lakes East PIK Parcels Registered Land Survey**

14 At the request of Councilmember McGehee, City Manager Trudgeon clarified the
15 tracts and specific ownership of the various tracts related to this survey.
16

17 Etten moved, Laliberte seconded, adoption of Resolution No. 11374 (Attachment
18 A) entitled, “A Resolution Approving the Registered Land Survey for Parcels of
19 Land within the Twin Lakes Area;” known as the Twin Lakes East PIK Parcels.
20

21 **Roll Call**

22 **Ayes:** Willmus, Laliberte, Etten, McGehee and Roe.

23 **Nays:** None.

24
25 **e. Issuance of Two 1-4 Day Temporary On-Sale Liquor Licenses**

26 Etten moved, Laliberte seconded, approval of two 1-4 day Temporary Liquor Li-
27 cense applications for Bent Brewstillery as it hosts two events entailing the selling
28 of spirits on site at 1744 Terrace Drive; as detailed in the RCA dated today’s date.
29

30 **Roll Call**

31 **Ayes:** Willmus, Laliberte, Etten, McGehee and Roe.

32 **Nays:** None.

33
34 **9. Consider Items Removed from Consent**

35
36 **d. Consider a Conditional Use pursuant to Table 1005-1 and Section 1009 of**
37 **Roseville City Code to Allow a Yoga Studio at 1940 – 1844 Lexington Avenue**
38 **(PF16-028)**

39 City Manager Trudgeon briefly reviewed this item as detailed in the RCA dated
40 November 14, 2016 and related attachments. Mr. Trudgeon noted the revised
41 draft resolution (Attachment C) provided as a bench handout tonight.
42

43 Given parking concerns in this area, Councilmember Willmus asked staff if there
44 was an existing parking agreement in place for the adjacent hardware store and
45 this parcel.

1
2 City Planner Thomas Paschke responded that there was not an agreement in place.

3
4 Etten moved, McGehee seconded, adoption of Resolution No. 11375 (*Attachment*
5 *C, as revised*) entitled, “A Resolution Approving a Yoga Studio/Fitness Center as
6 a CONDITIONAL USE at 1940-1944 Lexington Avenue.”

7
8 **Roll Call**

9 **Ayes:** Willmus, Laliberte, Etten, McGehee and Roe.

10 **Nays:** None.

11
12 **10. General Ordinances for Adoption**

13
14 **a. Consider Text Amendments to Employment Districts, Chapter 1006 and Sec-**
15 **tion 1009, Procedures, to include Motor Freight Terminal as a Conditional**
16 **Use (PROJ 0017-Amtd. 30)**

17 City Planner Thomas Paschke briefly summarized this request for text amend-
18 ments as detailed in the RCA dated November 14, 2016.

19
20 Mayor Roe clarified, with confirmation by Mr. Paschke that the request was for
21 general text amendments allowing for future applications for such a Conditional
22 Use, and not related to a specific application for a Conditional Use on any particu-
23 lar site at this time.

24
25 Councilmember McGehee referenced the truck terminals currently operating in
26 Roseville, and stated that while she had no opposition to this text amendment in
27 particular she was concerned about the deterioration with long-term storage of the
28 semi-trailers. Councilmember McGehee asked if there was any way to condition
29 that the trailers had to be maintained to some degree versus resulting in rusting
30 hulks.

31
32 Mr. Paschke advised that once a Conditional Use is reviewed for a specific appli-
33 cant and property such a condition for approval could be considered along with
34 other site-specific use. Mr. Paschke noted that any reasonable condition that was
35 germane to a use could be added (e.g. screening, additional setbacks, and site is-
36 sues related to adjacent property uses).

37
38 Councilmember Etten asked if there was any provision for an approved access
39 plan for semi-trailer parking from the Fire Marshal.

40
41 Mr. Paschke responded that staff looked at sites and uses differently depending on
42 whether they were analyzed and recommended for approval under a Conditional
43 Use or Interim Use and their respective parameters, such as specific plans and
44 spacing that had been addressed for the last three Interim Use permits vetted by
45 the city. Mr. Paschke noted that current uses for those zoning areas did not allow

Regular City Council Meeting

Monday, November 14, 2016

Page 5

1 semi-trailer storage, thus the application for an Interim Use. Mr. Paschke re-
2 viewed the differences for the outdoor storage of trailers under an Interim Use in
3 designated zoning areas where they would not typically be allowed and those con-
4 sidered more “active” sites with semi-trailers stored outdoors storage under a
5 Conditional Use, such as would be applicable if this text amendment was ap-
6 proved for Motor Freight Terminal uses.

7
8 At the request of Councilmember Willmus, Mr. Paschke distinguished between
9 the already-permitted Warehousing use and this proposed addition of Motor
10 Freight Terminal as a Conditional Use, with Warehousing generally involving
11 storage for longer terms versus simply trans loading merchandise from one truck
12 to another in the Motor Freight Terminal use.

13
14 Mayor Roe noted the reference in the RCA (page 2) consisting of an excerpt from
15 the 2010 Zoning Code update that defined “Motor Freight Terminals” with staff
16 determining that the use had been inadvertently omitted from the table of uses in
17 that update.

18
19 Councilmember Willmus stated he wasn’t sure he agreed that it was an oversight,
20 but actually a desire to limit this type of use.

21
22 Based on staff’s research and available information, and based on the definitions
23 for “Industrial District” and Zoning Code definition of “Motor Freight Terminal,”
24 Mr. Paschke reported that to the best of staff’s knowledge it was simply an over-
25 sight in not listing that particular use. Mr. Paschke stated this was supported more
26 given the number of such uses and their preferred location on the west side versus
27 the east side of I-35W.

28
29 Specific to the narrative related to a principle use or structure, Councilmember
30 Willmus asked how it was determined if there was more than one on a site.

31
32 Mr. Paschke responded that there could actually be two or more primary buildings
33 on one site, and two or more separate uses. Mr. Paschke opined this was true on a
34 number of sites in Roseville that would be no different than the narrative from the
35 one applicant referenced by Councilmember Willmus at 2600 County Road C.

36
37 Mayor Roe noted that the City Council was cognizant of the discussions held at
38 the Planning Commission meetings.

39
40 **Public Comment**

41 **Ann Steingraeber of Winthrop & Weinstine on behalf of a Roseville property**
42 **owner, Koch Trucking**

43 Ms. Steingraeber reiterated comments on record from the Public Hearing held at
44 the Planning Commission in October and November, along with their request re-
45 lated to Section 37.a. Ms. Steingraeber noted their request was to remove the text

1 for a blanket prohibition for parking between a building and street, and consider
2 that on a case by case basis under a Conditional Use and then conditioned accord-
3 ingly. Ms. Steingraeber opined that this would serve the city and future appli-
4 cants as well and allow for a one-step application process versus a two-step ap-
5 proach for a Conditional Use and Variance process.

6
7 While asking for the City Council’s consideration of her client’s request, Ms.
8 Steingraeber advised that they would accept the City Council’s decision; and due
9 to timing concerns, had already taken steps for consideration of their Conditional
10 Use and Variance at the December Planning Commission meeting.

11
12 **Robert K. Buss, Stan Koch & Sons Trucking, Inc., 42000 Vahlberg Drive,**
13 **Minneapolis, MN (looking to purchase 2500 County Road C)**

14 Mr. Buss asked for a decision by the City Council tonight, noting that there was a
15 timing conflict to the degree that the next Planning Commission meeting was
16 scheduled for December 7 and the last City Council meeting of 2016 was prior to
17 that on December 5, 2016.

18 **Council Deliberation**

19 At the request of Councilmember McGehee, Mr. Paschke clarified that staff’s ra-
20 tionale for including the language in Item 37.a for locations of outdoor semi-
21 trailer storage was tied to how they are considered in city code, specific to “out-
22 door storage.” Mr. Paschke advised that this language was consistent with other
23 city code regulations on all sites, including Industrial sites. While recognizing the
24 merits brought forward during public comment and their desire that this be con-
25 sidered on a case by case basis, Mr. Paschke advised that staff’s intent was to ad-
26 dress outdoor storage and how it relates to buildings with more than one public
27 street to remain consistent. However, Mr. Paschke advised that staff wasn’t nec-
28 essarily opposed to the City Council deleting it.

29
30 Councilmember Etten clarified, with confirmation by Mr. Paschke that a review
31 of other parts of city code would consistently list that “no outdoor storage was al-
32 lowed between a principle building and street.” Councilmember Etten asked if an
33 applicant could receive approval for such outdoor storage as a condition under a
34 Conditional Use without the added Variance process.

35
36 Mr. Paschke reviewed how staff analyzed outdoor storage, including but not lim-
37 ited to semi-trailers parked anywhere in the yard,” that would be taken into con-
38 sideration under a Conditional Use application and specific mitigation efforts by
39 the city and others addressed on any given site. With each site reviewed individ-
40 ually, including how many principle uses were involved and how many streets
41 were adjacent to the use(s), Mr. Paschke advised that part of the analysis would
42 include whether or not an upgraded site plan for a project and potential screening
43 or appropriate placement of outdoor storage (e.g. semi-trailers) were appropriate
44 as related to a public street and adjacent properties and uses. Mr. Paschke noted

Regular City Council Meeting

Monday, November 14, 2016

Page 7

1 this allowed a review for each individual property and use versus a blanket condi-
2 tion saying “No Parking” on the site at all.

3
4 Mayor Roe asked if there were exceptions to Section 37.a from staff’s perspec-
5 tive.

6
7 Mr. Paschke responded that there could be, but this particular section dealt specif-
8 ically with outdoor semi-trailer storage, and other “outdoor storage” could involve
9 numerous things. Mr. Paschke opined that this particular section took that “out-
10 door storage” to a different level in the process.

11
12 Through application of city code to future situations, Mayor Roe asked if there
13 may be problems if a given site and situation where outdoor storage might be al-
14 lowed between a building and adjacent street if some type of mitigation was done.
15 If recognizing the proposed language as the default – no storage between a build-
16 ing and any street – Mayor Roe questioned if this set the city up for unintended
17 consequences or served to preserve more flexibility on a site.

18
19 Mr. Paschke noted he couldn’t respond either one way or the other, but reiterated
20 the preference for review on a case by case basis.

21
22 Based on his understanding of Mayor Roe’s question, City Attorney Mark
23 Gaughan advised if the language was retained as recommended by staff for Sec-
24 tion 37.a (lines 78-84 of the RCA), the city could attach a condition permitting
25 semi-trailer storage between a principle building and adjacent public street if ap-
26 plicable to a given site and use.

27
28 In trying to understand the language and future uses, Mayor Roe advised he was
29 trying to ensure the process going forward for a Conditional Use and/or Variance
30 to facilitate similar applications.

31
32 Councilmember Willmus noted this discussion and staff’s responses were con-
33 sistent with the discussions held at the Planning Commission as well.

34
35 Councilmember Laliberte stated she would err on the side of consistency with
36 language found elsewhere in city code; and also spoke in support of utilizing the
37 Variance process for unique situations that may arise. Since the City of Roseville
38 is so developed, Councilmember Laliberte opined that there may be many proper-
39 ties with unique situations, and that language could not be developed tonight that
40 would address each of those issues going forward. Councilmember Laliberte stat-
41 ed that she recognized the scheduling issue brought forward by one applicant’s
42 legal counsel speaking tonight and at previous Planning Commission meetings
43 and their situation, but stated the City Council should also not be making general
44 citywide decisions under that rationale.
45

Regular City Council Meeting

Monday, November 14, 2016

Page 8

1 Councilmember McGehee voiced a different perspective based on a Conditional
2 Use addressing screening for an entire site and the role of the City Council and
3 Planning Commission in reviewing those applications. Councilmember McGehee
4 noted that a condition could be imposed by either body for no trailer storage on
5 whatever side is chosen and a determination made at that time. Councilmember
6 McGehee questioned if she was supportive of that being part of the Variance pro-
7 cess, but instead supported it as part of an overall site plan review that would not
8 only provide more flexibility for conditioning a Conditional Use, but allow the
9 City Council some control over those conditions as well versus consideration by
10 only the Variance Board.

11
12 Councilmember Willmus referenced the meeting minutes from the October 5,
13 2016 Planning Commission and their reference to different definitions related to
14 principle uses and things to be vetted by the City Council subsequent to that meet-
15 ing; and the Commission's tabling any action after concerns had been expressed
16 by them that this additional language change had not yet been properly vetted by
17 staff, nor had it received any public feedback as it hadn't been part of the initial
18 staff request for text amendments. Councilmember Willmus asked if staff was
19 aware of any other text amendments potentially yet to be addressed; with Mr.
20 Paschke responding that he was not aware of any others at this point.

21
22 Mayor Roe reviewed the options available for the City Council to consider to-
23 night. Mayor Roe stated his concern in removing the language altogether as re-
24 quested by the applicant's legal counsel speaking tonight was there was then no
25 reminder that it was an important point to consider. Therefore, Mayor Roe stated
26 that he would not be supportive of removing that reference completely.

27
28 Councilmember Willmus stated his reluctance as well to taking the language out
29 completely, depending on what the city preferred and what direction they wanted
30 to move forward with related to outdoor storage. When reviewing this issue,
31 Councilmember Willmus stated that he got a sense that some of the controls in
32 place for the city and future land use were no longer available if the language was
33 struck; noting his concerns with that ramification.

34
35 From the other perspective, Councilmember McGehee asked what would be ame-
36 nable if there was a selected primary street by definition that would serve as a flag
37 for staff to address with any other abutting streets.

38
39 Mayor Roe clarified that he also preferred to err on the side of leaving the lan-
40 guage as recommended by staff, allowing the City Council to retain some flexibil-
41 ity if they so desired.

42
43 McGehee moved, Etten seconded, enactment of Ordinance No. 1514 (Attachment
44 C) entitled, "An Ordinance Amending Roseville City Code, Table 1005-1 and
45 Section 1009.02.D of Title 10 (Zoning Ordinance);" *amended as follows:*

1 Ms. LaBay reported on and provided information materials as a bench handout,
2 ~~attached hereto and made a part hereof~~, related to their outreach efforts, with
3 additional information available on the city website at
4 www.cityofroseville.com/dementiainfo. Ms. LaBay reported on some of the re-
5 sults of coping sessions, attendance and topics covered, and reviewed future plans
6 going forward, including development of a guideline in conjunction with the
7 City's Police and Fire Departments to serve as a model for other cities. Ms.
8 LaBay advised that the plan was to research and develop, and then incorporate a
9 basic resource information form for use by the 9-1-1 system and subsequent staff
10 training.

11
12 Councilmember McGehee thanked Ms. LaBay for the team's use of C-TV and not
13 just the city's website for their outreach. Councilmember McGehee also refer-
14 enced the availability of various tracking devices that could be expanded in the
15 future for developmentally disabled and/or autistic residents.

16
17 Ms. LaBay noted the variety of resources and types of bracelets currently availa-
18 ble, but also noted the cost of some of those options was prohibitive but continued
19 to be considered as options, depending on funding available or subsidized re-
20 sources found.

21
22 **Sara Barsel**

23 Ms. Barsel reported that the Roseville Fire Department had been working on
24 some of those tracking options, with their research involving units that were easi-
25 er to wear. Given the number of bright, tech-savvy people in Roseville, Ms. Bar-
26 sel suggested the city sponsor a contest enticing them to develop something that
27 would function similarly but be smaller than those currently available on the mar-
28 ket.

29
30 With various options being discussed, and while there was a wide range to choose
31 from, Ms. LaBay advised that there was an initial cost to purchase a bracelet (e.g.
32 \$200 - \$300), along with a monthly maintenance fee (e.g. \$30).

33
34 Councilmember Laliberte opined that it was fantastic that Ms. LaBay was thank-
35 ing the city and making viewers aware of what was available; but also noted the
36 city's need to thank Ms. LaBay and the A/D team, who's passion and dedication
37 in promoting ideas received from residents and volunteers, this effort would not
38 be happening in Roseville.

39
40 Ms. LaBay also referenced a recent caregiver's survey done in conjunction with
41 the U of MN, and available online, and being utilized nationwide and worldwide.

42
43 Mayor Roe recognized the amount of work that went into that survey.
44

1 City Manager Trudgeon echoed the comments of Councilmember Laliberte in
2 thanking the team for their work day in and day out, and thanked Councilmember
3 Laliberte for her work in creating the materials. Mr. Trudgeon expressed his ap-
4 preciation to be a part of the huge group effort, including those reporting and also
5 in attendance in tonight's audience.
6

7 Ms. LaBay agreed it was a collaborative effort and had aligned people of passion
8 and proven results.
9

10 Mayor Roe thanked the team and encouraged them to forge ahead.
11

12 **12. Public Hearings and Action Consideration**

13
14 **13. Budget Items**

15
16 **14. Business Items (Action Items)**

17
18 **a. Revisit Long-Term Facility Options for the Roseville License Center**

19 Mayor Roe recognized License Center supervisory staff in tonight's audience.
20

21 Finance Director Chris Miller introduced this discussion and reviewed staff's in-
22 house research and discussion since the March 2016 discussion with the City
23 Council based on previous direction.
24

25 Finance Director Miller reviewed three options (lines 12-15) identified by staff
26 and financial considerations if the City Council wanted to pursue a city-owned fa-
27 cility (lines 26 – 29 of the RCA). Mr. Miller reported on his preliminary conver-
28 sations with the owners of two properties identified last spring and early summer.
29 Mr. Miller stated his personal support for this operation being located in a city-
30 owned facility having now been in operation for several decades and continuing
31 to serve as a vibrant operation with other city functions. Mr. Miller opined that
32 given the added traffic from the License Center averaging 500 vehicles/day and
33 the synergy with other government services, it made sense to have that function in
34 proximity to the city campus.
35

36 Over the last eight months or research, Mr. Miller reported that the most viable
37 option found for a city-owned facility, but obviously the most costly as well, is to
38 concentrate efforts on exploring existing city-owned land near the general campus
39 area, including potential space at Veteran's Park and the north skating center
40 parking lot. Mr. Miller reviewed the options discussed in-house to repurpose an
41 existing building on the city campus, but noted each brought their own set of con-
42 flicts, most significantly that of adequate parking.
43

44 Mr. Miller displayed a map of the area being proposed city-owned Veteran's
45 Park. Mr. Miller noted this parcel could facilitate a 6,500 square foot footprint

Regular City Council Meeting

Monday, November 14, 2016

Page 12

1 with the License Center currently using approximately 3,300 square feet, but to
2 expand and streamline operations in a more customer-friendly atmosphere, sug-
3 gested an additional 2,000 square feet. Mr. Miller noted that any additional
4 square footage could be considered for other city needs, including storage that
5 was deemed to be currently lacking.
6

7 Finance Director Miller reviewed various opportunities and challenges with the
8 proposed repurposing of Veteran's Park; use of existing green space; additional
9 pressures on existing parking and sharing existing available parking; screening of
10 the athletic field among a few considerations. Mr. Miller noted that a substitute
11 park space elsewhere in the city had yet to be identified. Mr. Miller reviewed
12 some of the parking options and challenges with use of adjacent ballfields and
13 hours of operation for the License Center in the early evening and on Saturdays,
14 and possible overflow parking into the skating center lot. Mr. Miller concluded
15 by stating that as now understood, it appears physically that a building of that size
16 footprint on that site would be feasible without repurposing current activities and
17 buildings on the campus. Mr. Miller expressed staff's confidence that the build-
18 ing could be positioned to preserve options to the north and east for future grander
19 ideas and pursuits in this general area as time and development opportunities
20 came forward.
21

22 Finance Director Miller reported that staff had also considered new construction
23 on the NEW corner of the skating center lot that could provide space to tuck it in
24 without impacting geothermal wells on the south. However, Mr. Miller noted this
25 option created parking issues with hockey and ice time, spilling over in the oppo-
26 site direction and on neighborhood streets, already utilized during highly-attended
27 events. Mr. Miller also noted the current park & ride facility using part of the
28 south lot, and if considering this site, perhaps that would need to be removed en-
29 tirely. Mr. Miller estimated the need for a minimum of forty parking spaces dur-
30 ing the day for the License Center operation to facilitate employees and customers
31 during their busiest times, and sometimes perhaps more.
32

33 Finance Director Miller reported that considerable time had been spent on this is-
34 sue over many years, and based on the most recent City Council direction, staff
35 had accelerated some of those conversations. While there are some other appeal-
36 ing sites near the city campus, Mr. Miller advised there were no willing sellers yet
37 identified. However, if so directed, Mr. Miller expressed staff's willingness to
38 seek appraisals as applicable in preparation of a formal, bona-fide offer to more
39 strongly convey the city's commitment in acquiring new space.
40

41 At this point, Finance Director Miller advised that staff was seeking a direction
42 from the City Council. Mr. Miller noted that the city's lease was up for renewal
43 the end of January of 2017, with the owner of that site willing to negotiate a new
44 lease, once the proposed term was identified, and anticipating a 3% to 4% in-
45 crease annually. Mr. Miller advised that staff's negotiations for this leased space

Regular City Council Meeting

Monday, November 14, 2016

Page 13

1 would be predicated on how aggressive the City Council wanted to be in defining
2 a new space for this function.

3
4 Councilmember Willmus sought additional context on the other city needs (e.g.
5 storage).

6
7 City Manager Trudgeon advised that, independent but also related to this discus-
8 sion, was storage needs for the maintenance facility, currently woefully inade-
9 quate with nothing likely available on site. While that additional space could be
10 constructed elsewhere in the city and independent of the city campus, Mr. Trudg-
11 eon also noted the significant cost of doing so. Regarding short-term storage
12 needs, Mr. Trudgeon reported that the city was currently renting storage space;
13 and since some of the storage was specific to heavy equipment that needed access
14 in the early morning and/or weekend hours, he questioned whether or not it was
15 compatible as part of the License Center, especially if for a new facility at Veter-
16 an's Park adjacent to residential properties. While the existing maintenance fa-
17 cility on the city campus could be repurposed for the License Center and other
18 city needs, Mr. Trudgeon noted that it would cost many millions of dollars to
19 move the maintenance facility off-site, with bonds for the facility still being paid
20 off. At this point, Mr. Trudgeon noted staff had been able to cobble together stor-
21 age space short-term, but admitted it didn't serve to address the bigger and longer-
22 term issues.

23
24 Councilmember Willmus stated his desire for a more in-depth discussion on
25 citywide needs versus taking a piecemeal approach. While recognizing that the
26 current lease for the License Center needed to be renewed in the very near future,
27 Councilmember Willmus suggested reviewing facilities on the current city cam-
28 pus, as well as taking a more proactive approach to the issue to see if there was
29 additional acreage around City Hall that could be more seriously looked at.

30
31 Councilmember Laliberte agreed that, with the City Council was continuing its ef-
32 forts to not think or perform in a silo mentality, if this involved a bigger facility
33 conversation, now was the time to have that broader discussion. Councilmember
34 Laliberte stated that she was fine in ramping up that discussion to consider all city
35 needs, including possibly repurposing the maintenance building with the License
36 Center located on the main floor, depending on options. However, Councilmem-
37 ber Laliberte suggested considering going "up" versus just limiting the conversa-
38 tion to building "out."

39
40 Mayor Roe noted the large equipment storage involved in the maintenance facility
41 versus personnel that could be more amenable for a second story.

42
43 In general, Councilmember Etten supported looking at the big picture versus con-
44 structing a 6,500 square foot building only to find that more space was needed. If
45 the need was to accelerate the conversation now, Councilmember Etten supported

1 that process. Councilmember Etten asked staff to report on how many square feet
2 were involved in the License Center and Passport Office operations.
3

4 Finance Director Miller reported that the current operations took up approximate-
5 ly 3,300 square feet, but based on current growth over the last decade, opined it
6 wasn't worth doing anything less than 5,000 square feet minimum. Mr. Miller
7 clarified that the footprint shown on the displayed map was provided only to show
8 the potential impact to the site and adjacent properties with a 6,500 square foot
9 building, and had not taken into consideration a second story or smaller or larger
10 building on that same parcel.
11

12 Councilmember Etten referenced staff's identification of the need for an addition-
13 al 2,000 square feet of leased space in the RCA (lines 28 – 29) . While seeing the
14 need, Councilmember Etten opined that one way or another, the city would be
15 looking to lease more space in the short-term.
16

17 Finance Director Miller agreed that, if the viability of getting into a city-owned
18 facility was three or more years out, he would recommend a significant invest-
19 ment to the leased space, in addition to additional square footage, to provide a
20 warmer and more inviting customer service look like the License Center used to
21 have. Mr. Miller noted the current space and operations were cramped with many
22 physical limitations as to how many customers could be processed; with many
23 having to wait outside in all kinds of weather, or try to time their visits during less
24 busy hours. Mr. Miller reported that it was a frequent observation to see custom-
25 ers walking away from the License Center. However, Mr. Miller noted there was
26 no way to determine if those customers would return or simply have the incentive
27 to go to another license center in the immediate area. Mr. Miller noted the im-
28 portance as part of that concern with 80% of those customers visiting the License
29 Center being other than Roseville residents.
30

31 Councilmember Etten referenced his discussions with Parks & Recreation Direc-
32 tor Brokke regarding space needs of that Department, shared space opportunities,
33 and impacts to investing functions, as well as the Parks Master Plan concept for
34 no net loss to available park space and acquisition of replacement square footage
35 for any current park or open space that was eliminated.
36

37 Councilmember McGehee stated that she echoed most of the comments of her
38 colleagues, and the need to look at the big picture as part of this space need.
39 However, Councilmember McGehee also noted the considerable amount of time
40 discussing this with no action taken, and building up reserves to address space
41 needs, but then frequent use of those reserves for other needs over the years.
42 With the License Center being a good revenue generator for the city, Coun-
43 cilmember McGehee recognized the need to make it a good experience for cus-
44 tomers using it. While addressing several options for the License Center, includ-
45 ing repurposing the Public Works Maintenance Facility with a second story and

Regular City Council Meeting

Monday, November 14, 2016

Page 15

1 installation of an elevator, Councilmember McGehee noted the need to remain in
2 this area to retain the familiarity for repeat customers to the License Center and
3 other government services nearby. Councilmember McGehee offered her support
4 of working with property owners as suggested by staff to determine if a purchase
5 price could be negotiated for existing buildings as the most cost-effective option
6 for the city, and potential to rent out any additional space to leverage city costs for
7 their space.

8
9 Mayor Roe stated his interest in understanding more about the Public Works
10 Maintenance Facility opportunities and challenges, and how that works with the
11 remainder of the city campus. While agreeing that adjacent properties are also fa-
12 vorable options, and could address future possibilities to meet the desire of the
13 community for other facilities down the road (e.g. community center), Mayor Roe
14 noted that property adjacent to the city campus obviously made the most sense.
15 Mayor Roe expressed interest in a win-win-win for all three parties if such an op-
16 tion could be pursued. Mayor Roe suggested staff negotiating a short-term lease
17 for the current License Center space, entering into a dialogue with that property
18 owner to see if more long-term solutions were available, even an option that
19 might involve them as partners in the process if they were interested.

20
21 Councilmember Willmus agreed with Councilmember McGehee's comments that
22 various City Councils had been talking about this for a number of years, in addi-
23 tion to the additional storage needs of the Public Works and Parks Departments.
24 Councilmember Willmus opined that it was time that we compiled more detailed
25 information on parcels adjacent to the city campus seriously begin that conversa-
26 tion.

27
28 Without objection, the City Council agreed that part of that process would be to
29 initiate appraisal information on adjacent properties as applicable for a better un-
30 derstanding.

31
32 Councilmember Laliberte suggested another part of the conversation, not specifi-
33 cally related to the License Center but also applicable, should be a solution to the
34 city's current use of the former Fairview Fire Station for storage, and the potential
35 to relocate that storage as a prelude to the potential sale of that site. Coun-
36 cilmember Laliberte noted that the sale of the parcel could assist in the acquisition
37 of property closer to the city campus. Councilmember Laliberte asked that staff
38 provide an update as part of this consideration as to what was being proposed for
39 that site.

40
41 City Manager Trudgeon reported that staff had delayed further conversations on
42 the former Fire Station site understanding that its future was ultimately tied into
43 making other facility decisions. Mr. Trudgeon noted that the facility is fully used
44 for city storage and hat of the Roseville Historical Society, and needed a solution.
45

1 Mayor Roe stated his appreciation for the reminder about the Historical Society
2 needs in case a solution didn't work out with a future golf course clubhouse facili-
3 ty.
4

5 Councilmember McGehee opined that displays by the Roseville Historical Socie-
6 ty at City Hall was most appropriate. However, Councilmember McGehee sug-
7 gested storage for Park & Recreation equipment belonged somewhere more rela-
8 tive to park spaces to avoid hauling it around during off season, suggesting con-
9 sideration may be given to storage as part of some of the new park buildings con-
10 structed or as additions to them as appropriate as should have been planned in the
11 first place.
12

13 From a timing standpoint, Mayor Roe suggested, without objection from his col-
14 leagues, looking seriously at this facility issue in early 2017, especially given the
15 need to extend the current lease term.
16

17 Specific to the leased facility, and involving the Public Works Maintenance Facil-
18 ity in the discussion, as well as continuing efforts to avoid thinking in a "silo"
19 format, City Manager Trudgeon suggested starting initial discussion in December
20 of this year, then in January of 2017 get appraisals updated. However, Mr.
21 Trudgeon noted the need to sort out and direct staff on the current short-term lease
22 solution tonight
23

24 Lease-specific Discussion and Direction to Staff

25 For a lease term extension, Councilmember McGehee opined that the city
26 couldn't make much progress on a new facility in less than two years; and that
27 one year would suffice to review the big picture, find property, and construct a
28 building. Therefore, Councilmember McGehee spoke in support of a minimum
29 two-year lease.
30

31 Councilmember Willmus spoke in support of a one year lease with an annual op-
32 tion to renew.
33

34 Councilmember Etten spoke in support of a minimum two-year lease, opining that
35 not only finding a site, planning a building design, and then funding it, all while
36 addressing different needs within the community could not be accomplished any
37 sooner.
38

39 Finance Director Miller, from his perspective and in all reality, if the City Council
40 directed staff tonight to pursue a new facility on an identified site, staff could not
41 accomplish that in two years for planning, design and construction. Mr. Miller
42 opined that just the process itself and actual construction was staggering to con-
43 sider in less than two years. While appreciating the City Council's sensitivity to a
44 shorter lease term providing more options, Mr. Miller also noted that the shorter
45 lease term the less favorable options staff could negotiate with the current lease-

Regular City Council Meeting

Monday, November 14, 2016

Page 17

1 holder. Therefore, Mr. Miller stated he would strongly suggest that the City
2 Council consider something slightly different than a one-year lease.

3
4 Adding to that timing scenario, Councilmember Laliberte noted that everyone was
5 of mind in expressing dissatisfaction with the current condition of the License
6 Center. Therefore, Councilmember Laliberte opined that to just renew the lease
7 and stay in the tight confines in the unwelcoming conditions at the Center was as
8 equally undesirable. Councilmember Laliberte suggested that whether or not the
9 city was amenable to staying in those same circumstances or what improvements
10 it would consider with a short-term lease renewal also needed to be part of this
11 conversation.

12
13 Regarding the lease term, Councilmember Willmus stated he didn't have strong
14 feelings, but if the city was serious about property acquisition, the lease term
15 would become moot at some point. Councilmember Willmus stated that he hoped
16 that wouldn't be as long as three years from now.

17
18 Councilmember McGehee stated her agreement, but noted the need to balance the
19 additional space needed at the current leased space and potential acquisition of a
20 new site. Councilmember McGehee suggested that staff advise the City Council
21 about what a two-year versus a three-year lease would lease and costs entailed.

22
23 Finance Director Miller noted the good relationship between the city and building
24 owners at the current leased site, with that relationship continuing over the last
25 sixteen years. Mr. Miller clarified that while the relationship remained good be-
26 tween the parties and they continued to be willing to work with the city on a
27 short-term solution, at the end of the day the property owner was also a business
28 person, and if the city pursues extending their space further south in the facility, it
29 would displace the current tenant, with the city potentially liable for those reloca-
30 tion costs for that tenant. Mr. Miller also noted there is room on the property to
31 expand the facility north, with the city currently occupying the end cap of the fa-
32 cility. However, Mr. Miller also noted that the potential expansion on the north
33 end had been marketed by the property owner for over fifteen years, without seri-
34 ous interest shown. If the city was to consider an expansion to the north, Mr. Mil-
35 ler opined that he doubted the property owner would be interested in doing so for
36 a two-year lease, since it would not provide them much incentive to speculate as
37 to whether it could market the space to future tenants after the city's two-year
38 lease terminated and they moved to another facility. Therefore, Mr. Miller noted
39 that the longer lease term, the more options and leverage staff could negotiate.

40
41 Finance Director Miller recommended a minimum three year lease with an option
42 to renew for an additional two years. Mr. Miller opined that this provided the city
43 with a short-term solution, while providing significant motivation to get a long-
44 term solution done within three years, with the two year option available to buy
45 more time if and as needed.

1
2 Councilmember Willmus questioned if the timeline was being looked at properly;
3 and if the focus is property acquisition, the build date was irrelevant. Therefore,
4 Councilmember Willmus stated he wouldn't enter into a long-term lease if the
5 City Council consensus was to pursue acquisition that should remain the focus.
6 Councilmember Willmus suggested serious consideration should be given to relo-
7 cation expenses versus adding onto the existing infrastructure already in place at
8 the leased License Center facility.
9

10 Mayor Roe agreed with the short-term nature of a lease, stated his interest in
11 short-term leasehold improvements to address how to use the expanded space and
12 process customers with better flow and as economically as possible.
13

14 Mayor Roe suggested, that the direction to staff was for a shorter term lease, and
15 to consider inexpensive leasehold improvements based on further discussion and
16 decisions on how the city wanted to move long-term and going forward.
17

18 Councilmember McGehee agreed, but noted the additional cost to buy out the les-
19 see to the south and necessary agreement to do so by the property owner. Coun-
20 cilmember McGehee stated she wasn't sure she agreed with Councilmember
21 Willmus on his version of a short-term lease, opining it didn't allow sufficient
22 time for the city to perform its due diligence to ensure all the cohesive pieces fit
23 together, noting there were a number of moving parts and various complexities
24 involved. Councilmember McGehee with Finance Director Miller's suggestion
25 that the city could get a better lease if it was for a longer term; and stated her pre-
26 ference not to be rushed in making this decision based on an unrealistic short-term
27 lease.
28

29 Mayor Roe asked that staff return to the City Council with more information on
30 the options noted in the RCA, along with numbers associated with them. Mayor
31 Roe clarified that this didn't mean an appraisal that need to be discussed in Closed
32 Executive Session, but to just provide options versus stipulating only one path for
33 staff direction at tonight's meeting. Mayor Roe questioned if further discussion
34 on this was feasible in December given other agenda items, but suggested that
35 staff provide at a minimum numbers and lease costs, and leasehold costs involved,
36 in order to make a more informed decision.
37

38 Councilmember Willmus clarified that he wasn't suggesting a short-term lease,
39 but could agree to a two-year lease term, with his main concern being that the
40 lease term should not run longer than the acquisition date for acquiring property.
41 If the City Council had no intention of agreeing on property acquisition within
42 five years, Councilmember Willmus agreed that then by all means, staff should be
43 directed to negotiate a five-year lease term.
44

1 Mayor Roe noted that his observation was that the remainder of the body was not
2 considering a 4-5 year timeframe.

3
4 Councilmember McGehee stated her preference for a three year with two-year op-
5 tion; and Councilmember Etten stated his preference for a two- to three-year lease
6 term.

7
8 If possible, Mayor Roe asked staff to bring this discussion forward, with options
9 and associated numbers at the December meeting; with Councilmember Laliberte
10 reminding staff to include other city needs already identified as part of that con-
11 versation.

12
13 **b. Agreement for Comprehensive Recycling Services**

14 Public Works Director Marc Culver and Environmental Specialist Ryan Johnson
15 provided an update on negotiations since their last presentation and further direc-
16 tion from the City Council in October. Mr. Culver noted this update was detailed
17 in the RCA of today's date.

18
19 Mr. Culver reported on further discussions internally at Eureka and with city staff
20 including floor prices related to revenue sharing and a termination clause. The
21 options presented through negotiations were compared to the original Eureka pro-
22 posal and additional costs to the base rate higher than the 2016 base rate. Repre-
23 sentatives of Eureka were present in the audience for questions or comments at
24 the discretion of the City Council. Mr. Culver directed the City Council to the
25 chart on page 3, line 45 of the RCA for a quick comparison of the proposed op-
26 tion compared to the existing Eureka agreement. Mr. Culver also directed atten-
27 tion to revenue sharing results from the current three-year contract from 2014
28 through 2016. Mr. Culver concluded his presentation by reviewing the risks with
29 either option, seeking direction from the City Council for staff on either of two
30 proposals as outlined.

31
32 At the request of Mayor Roe, Mr. Culver referenced a draft contract prepared for
33 either option, with the original proposal represented in Attachment C and Option
34 2 provided in Attachment E.

35
36 Discussion ensued regarding current Recycling Fund reserves (estimated by staff
37 at \$90,000); total possible annual loss in revenue sharing, with 2015 used as an
38 example showing an additional cost to the city would have been approximately
39 \$22,000; and the length of the contract proposed under Option 2.

40
41 Councilmember McGehee stated her preference for Option 1 or the original pro-
42 posal, opining there was obviously some risk but based on the last five years' ex-
43 perience, it would balance out.

44

Regular City Council Meeting

Monday, November 14, 2016

Page 20

1 Councilmember Willmus noted where the disclaimer came into play, whether re-
2 lying on past performance or not, stating his concern was with the length of the
3 contract at five years versus the current three year contract. Councilmember
4 Willmus noted his discomfort in not knowing the city's costs going forward and
5 being able to fix those costs. However, Councilmember Willmus noted that the
6 Eureka proposal without revenue share was still under the proposals received
7 from other firms responding.
8

9 Mr. Culver concurred, noting Attachment B provided those other prices for the
10 same term, with the next lowest proposal at \$3.62 per unit, still over \$1.00 higher
11 and not including revenue sharing in their models. In his research of metropolitan
12 peer communities, Mr. Culver opined that \$2.56 per unit as proposed by Eureka
13 was still a very good price.
14

15 At the request of Councilmember Etten, Mr. Culver reviewed annual service costs
16 shown on Attachment B under Options 2 and 2 based on last minute negotiations
17 over the last few weeks, with some of those numbers continuing to fluctuate to a
18 small degree. Mr. Culver assured the City Council that those minor differences
19 would be refined with final negotiations and adjusted accordingly in the final con-
20 tract agreement.
21

22 While understanding Councilmember Willmus' concerns, Councilmember
23 McGehee noted the need to finalize this contract, and wasn't sure an additional
24 \$40,000 cost to the city was called for to avoid the risk if the recycling market
25 completely declined. Councilmember McGehee referenced the good and fair re-
26 lationship to-date between Eureka and the city; and expressed hope that the final
27 details could be worked out accordingly.
28

29 At the request of Councilmember McGehee as to what other communities did in
30 terms of revenue sharing, Mr. Culver reported that his research had found many
31 still working on the older model with the floor . Mr. Culver reported that the City
32 of St. Paul had just recently negotiated a contract with Eureka without a floor.
33 Mr. Culver noted that the Walter's proposal did not have a floor either; and
34 opined that this new model appeared to recognize the risk involved in the recy-
35 cling commodity market in today's world.
36

37 Referencing Councilmember Etten's question related to impacts to utility rates for
38 Roseville residential customers, Mr. Culver reported that his in-house discussions
39 tonight indicated the need for further refinement in curbside recycling rates that
40 will be presented later on tonight's agenda depending on the City Council's cho-
41 sen option tonight. If the City Council chose the no revenue sharing model, Mr.
42 Culver advised that staff would recommend a \$7/quarter fee versus the \$6.50
43 quarterly fee proposed on the fee schedule at this time for 2017; both up from the
44 current \$5.60 quarterly fee.
45

Regular City Council Meeting

Monday, November 14, 2016

Page 21

1 At the request of Mayor Roe, Mr. Culver agreed that not all providers offered a
2 revenue sharing option, and that given changes in the market, it appeared to be
3 more the exception than the rule.
4

5 Councilmember Laliberte sought additional clarification on negotiations on a
6 three- versus five-year contract term related to whether or not revenue sharing
7 was an option.
8

9 Mr. Culver reported that the original proposal was for a three-year term but prices
10 were higher with the shorter term. In response to Councilmember Willmus' point,
11 Mr. Culver noted that the city had generally operated on a three-year cycle, but
12 staff had recommended a five-year term based on previous City Council discus-
13 sions and seeking a lower pricing model by setting the price for a longer term.
14

15 Further discussion ensued regarding pricing accuracy on the RCA and attach-
16 ments; and relevancy of and comparables with the colored sections at the table on
17 Exhibit D between three- and five-year terms.
18

19 Option 2

20 Willmus moved, Laliberte seconded, approval of a revised, no revenue sharing
21 model, Agreement (Attachment D) for Comprehensive Recycling Services with
22 Neighborhood Recycling Corporation, d/b/a Eureka Recycling as presented.
23

24 Councilmember Willmus stated that it was important to note that a revenue shar-
25 ing floor had been included in past contracts. Therefore, Councilmember
26 Willmus reiterated his concern was with rates fifty cents per unit over the current
27 contract, the city needed to be frugal based on what could be a downside in the
28 commodities market.
29

30 Councilmember Laliberte admitted she saw benefits and drawbacks with either
31 option; and while not being a fan of taking risks on behalf of the city, based on
32 what she was seeing in the recovering commodities market, it could prove to work
33 in the city's favor, but there was no guarantee at this point.
34

35 Councilmember Etten stated he could not support the motion, opining that a dif-
36 ference of \$37,000 and \$40,000 represented a significant amount of money over
37 time. While admitting there may be some losses in revenue sharing for the city in
38 some years, Councilmember Etten noted the potential for the city to make money
39 in other years as well, such as the unexpected revenue this year compared to 2015.
40

41 Even though not being much of a risk taker, Councilmember McGehee stated that
42 she was inclined to take the risk in this case. With a combined expense of
43 \$40,000 but potential of revenue of \$20,000, Councilmember McGehee opined
44 that, with the sufficient cushion in the Recycling Fund to cover short-term set-
45 backs, she couldn't support this motion.

Regular City Council Meeting

Monday, November 14, 2016

Page 22

1
2 Mayor Roe stated that he understood risk avoidance, but based on a five-year con-
3 tract term and worst case scenario projections versus annual costs, he opined there
4 could be both negative and positive years. While having supported the notion of
5 getting rid of revenue sharing, Mayor Roe stated he was inclined, based on the
6 additional information presented tonight to support not eliminating it completely
7 at this time, and therefore would be voting in opposition to this motion at this
8 time.

9 **Roll Call**

10 **Ayes:** Willmus.

11 **Nays:** Laliberte, Etten, McGehee and Roe.

12 **Motion failed.**

13
14 Option 1

15 Etten moved, McGehee seconded, approval of the original Agreement for Com-
16 prehensive Recycling Services (Attachment C) with Neighborhood Recycling
17 Corporation, d/b/a Eureka Recycling as presented.

18
19 **Roll Call**

20 **Ayes:** Laliberte, Etten, McGehee and Roe.

21 **Nays:** Willmus.

22 **Motion carried**

23 **Recess**

24 Mayor Roe recessed the meeting at approximately 8:12 p.m., and reconvened at approximately
25 8:19 p.m.

26
27 **c. City Campus Solar Installation Project**

28 Public Works Director Marc Culver provided an update on solar installation o the
29 city campus, as detailed in the RCA and attachments. Mr. Culver referenced a
30 bench handout providing a short- and long-term comparison of Power Purchase
31 Agreement (PPA) rates, buyout and Xcel Energy rates for the City Hall and Pub-
32 lic Works buildings.

33
34 Representing Sundial Solar, Mr. Culver introduced Mr. Art Kroll and **Mr. Paul**
35 **Christianson**, both having worked with the city over the last eighteen months to
36 develop this project.

37
38 With assistance as needed by Mr. Kroll, Mr. Culver provided a quick review of
39 the proposal, and updates to consider these two buildings rather than the original
40 proposal for the Skating Center roof due to the age and condition of the roof, and
41 potential capital improvements intended before the solar project's investment end
42 at twenty-five years. Mr. Culver also noted that, during the detailed engineering
43 of the Skating Center roof, it was found that the arena and roof supports and sub-
44 structure would need shoring up to meet current building codes and support a so-
45 lar array. Mr. Culver noted this would also involve gaining access to the beams

Regular City Council Meeting

Monday, November 14, 2016

Page 23

1 and over the ice surface, taking it out of commission for several months and dur-
2 ing heavy usage months. According to the current capital improvement program
3 (CIP) schedule, Mr. Culver noted the roof would be considered for major rehabili-
4 tation five years from now. Therefore, Mr. Culver reported that Sundial and staff
5 had looked to other available roofs on the city campus, resulting in the new pro-
6 posal for two smaller arrays on the newer roof portions of the City Hall/Fire De-
7 partment and Public Works Maintenance facilities as shown on the display.
8

9 Mr. Culver reviewed and defined what would be involved in the installation as de-
10 tailed in the various draft attachments to the RCA. Mr. Culver advised that staff
11 and Sundial were seeking City Council action for a non-binding Letter of Intent as
12 identified in the RCA based on the draft agreements; and emphasized that once
13 final documents and engineering had been completed, the documents would re-
14 turn for approval by the City Council.
15

16 Discussion ensued regarding charts provided and displayed (Attachment D)p pro-
17 visions of the PPA and annual purchases and energy savings projected; initial in-
18 vestment and actual city costs; vested interests of the city and investor in keeping
19 the system operational; and payoff term under a standard solar financing scenario.
20

21 Councilmember McGehee noted previous presentations and arrangements for a
22 different program and shorter period of time.
23

24 Mr. Culver clarified that the city had applied for Made in Minnesota Grants for
25 the last three years involving agreements with different solar developers who had
26 submitted applications for the city, and if successful would have installed panels
27 on roofs with the city receiving up to 40 K2H based on the grant provisions and
28 an annual payment of \$13,000 for ten years until the system had been paid in full.
29 However, Mr. Culver further clarified that the city would have no money invested
30 in those systems, financed by a developer and reimbursed through grant awards.
31 Mr. Culver noted that only a small percentage of those applications are actually
32 awarded; while this installation is financed independently, and not relying on a
33 lottery or grant system.
34

35 At the request of Councilmember Laliberte, Mr. Culver reviewed language in the
36 second paragraph of the PPA with the Letter of Intent not binding, but was basi-
37 cally a mutual agreement for the city and Sundial to work together in good faith
38 while Sundial puts more money into exploring the engineering of the system.
39 Councilmember Laliberte referenced earlier conversations tonight regarding a re-
40 view of existing buildings on the city campus that might be repurposed; and ques-
41 tioned how that might impact this installation.
42

43 Mayor Roe noted the discussion involved the Public Works Maintenance facility,
44 its repurposing and/or relocation, in addition to other pending City Council dis-
45 cussions. Mayor Roe noted that he had wondered if the new Fire Station roof

Regular City Council Meeting

Monday, November 14, 2016

Page 24

1 may make more sense as a better option for the city given those pending issues,
2 and asked for staff's feedback on that.

3
4 Mr. Culver advised that the Fire Station roof had been reviewed and what could
5 be installed, but noted that it would be a much smaller installation. Even with an
6 installation on the City Hall/Police Department and Public Works Maintenance
7 facilities, Mr. Culver advised that those sizes of installations were considered
8 "small potatoes" for Kenyon to work on; therefore the attempt was to make the
9 installation as large as possible. Mr. Culver reported that the only reason the city
10 was able have Kenyon consider this smaller project was that they were seeing it as
11 an extension of a larger system in the area. While it would not be impossible to
12 bring the Fire Station into the equation, Mr. Culver noted it would change the
13 economics. While not having gotten into much detail at this point, Mr. Culver
14 further reported that in initial discussions with City Manager Trudgeon, even if
15 the existing Public Works Maintenance facility was repurposed and the mainte-
16 nance function moved elsewhere, the shell of the building wouldn't change and
17 simply involve walls and interior space reconfiguration and repurposing. Without
18 having talked to an architect on-site, Mr. Culver opined that adding a second floor
19 to the Public Works Maintenance facility as it is designed would be difficult and
20 expensive.

21
22 While agreeing that the Maintenance facility is basically a large garage, and also
23 agreeing that it probably wasn't feasible to add a second floor, Mayor Roe noted
24 one outcome of the pending facilities study may be that the shell of the building is
25 no longer there; thus addressing the city's risk level.

26
27 Mr. Culver agreed that may be a possibility; but opined it would be more cost-
28 effective to repurpose the existing building, after formal discussions with an arch-
29 itect about that feasibility. Mr. Culver noted part of that could involve lowering
30 the tall ceilings of installing a false ceiling lower and repurposing the open space
31 into a License Center or some other use. However, Mr. Culver noted the intent
32 was that repurposing the building wasn't necessarily exclusive for installation of
33 solar panels and keeping them operational for the twenty-five year term of the in-
34 stallation.

35
36 At the notice of Councilmember McGehee and previous discussions earlier today,
37 Mr. Culver advised that the preliminary financial analysis predictions of the twenty-
38 five years of the long-term PPA program shown as \$105,000 (RCA, page 2,
39 line 39) was inaccurate, and was actually \$242,000.

40
41 Councilmember McGehee further noted the exit clause detailed in line 98 of the
42 RCA and the projected \$242,000 didn't appeal to her; opining she liked the previ-
43 ous lottery program as a smaller experiment to begin with.
44

1 Mr. Culver apologized for not providing more detail for the city's risk in his
2 presentation tonight, advising that after distribution of the meeting packets, city
3 staff and Sundial representatives had a breakthrough in negotiations for that item,
4 with an energy performance guarantee agreement with Sundial that would elimi-
5 nate that risk factor with Xcel Energy rates that may fluctuate and be lower than
6 the initial contractual energy purchase rates. Mr. Culver noted this had been a
7 concern he shared as well until these most recent negotiations.

8
9 Councilmember McGehee stated there were many things concerning her related to
10 the city's potential risk.

11
12 Mr. Culver noted that, the only significant risk he saw to the city was if there was
13 an unexpected but major maintenance on a roof with a solar array, if for more
14 than 72-hour in a 60-day period, the city would be liable to pay the power provid-
15 er for that lost power, since they were depending on that power production to help
16 pay for the system and their financing of it.

17
18 At the prompting of Councilmember McGehee, Mr. Culver addressed natural dis-
19 asters (e.g. fire, storm, or collapse) if the system could not be salvaged or returned
20 to that roof, noting the force Majeure clause (lines 100-104 of the RCA) that cov-
21 ered a longer period of time to restore operations, allowing that the power provid-
22 er can abandon the system at which time the city would be stuck with it. If it still
23 works and can still generate power, Mr. Culver advised it would not be an issue,
24 but otherwise the city would need to deal with the salvage and removal of the
25 equipment from the site.

26
27 Councilmember Willmus opined that this was similar to his concerns with the Re-
28 cycling contract and term. When he considered the Made in Minnesota proposals,
29 with a shorter horizon, Councilmember Willmus stated that he found those
30 agreements more attractive. Given the pending city campus discussions and relat-
31 ed issues, Councilmember Willmus stated that he wasn't sure he was ready to
32 proceed at this point with a Letter of Intent with Sundial Solar as presented.

33
34 **Willmus moved, McGehee seconded, WITHHOLDING entering into a Letter**
35 **of Intent with Sundial Solar for installation of a 450 kW Photovoltaic System**
36 **proposed for the roofs of City Hall and the Maintenance Facility, until com-**
37 **pletion of the analysis of buildings on the city hall campus was completed.**

38
39 Councilmember McGehee agreed that a variety of concerns for her included the
40 duration of the agreement, ultimate payback for the city, disposal of panels should
41 the city end up purchasing them and how to manage them, and other contract de-
42 tails as she had addressed to Mr. Culver earlier today and some tonight. With so
43 many questions still unanswered for her, Councilmember McGehee agreed with
44 the delay until city campus discussions and facilities had been reviewed.
45

1 Mayor Roe offered an opportunity for public comment, with no one appearing to
2 speak.

3
4 Councilmember Etten asked if this motion pauses the process for possibly up to
5 six month and no Letter of Intent was in place, would something similar be con-
6 sidered in the future or would the process need to start all over again.

7
8 Mr. Kroll responded that he thought the discussions could generally pick-up
9 where it was currently, and even if Kenyon didn't share those sentiments, there
10 were other investors willing to look at projects of this nature. Mr. Kroll noted that
11 economics continued to change with solar rates, resulting in the savings spread for
12 the city being better or worse. While those factors could change, Mr. Kroll ad-
13 vised that as far as Sundial's willingness to work with the City of Roseville, their
14 interest would remain intact.

15
16 Councilmember Etten spoke in opposition to the motion, opining he wasn't sure
17 the existing buildings identified for these solar installations would be taken off
18 line to the extent it would involve the solar panels. Councilmember Etten further
19 opined that if the city built additional facility space, he didn't see the city taking
20 down existing buildings to construct new ones. Therefore, Councilmember Etten
21 stated his preference to move forward with this project that would provide some
22 benefit to the city.

23
24 Councilmember Laliberte spoke in support of the motion to take a pause; along
25 with fast tracking discussions on additional city needs first before making a deci-
26 sion on this project.

27
28 As stated, Mayor Roe recognized that the market place for solar continued to
29 evolve; and whether six months or longer from now, there may be other factors in
30 the marketplace that may or may not work to the city's benefit. Therefore, Mayor
31 Roe spoke in support of the motion.

32
33 Councilmember Etten noted there may be fewer solar credits available at that time
34 as well.

35 **Roll Call**

36 **Ayes:** Willmus, Laliberte, McGehee and Roe.

37 **Nays:** Etten.

38 **Motion carried.**

39
40 **d. Consider Adopting the 2017 Utility Rate Adjustments**

41 Finance Director Chris Miller provided a presentation that was complimentary to
42 the detail provided in the RCA of today's date; along with the bench handout in-
43 corporated into the RCA, providing a projected analysis of the water, sanitary
44 sewer and recycling utility funds and their current and proposed rate structures.
45

Regular City Council Meeting

Monday, November 14, 2016

Page 27

1 Finance Director Miller provided a rate overview, incorporating updated figures
2 for the twenty-year CIP, and rate increases and/or decreases in each utility fund,
3 along with including the net change as projected in Recycling Revenue Sharing
4 under the recycling contract as approved earlier tonight.

5
6 Finance Director Miler advised that staff had prepared a draft resolution establish-
7 ing the 2017 utility rates for City Council consideration tonight. However, Mr.
8 Miller suggested the resolution could await adoption at a future meeting.

9
10 On page 4 of the RCA, Councilmember Etten noted expenses for stormwater-
11 related capital and “other services and charges,” asking if that could be brought
12 down further.

13
14 Based on Mr. Culver’s comments earlier tonight, Finance Director Miller advised
15 that was a possibility to shave off further money for the Stormwater Fund that
16 hadn’t been factored into the rates yet, but extracted during staff’s rate analysis.
17 However, Mr. Miller noted this plan only occurs every ten years, and therefore
18 was not considered part of the revenue stream. Based on City Council direction
19 for using reserves for one-time costs versus applying them to base rates, Mr. Mil-
20 ler advised this was the recommendation in this case.

21
22 Councilmember Etten noted comments he’d heard from residents and their frus-
23 trations in losing the senior discount, not based on federal income guidelines
24 through Ramsey County records. Councilmember Etten asked staff is there was
25 any way to include more households or another barometer that could be used to
26 tie a higher income threshold into that used by Ramsey County.

27
28 Finance Director Miller advised that, as of now, there were 3-4 programs tied to
29 income at the 160% of federal income guidelines; with other energy companies
30 offering financial assistance programs for residents as well. Mr. Miller noted the
31 city might have more local control with its rate structure, but if identifying the
32 demographic group and requested financial relief, it would simply make the rate
33 structure more favorable for another segment and less favorable for the remaining
34 segments. Mr. Miller stated the question for the City Council was where it want-
35 ed to provide the relief; and since the city doesn’t verify incomes and relied on
36 applications for other programs through Ramsey County, in order to revise the
37 program or demographic, it would involve additional city administrative costs to
38 implement. Mr. Miller noted this was part of the discussion several years ago
39 when the City Council changed the discount program from age to income veri-
40 fied. Mr. Miller advised that one year ago, the city had nineteen households in-
41 volved in the discount program, and now it had twenty-nine households. Mr. Mil-
42 ler opined that he was confident there were more that qualified in Roseville, but
43 for one reason or another, chose not to apply for reduced rates via an income veri-
44 fication process.

45

Regular City Council Meeting

Monday, November 14, 2016

Page 28

1 At the request of Mayor Roe, Finance Director Miller clarified that the increase of
2 5.4% in the CIP was a result of updated assumptions and projections, including
3 some not identified before. Mr. Miller reported that each department had been
4 challenged to seriously review those assumptions, which they had done, providing
5 for a recalibration and more accuracy in the numbers, part of what was driving an
6 increase in base fees for 2017.

7
8 Mayor Roe thanked staff for the bench handout providing the analysis of how
9 rates were achieved, allowing him to see cost inputs and rate needs in various cat-
10 egories, along with the capital areas. Mayor Roe encouraged staff to incorporate
11 this information with the RCA on the website for public information, duly noted
12 by City Manager Trudgeon.

13
14 Councilmember McGehee referenced, and displayed, her previous calculations
15 and considerations entitled, "Utility Rate Facts and Questions," ~~attached hereto~~
16 ~~and made a part hereof~~. Councilmember McGehee noted this involved her pref-
17 erence of a different funding structure for utility rates, opining the current system
18 was unfair and impacts of the fee were burdensome for homeowners, especially
19 those living in lower prices homes with the link to their home's value. Coun-
20 cilmember McGehee suggested increasing the city's tax levy by 15% that would
21 actually result in saving money for all single-family homeowners and in the long
22 run make the system more equitable citywide. Councilmember McGehee noted
23 that the city could then pay for its fire station, parks public safety services, and in-
24 frastructure through that levy increase while providing utility rate relief to almost
25 every homeowner in Roseville without reducing upkeep and maintenance on the
26 city's infrastructure system. Councilmember McGehee asked her colleagues to
27 reconsider her proposal rather than continuing to penalize residents through its
28 current utility fee and rate structure.

29
30 Mayor Roe opined this involved a philosophical decision as to how the city chose
31 to pay for its infrastructure. Mayor Roe stated a question he'd want to understand
32 better was a correlation between a home's value and the ability to pay. Under
33 Councilmember McGehee's suggested revenue source, Mayor Roe noted that by
34 basically using the property tax system, a resident was paying for water provision
35 based on the value of their home through the tax system. Mayor Roe stated his
36 question was whether that made sense or not that may result in a higher rate based
37 on that value than the current flat fee used. Mayor Roe also noted the tax exempt
38 properties that would no longer pay utility rates under Councilmember McGe-
39 hee's proposal, and impacts for businesses that already pay significantly more in
40 property taxes.

41
42 As suggested by Finance Director Miller, Councilmember Willmus suggested this
43 2017 utility rate proposal not be adopted tonight, but at the December 5, 2016
44 meeting to allow the community to review, digest and provide feedback on it.
45

Public Comment

Roger Hess, Jr. 1906 Wagner Place

Mr. Hess noted comparisons with other communities; but suggested a comparison if the City of St. Paul was to take over the Roseville water system, as it did for other suburbs. Mr. Hess opined that there must be a reason they use that system, and asked staff to compare the current system versus St. Paul taking over the system. Mr. Hess thanked Councilmember McGehee for out-of-the-box ideas brought forward for consideration. Mr. Hess opined that it would be nice if other Councilmembers brought forward similar ideas for consideration.

15. Business Items – Presentations/Discussions

a. Consider Changes to City Code, Chapter 314.05: the 2017 Fee Schedule

Finance Director Miller referenced an updated copy of the proposed 2017 Fee Schedule, provided as a bench handout and replacing the schedule included as an attachment to the RCA of today's date. Mr. Miller noted the revised schedule included some fees inadvertently omitted in the previous draft, along with additional corrections upon further staff review. Mr. Miller noted that most fees are grouped by department, and included more recommended changes this year given staff's detailed review line by line. Mr. Miller advised that the fees were intended to be representative of actual city costs in providing a particular service.

Mayor Roe asked that staff go through the document with the items highlighted as new and/or revised fees. Finance Director Miller deferred to Departments Head available and related rationale for the proposed fee changes. Individual Councilmembers asked questions of Department Heads as applicable during the presentation.

Public Works Department (page 2)

Mr. Culver noted a new fee for **curb stop turn-on/off** fees, shown as a trip fee; estimating approximately 30-40 annually at this time, but unsure of how that may increase without an identified way to recoup city staff and equipment resources involved.

Mr. Culver noted this **erosion control escrow fee** had been brought to the City Council's attention earlier this fall for clarification, with staff putting numbers to ideas and establishing new thresholds involving the need for erosion control permits at an amount less than the current fee and involving smaller things in the city's shoreline district. Mr. Culver advised the intent was to ensure that staff was able to monitor these areas without charging the full fee for residents and smaller projects and of less than one-quarter acre (e.g. minor grading, etc.).

Fire Department (page 3 & 4)

Fire Chief O'Neill addressed the increase in **commercial vent hood inspections, stand-alone temporary fireworks sales, and inspections of underground fuel**

1 **storage tank removals.** Chief O’Neill also noted a proposed increase in **open**
2 **burning permit fees** and for the cost of required notices to area properties.

3
4 Public Works Department (page 4)

5 Mr. Culver addressed another earlier City Council discussion and new for **private**
6 **hydrant inspection** costs depending on the number.

7
8 Community Development Department (page 5)

9 Community Development Director Collins advised that some of these fees were a
10 result of many changes within the department as work flow was tracked more ac-
11 curately with the integration of the new Accela software program.

12
13 Ms. Collins addressed an **additional fee for rentals failing to submit renewals**
14 **within 60-days** of expiration of the current registrations. Ms. Collins advised that
15 this was inadvertently omitted in previous fee scheduled. Ms. Collins also noted
16 the addition of a **late renewal fee for rental registrations.** Building Codes Co-
17 ordinator Dave Englund confirmed that this was a follow-up defined on new rent-
18 al license application forms.

19
20 Public Works Department (page 5)

21 Mr. Culver addressed a new fee for **stormwater impact fees**, also discussed by
22 the City Council earlier this year; and **adjustments for street patching** based on
23 actual costs.

24
25 Mr. Culver further addressed new **sump pump waiver fees** and **monthly sur-**
26 **charge fees.**

27
28 Mr. Culver advised that the **sump pump waiver and surcharge fees** were in-
29 tended to allow the city enforcement capabilities under current city code to en-
30 courage property owners to separate their direct discharges of sump pumps into
31 the sanitary sewer system to avoid the city being charged by the Metropolitan
32 Council for treating that water. Mr. Culver noted the waiver would apply if dis-
33 connecting the sump pump would result in safety or property issues, and allow a
34 property owner temporary reprieve to discharge into the sanitary sewer system
35 until the problem had been resolved. Mr. Culver clarified that this would involve
36 a one year annual renewal.

37
38 Regarding the new stormwater impact fee, Councilmember Laliberte asked if that
39 one-time fee of \$22.50 would be sufficient. Mr. Culver stated that remained an
40 unknown until put into play and after a year’s experience.

41
42 Community Development Department (page 5)

43 Ms. Collins reviewed the current 2% technology fee applied, and the new fee for
44 the **building permit technology fee** on the Planning Division side. Ms. Collins
45 noted that this fee is essentially embedded into current fees, but the Accela soft-

1 ware calculated it as a separate fee based on valuations and were incorporated into
2 building permit fees.

3
4 At the request of Councilmember Willmus, Ms. Collins advised that it was diffi-
5 cult to project the revenue at this point other than based on past numbers of build-
6 ing permits issued and their valuation. Ms. Collins noted that, when staff had ini-
7 tially proposed the Accela program, the cost of the software had been pro-
8 grammed into fees to offset the cost of the program, along with implementation
9 and maintenance of the software built into 2017 fees. Ms. Collins advised that
10 staff would review the numbers after the first year using the new software pro-
11 gram and make adjustments accordingly. At the further request of Councilmem-
12 ber Willmus, Ms. Collins advised that the 2% technology fee had been used in the
13 past with previous permit software, and was typical of most other communities.

14
15 On page 7, Councilmember Willmus noted a **reduction in administrative fines**
16 **for city code and property use violations**, with Ms. Collins advising that this
17 was an effort by staff to clarify the two and distinguish them from another for eas-
18 ier tracking. City Manager Trudgeon noted that the Nuisance Fee was listed
19 elsewhere at \$100.00.

20
21 Fire Chief O'Neill reviewed **building permit and plan review fees** (page 10) for
22 new construction and existing building remodels. While these inspections had
23 been performed in the past, Chief O'Neill noted they had not been identified as a
24 cost of doing business, and now were mirrored after the building department's
25 valuation, typically involving smaller jobs however. Chief O'Neill noted that
26 most renovations were under \$20,000 in value, and therefore while attempting to
27 keep the fees small, the department was seeking to break even at a \$93/hour fee.
28 If the inspections involved re-inspections, Chief O'Neill admitted these fees
29 would come nowhere near covering expenses or breaking even. However, Chief
30 O'Neill opined that this will take the steps necessary to get closer to the staff re-
31 sources required.

32
33 Councilmember Willmus asked if both commercial and residential inspections
34 were lumped together.

35
36 Chief O'Neill clarified that the department typically didn't perform residential in-
37 spections unless installing a sprinkler system; and would typically review building
38 permit data and conduct a plan review, with those costs currently included in resi-
39 dential building permit fees.

40
41 If the plan review fee is 65% of the commercial permit fee, Councilmember
42 McGehee asked if there was a cap, noting \$93/hour didn't allow very long for re-
43 view versus the time for a more complex plan and related review.
44

1 Chief O'Neill responded that staff didn't foresee extensive fees, since most plans
2 are pretty straight forward, and the average existing permit pulled took about one
3 hour.
4

5 Building Permit and Plan Review Fees (continued – page 12)

6 Ms. Collins addressed **new fees for residential driveway permits and expansions,**
7 **and shed permits.** At the request of Mayor Roe, Ms. Collins and Mr. Englund
8 clarified that a residential driveway permit was \$55, but expansion was set
9 at \$75 as more staff time was required to review impervious calculations.

10
11 Councilmember Willmus suggested looking at the area being expanded and how
12 to base the fee depending on the actual square footage of the expansion to justify
13 the cost of the fee for that expansion.
14

15 After a brief discussion, staff was directed by the City Council to review and clarify
16 language for better public understanding of whether or not driveways were included
17 as part of an overall building permit for a new home. Ms. Collins duly noted these
18 requests.
19

20 Councilmember McGehee thanked staff for **reducing the fee for backflow preventers**
21 to encourage people to have them installed.
22

23 (Page 14)

24 Ms. Collins noted the new fee for **Certificates of Occupancy,** noting it took staff
25 time to process and prepare them.
26

27 After a brief discussion, staff clarified that they include the fee as part of a building
28 permit application, but list it as part of that itemization of administrative costs
29 involved.
30

31 Ms. Collins noted the **new parking lot repair fee** was to address staff time involved
32 in reviewing the plan and reviewing impervious area.
33

34 Community Development Department Misc. Fees (Page 15)

35 Ms. Collins reviewed the **new landscape improvement permit fee** for staff's review
36 of impervious coverage on a site seeking improvement on residential lots (e.g. patios,
37 accessory structures, etc.). Ms. Collins noted that many of these things appear on
38 lots without a building permit being pulled or staff's knowledge, but sometimes
39 significantly increasing impervious coverage on a site and impacting those parcels
40 and adjacent policies, as was recently realized with a land use application on
41 Gluek Lane.
42

43 Councilmember Willmus asked staff to clarify a minimum type of project, with
44 Ms. Collins advising the intent could be addressing the addition of patios on

1 smaller lots, forcing staff to look at the percentage of existing impervious surface
2 coverage.

3
4 Mayor Roe noted it would be essentially a hardscape or impervious surface im-
5 provement permit.

6
7 Councilmember McGehee spoke in favor of that, opining that erosion problems
8 are one of the biggest problems in the community due to increasing impervious
9 surfaces, even though there are regulations in place, no one seems to adhere to
10 them.

11
12 The other new fees, including **Planned Unit Developments**, and **Public Assis-**
13 **tance fees for applications and escrow**, Ms. Collins noted were previously re-
14 viewed and approved by the City Council based on the newly adopted Public As-
15 sistance Policy.

16
17 Mayor Roe asked that staff clarify and consider a name other than “public assis-
18 tance” to avoid misunderstandings by the public based on other connotations of
19 the term.

20
21 Specific to the Public Assistance application fee set at \$1,500, City Attorney
22 Gaughan suggested staff denote that as the initial or minimum amount for escrow
23 versus giving the impression it was capped at that amount. Mr. Gaughan noted
24 this would allow for additional funds should a project prove highly complex and
25 allow the escrow account to city to replenished.

26
27 Ms. Collins agreed that should apply to any escrow account, and if addressed here
28 it should be done consistently throughout.

29
30 Mr. Culver noted that the existing footnote D in the Subdivision area indicated
31 that and could be extended to include public assistance applications accordingly;
32 with Ms. Collins duly noting that suggestion.

33
34 Landscape Plan Escrow (page 16)

35 Ms. Collins clarified that staff estimated the escrow amount needed for ‘**land-**
36 **scape plans**’ based on the scale of a project and to incorporated the time for the
37 arborist to review tree preservation and restoration plans as applicable.

38
39 Park Dedication Fees (Page 4)

40 Parks & Recreation Director Brokke advised that the Parks & Recreation Com-
41 mission had closely tracked this over the last fifteen years, and based on that data
42 was recommending the increase in residential fees, and increase for non-
43 residential fees as noted. Mr. Brokke advised that this was done largely because
44 of its correlation of the quality of the park system, past and future substantial in-
45 vestments made to the system, and future investments identified in the CIP yet to

1 be done. Mr. Brokke opined that this provided another funding resource for the
2 system, with residents consistently indicating their interest in maintaining a high
3 quality park system. Mr. Brokke advised these fees were being recommended us-
4 ing comparative data in terms of other communities and was consistent, as noted
5 in the matrix displayed of those comparisons by city for residential and commer-
6 cial park dedication fees in 2015 and in 2016 to-date, averaging \$3,900 per unit
7 for residential properties.

8
9 Councilmember McGehee noted some of the commercial properties having a con-
10 siderable portion of their site as a parking lot, very low in terms of cost and as-
11 sessed value, but at the same price per acre based on the proposed percentages.
12 Councilmember McGehee asked how staff figured in that trade-off.

13
14 Mr. Brokke advised that it proved more financially positive for Roseville to use
15 the percentage route.

16
17 Mayor Roe noted it was interesting to see the various and different approaches
18 used among other cities.

19
20 As with the proposed 2017 utility fees, Mayor Roe asked that residents and indi-
21 vidual Councilmembers provide any questions and their feedback to staff between
22 now and the December 5, 2016 meeting at which time those schedules will be
23 considered for adoption.

24
25 **Motion to Extend Meeting Curfew**

26 Etten moved, McGehee seconded, to extend the meeting curfew to complete item 15b.

27
28 **Roll Call**

29 **Ayes:** Willmus, Laliberte, Etten, McGehee and Roe.

30 **Nays:** None.

31 **b. Water Supply Plan**

32 Mr. Culver introduced Roseville Civil Engineer Luke Sandstrom who presented a
33 brief review summarizing the Local Water Supply Plan Template – Third Genera-
34 tion for 2016 – 2018 (Attachment A). Mr. Sandstrom advised that the Public
35 Works, Environment and Transportation Commission (PWETC) had seen the
36 same presentation at their meeting for their feedback.

37
38 Mr. Sandstrom provided a background of the plan done every ten years, and out-
39 lined the three parts of the plan: inventory, emergency planning, and water con-
40 servation. Mr. Sandstrom advised that tonight's presentation and discussion
41 would focus on water conservation, as per recent adoption of a state statute man-
42 dating it.

43
44 Mr. Sandstrom's presentation included those items being mandated, and those
45 items already being done by the City of Roseville, including a tiered and seasonal

Regular City Council Meeting

Monday, November 14, 2016

Page 35

1 rate structure, CIP, system improvements and stormwater re-use projects, and re-
2 mote read meters.

3
4 After this same presentation, Mr. Sandstrom reviewed the recommendations made
5 by the PWETC, including: continue the annual CIP; identify all unmetered city-
6 owned facilities and install meters; install smart irrigation meters at city-owned
7 facilities as a pilot program and subsequent results; educate the public on water
8 conservation options; and pursue grant funding for rebate programs.

9
10 Mr. Culver asked the City Council for their additional input on what to include in
11 the Water Plan for conservation-related efforts; and what the city was willing to
12 commit to as the Plan goes out for agency review by year-end.

13
14 Regarding smart irrigation, Mayor Roe asked if the Park Renewal Program irriga-
15 tion systems were installed as smart systems as part of that effort.

16
17 Mr. Culver responded that he wasn't sure, other than for the Upper Villa Park im-
18 provements with that stormwater management system based on weather forecasts
19 and would pump out storage capacity to make itself ready for an upcoming storm.
20 Mr. Culver further noted that there were some sensors and a wireless system con-
21 trolled from City Hall based on weather and other steps with the purpose to re-
22 duce total water usages.

23
24 Mayor Roe noted it was nice to see some credits already applied for Roseville ef-
25 forts to-date.

26
27 Councilmember McGehee opined that the city could improved its tiered rates sys-
28 tem; and suggested offering the public some rebates for low flow toilets or energy
29 efficient appliances given the broad selection available and as utilized by other
30 communities. Councilmember McGehee suggested advertising such rebates
31 should be part of the broader education program to show how much a household
32 could save.

33
34 Mayor Roe noted some communities were funding these rebates through grant
35 programs.

36
37 Mr. Sandstrom noted the Metropolitan Council had awarded grants, using Clean
38 Water Funds, to nineteen communities, which they had used to fund those rebate
39 programs. Mr. Sandstrom opined that the city may be able to apply for funds in
40 the fall of 2017 during the next grant cycle.

41
42 Councilmember Etten spoke in favor of pursuing grant applications as appropri-
43 ate; opining that many efforts are outdoor-related and reimbursed by other agen-
44 cies. Using lawn watering as an example, Councilmember Etten suggested en-
45 couraging residents to install smart irrigation systems or turf reduction programs,

Regular City Council Meeting

Monday, November 14, 2016

Page 36

1 perhaps by offering an incentive program through education and resulting in a
2 huge impact. Councilmember Etten suggested concentrating on outdoor water
3 usage where the greatest amount seemed to be used in the community. Coun-
4 councilmember Etten expressed his interest in pursuing a water use restriction ordi-
5 nance, noting the need to educate the public on the best time of day for irrigating
6 to avoid excessive water loss in the afternoon; and to address those times of great
7 drought in the community.

8
9 Mr. Culver noted a lot of communities have ongoing odd/even regulations and
10 others that kick in when water demand is high or during extended drought peri-
11 ods. While odd/even regulations don't necessarily conserve water, Mr. Culver ad-
12 vised that it did allow a city to have a ready supply of water by reducing peaks
13 and spreading it out for maximum demands.

14
15 Mayor Roe suggested looking at an irrigation-based surcharge based on usage
16 comparisons if exceeding a certain amount depending on how it was calculated.
17 If a significant increase in usage was seen over the average for irrigation purpos-
18 es, Mayor Roe suggested a financial penalty be applied. Also, Mayor Roe sug-
19 gested addressing usage on the commercial side beyond meter sizes; and perhaps
20 not encouraging high commercial water uses to develop in the community, or at
21 least not incentivize them.

22
23 Without objection, Mayor Roe directed staff to take this additional City Council
24 feedback to the PWETC for their further vetting and discussion.

25
26 Councilmember McGehee reported anecdotally on her experience with rain bar-
27 rels and heavy rainfalls this year; and her favorable impression with how easy
28 they were to use and their efficiencies.

29
30 Mayor Roe noted there were products available to meter rain barrels to control
31 when to release stored water or for a drip irrigation system at lower pressures.

32
33 At the request of Councilmember Willmus, Mr. Culver reported that the city did
34 not currently have a separate irrigation meter in most city facilities. If residential
35 and commercial irrigation systems were on a separate meter, Mr. Culver advised
36 that the city could charge a higher rate for those irrigation purposes only. At the
37 further request of Councilmember Willmus, Mr. Culver advised that there was a
38 code application for new systems accordingly, with residential applications need-
39 ing city code revisions beyond the current base fee per meter.

40
41 Councilmember Laliberte opined that education, education, education should be
42 the focus as it was the easiest and least expensive thing to do. While recognizing
43 the things Roseville was already doing as noted in staff's presentation, Coun-
44 councilmember Laliberte opined that more could be done.
45

1 Councilmember McGehee suggested encouraging the public to use less grass, and
2 more shrubs or mulch versus the typical lawn.
3

4 Councilmember noted the report provided a list of top commercial water users in
5 Roseville or on the Roseville system.
6

7 Mr. Culver noted there were several Maplewood commercial users on the Rose-
8 ville water system, as the City of Maplewood had no water main along Rice
9 Street, with all east side properties on Rice Street getting their water from Rose-
10 ville.
11

12 Councilmember Etten noted that Walmart was shown as #7 in the list of high us-
13 ers at 8 million gallons, while the much larger Rosedale Center complex using
14 13.6 million gallons. Given the considerable difference in size of the two proper-
15 ties, Councilmember Etten asked why there wasn't more of a differential in their
16 water usage.
17

18 Discussion ensued as to how much was associated with the outside sprinkler sys-
19 tem; suggestions for the Department of Natural Resources or Department of
20 Health to audit Roseville businesses and their water usage to help them not only
21 save water but also money for the benefit of the city and the business.
22

23 Councilmember Willmus noted the Walmart parking lot was the first commercial
24 property required to include green areas in their parking lot; opining that the sea
25 of asphalt surrounding those areas and the intense heat radiating from them may
26 impact the amount of water required to keep them green.
27

28 Since that outside irrigation system was already on a separate meter, Mayor Roe
29 suggested a smart irrigation system might be a good fit for them.
30

31 **16. City Manager Future Agenda Review**
32

33 **17. Councilmember-Initiated Items for Future Meetings**
34

35 **18. Adjourn Meeting**

36 Etten moved, Laliberte seconded, adjournment of the meeting at approximately 10:18
37 p.m.

38 **Roll Call**

39 **Ayes:** Willmus, Laliberte, Etten, McGehee and Roe.

40 **Nays:** None.
41

42 _____
Daniel J. Roe, Mayor

43 ATTEST:

44 _____
45 Patrick T. Trudgeon, City Manager

