



Public Works, Environment and Transportation Commission Agenda

Tuesday, June 25, 2024

6:30 PM

City Council Chambers

Members of the public who wish speak during public comment or an agenda item during this meeting can do so virtually by registering at www.cityofroseville.com/attendmeeting

(Any times listed are approximate – please note that items may be earlier or later than listed on the agenda)

- 6:30 p.m. **1. Roll Call**
- 6:32 p.m. **2. Public Comments**
- 6:34 p.m. **3. Approval of Meeting Minutes**
 - a. Approve May Minutes
- 6:35 p.m. **4. Communication Items**
 - a. Communication Items
- 6:45 p.m. **5. Civic Campus Master Plan Update**
 - a. Civic Campus Project Update
- 7:15 p.m. **6. Bike Plan Update**
 - a. Bike Plan Update
- 7:45 p.m. **7. City Survey – Public Works Review**
 - a. 2024 Community Survey – Public Work Item Review
- 8:00 p.m. **8. Prepare for PWETC / City Council Joint Meeting**
 - a. City Council Joint Meeting Discussion Items
- 8:20 p.m. **9. Future Agenda Items**
 - a. Future Agenda Items
- 8:30 p.m. **10. Adjourn**

Roseville Public Works, Environment and Transportation Commission Agenda Item

DATE: June 25, 2024

ITEM: 3.a.

ITEM DESCRIPTION: Approve May Minutes

Background

Attached are the minutes from the May 28, 2024 meeting.

Recommendation

Motion approving the minutes of May 28, 2024, subject to any necessary corrections or revision.

Attachments

1. May Minutes - Draft

Roseville Public Works, Environment and Transportation Commission Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, May 28, 2024, at 6:30 p.m.
City Council Chambers, 2660 Civic Center Drive
Roseville, Minnesota 55113

1. Introduction / Roll Call

Chair Ficek called the meeting to order at approximately 6:30 p.m. and at his request, Public Works Director Jesse Freihammer called the roll.

Present: Chair Bryant Ficek; Vice Chair Edwin Hodder; and Members Jarrod Cicha, Daniel Fergus, Des Mueller, and Sarah Rudolf

Absent: Member Allison Luongo (Excused), Youth Commissioners Alexi Jendro, and Carson Bauer

Staff Present: Public Works Director Jesse Freihammer; and Environmental Manager Ryan Johnson

2. Public Comments

3. Approval of April 23, 2024 Meeting Minutes

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

Motion

Member Fergus moved, Member Cicha seconded approval of the April 23, 2024 meeting minutes as presented.

Ayes: 5

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

4. Communication Items

Public Works Director Jesse Freihammer provided a brief review and update on projects and maintenance activities listed in the staff report dated May 28, 2024.

32 Member Mueller was curious regarding Less Mow May, and what information was
33 provided to the residents, and she wondered if there was a way to increase outreach
34 and education regarding how people mow. She thought a lot of times people let
35 their lawns grow out and then basically mow hay and mow it into the street and the
36 storm drains.

37
38 Mr. Freihammer indicated in the past the City has done articles on this and could
39 expand on that later this summer as well as in the future.

40
41 Member Mueller thought with the U of M extension and turf care and all of that it
42 is recommended to raise the deck as high as possible, cut the grass, and then let it
43 sit for a day before lowering the deck and cutting the grass again. She noted it
44 bothers her to see yard waste blown into the street.

45
46 Commissioner Rudolph arrived at 6:46 p.m.

47 48 **5. Trout Brook Interceptor Flood Analysis**

49 Environmental Manager Ryan Johnson introduced Mr. Nate Zwanitser from the
50 Capital Region Watershed District.

51
52 Mr. Zwanitser presented the Trout Brook Interceptor Flood Analysis to the
53 Commission.

54
55 Chair Ficek thanked Mr. Zwanitser for the presentation.

56
57 Member Fergus appreciated they were looking at the social vulnerability index. He
58 wondered if there was any effort to look at the neighborhood that is getting flooded
59 because the social vulnerability of this neighborhood next to another neighborhood
60 could be quite different.

61
62 Mr. Zwanitser indicated these areas blend a little bit but the information it is built
63 on is based on census tracts and blocks. For now, at least, this is the best
64 information Capital Region Watershed District has for this type of analysis. There
65 is a lot of work being done to refine and go in the direction Member Fergus is
66 talking about, getting more resolution, and classifying the different areas.

67
68 Chair Ficek indicated the grant helped to create the model and he wondered if there
69 was any money for upkeep or if something else needed to go after.

70
71 Mr. Zwanitser thought this would be a worthwhile investment. He thought it would
72 be a modest investment to keep it up to date.

73
74 Chair Ficek asked if the Capital Region Watershed District is looking at other
75 agencies CIP's and looking ahead.

Mr. Zwanitser indicated they are doing that and, on the flip side, their partnering agencies, when they have things coming up, they know about this and are on the technical advisory committee.

Chair Ficek asked if there are connections outside of the watershed District and if so, if there is any way to connect outside of the boundaries to connect to bigger areas.

Mr. Zwanitser indicated in an urban area like this it can be pretty isolated and each of the storm sewer systems is pretty independent and there are clear break lines in them. The boundaries do not always reflect that, so the Watershed District frequently partners with other districts.

Member Mueller explained she was curious how much the Watershed District partners with the Met Council.

Mr. Zwanitser indicated the Met Council has very little to do with what the Watershed District does, and they do not dictate the work done.

Member Mueller thought this was a great presentation and exciting to see the model and how it was laid out.

6. MSA Annual Meeting

Environmental Manager Ryan Johnson indicated this is a required public information meeting where city residents are encouraged to share their comments and feedback regarding the City's proposed Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), and the implementation of the past year's report.

Mr. Johnson presented the 2023 City's Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program report.

Member Fergus asked what happens to what is collected after sweeping the streets.

Mr. Johnson reviewed with the Commission how the street sweeping works in the City. He noted the sediments go to Elk River and get reused after testing.

Chair Ficek thanked Mr. Johnson for the presentation.

7. Forestry/EAB Update

Public Works Director Jesse Freihammer presented the Forestry/EAB update to the Commission.

Member Fergus thought it would be a good idea if someone could incentivize privately owned trees with EAB to remove them because it is expensive to remove them.

Vice Chair Hodder asked what kind of replacement trees there would be.

Mr. Freihammer explained there will be a variety of trees and following the Master Plan, the City has in place. He noted there are twelve or fourteen different varieties that will be replacement trees.

8. Future Agenda Items

Discussion ensued regarding the upcoming PWETC agendas:

June 25 meeting

- Prep for the Joint Council Meeting
- Public Safety Update
- Pavement Management Funding – Asset Management
- Civic Campus Master Plan Update

July 23 meeting

- Joint Council Meeting Follow-up/Update Work Plan

Future meetings

- Transit/Micro Transit Update
- Tour – SPRWS Water Plant – July 1 @ 1:00 p.m.

9. Adjourn

Motion

Member Fergus moved, Member Cicha seconded, adjournment of the meeting at approximately 8:32 p.m.

Ayes: 6

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

Roseville Public Works, Environment and Transportation Commission Agenda Item

DATE: June 25, 2024

ITEM: 4.a.

ITEM DESCRIPTION: Communication Items

Background

At each commission meeting, City staff provides updates on City activities and projects ongoing within the city that pertain to public works activities.

Recommendation

Receive report and provide feedback.

Attachments

1. Communications Memo
2. 2024 Roseville Project Map
3. June Development Activity Report



Public Works Department

Memo

To: Public Works Environmental and Transportation Commission Members

From: Jennifer Lowry, City Engineer

Date: June 20, 2024

Re: Communications Items

The following are updates to projects and other activities happening in Roseville since the last commission meeting:

Roseville Public Works project updates:

- Bike Plan
 - The online survey and map to compile comments are live until June 30, 2024. Please share the link below with your networks and encourage others to participate and subscribe.
 - Two bike audits and one walk audit took place on June 10, covering the Rosedale area and both southeast and northeast Roseville to identify specific areas and opportunities for improvement and route creation. Each audit had approximately 10-15 participants.
 - Staff and consultants met with Ramsey County and MnDOT staff on June 11 to begin planning for a demonstration project on Hamline Avenue between County Road B and County Road B2.
 - A network workshop took place on June 11, with around 25 community members taking part to identify locations and routes across Roseville in need of safe cycling infrastructure.
 - Bike Plan efforts were featured in a [Star Tribune article](#) on May 12 and a [KSTP story](#) on May 14.
 - Listening sessions with key groups are being scheduled.
 - <https://talk.dot.state.mn.us/roseville-bike-plan>
- McCarrons Retaining Wall Replacement
 - Construction is anticipated to begin the week of July 8 and complete by Labor Day.
- County Road B Reconstruction, west of Cleveland Avenue
 - Construction continues to be delayed due to rain. Currently, storm sewer is anticipated to begin July 1. Residents are encouraged to subscribe to the website for ongoing updates.
- 2024 PMP
 - Portions of the PMP in the Midland Hills neighborhood adjacent to the reconstruction project will be done in coordination with the reconstruction. Other streets that are a part of the PMP are complete.

- County Road B Reconstruction from Snelling Avenue to Lexington Avenue (Ramsey County)
 - Road construction and city watermain replacement has begun.
- 2024 Sewer Lining Project
 - Cleaning and lining has begun on the various locations throughout the city. Contractor to notify impacted properties a minimum of 24 hours in advance of lining.
- 2024 Pathways Project
 - Project is currently in design and includes Lexington Avenue, between County Road B and TH 36, the Wagner Street to Western Avenue cul-de-sac connection, and Tamarack Park pathways shown in Attachment 2. The project will be bid later this year and construction may expand into 2025.
- Hamline Watermain Project
 - Project is currently in design and includes upsizing of the watermain along Hamline Avenue from Josephine Road into Arden Hills. The project will be bid later this year and will likely be coordinated with Ramsey County's storm sewer improvements at Clamar.
- Twin Lakes Trail Phase 2
 - Design is complete. Bidding and tree removal later this year for construction next year.

Other agency project updates:

- Th 36 Multimodal Study (MNDOT)
 - The 18-month process and resulting alternatives analysis is nearly complete.
- TH 36 Mill and Overlay from Cleveland Avenue to Edgerson Street (MnDOT)
 - Notes below from recent MnDOT presentation:
 - Six full weekend directional closures from I35W to Hwy 61.
 - 10-day ramp closure westbound TH36 to southbound I35W.
 - 30-day ramp closure northbound Cleveland to eastbound TH36.
- Dale Street 4-3 Conversion from Lovell Avenue into St. Paul (Ramsey County)
 - Plans going to bid soon for construction this year.
- County Road C from Lexington Avenue into Little Canada (Ramsey County)
 - Project team meetings and public engagement have begun.

Engineering Updates:

- The Assistant City Engineer vacancy (reposted as Assistant City Engineer / Graduate Civil Engineer) has closed and interviews are being scheduled.
- PW has partnered with other departments to offer intern and staff tours/presentation this summer.

Sustainability Updates:

- Staff attended Ramsey Washington Metro Watershed District's Waterfest event on June 1.

- Staff attended the Roseville Farmer's Market on June 4 to conduct outreach for Green To Go and the bike plan.
- Staff (Bakken and Lowry) worked closely together to plan the Bike Summit week of engagement around the Bike Plan.
- Green To Go outreach continues – a second mailing was sent to all licensed food entities in Roseville, staff has reached out to 25 select businesses to create a focus group, and staff is visiting restaurants in person to encourage participation in the survey and community conversation. The final community conversation is taking place on Monday, June 24, at 2pm.

Maintenance Updates:

- Street and Storm
 - Centerline painting completed. 75% message painting completed.
 - Second right-of-way mow completed.
 - Second city-wide sweep started.
 - Ongoing street patching.
 - Ongoing repair and replacement of street signs.
 - Continue compost site turning and maintenance.
 - Continued storm sewer maintenance repairs.
- Water and Sanitary Sewer
 - Continue inspections for water service line inventory.
 - Lead Free Roseville reporting at 77%
 - In progress - 2024 sewer television and cleaning.
 - Ongoing watermain repairs.
 - Annual cleaning of lift stations in progress. Repairs needed are being scheduled and addressed.
 - Continued underground locates, weekly lift station inspections, collection of water samples, and replacing water meters and MIUs.

Council Updates:

- Below is a highlight of items recently presented to and/or acted on by the City Council. More information can be found in the agenda packets and minutes for the referenced Council meetings:

See attached ordinance amendment to clarify the purpose, membership, schedule, duties, and functions commissions

June 3, 2024

- **Held:** Public hearing and Approved Resolutions on the Vacation of Multiple Streets Easements and Rights-of-Way
- **Received:** 2024 Community Survey and Analysis Presentation by the Morris Leatherman Company

June 17, 2024

- Denied: Appeal to staff's order to remove fence at 257 S. McCarrons Blvd.
- Approved: Resolution Prohibiting Parking on County Road B2 by Central Park Elementary

2024 All Projects



Prepared by: Engineering Department
12/27/2023

- City Roadway Reconstruction
- City Roadway Mill & Overlay
- County Roadway Project
- MnDOT Roadway Project
- Signal Improvement
- New Pathway
- Pathway Maintenance
- Parking Lot
- Retaining Wall
- Watermain Replacement
- Sanitary Sewer Project
- Street Light Project

Data Sources
* Ramsey County GIS (12/05/2023)
* City of Roseville Community Development
* City of Roseville Finance Department

DISCLAIMER:
This map is neither a legally recorded map nor a survey and is not intended to be used as one. This map is a compilation of records, information and data located in various city, county, state and federal offices and other sources regarding the area shown, and is to be used for reference purposes only. The City does not warrant that the Geographic Information System (GIS) Data used to prepare this map are error free, and the City does not represent that the GIS Data can be used for navigational, tracking or any other purpose requiring exacting measurement of distance or direction or precision in the depiction of geographic features. If errors or discrepancies are found please contact 651-792-7075. The preceding disclaimer is provided pursuant to Minnesota Statutes §466.03, Subd. 21 (2000), and the user of this map acknowledges that the City shall not be liable for any damages, and expressly waives all claims, and agrees to defend, indemnify, and hold harmless the City from any and all claims brought by User, its employees or agents, or third parties which arise out of the user's access or use of data provided.

0 700 1000 2000 3000 Feet
Proposed2024_AllProjects





Development Projects: June 2024

ROSEVILLE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT Updated: May 30, 2024					
	Project Name	Address	Project Description	Applicant/Owner Information	Starting
RESIDENTIAL	The Enclave	201-261 McCarrons Pl	20 detached townhomes	Ovation Homes	Summer 2021
	Parallel Apartments	1415 County Road B	89 unit apartment building	Alliance Building Corp	Fall 2023
	Residential New Construction	2239 Cleveland Ave	New single family home	Bald Eagle Builders Inc	Fall 2022
	Residential New Construction	3092-3094 Victoria St	New townhome	Twin Cities Habitat for Humanity	Summer 2023
	Residential New Construction	2444-2454 County Road D	New townhomes	JT MEZZ Construction LLC	Summer 2023
	Residential New Construction	1254 County Road B	New duplex	Restoration Professionals	Summer 2023
	Residential New Construction	251 Capitol View Cir	New single family home	Ovation Homes	Winter 2023
	Residential New Construction	2172 Eustis St	New single family home	Creative Homes Inc	Fall 2023
	Residential New Construction	2179 Eustis St	New single family home	Creative Homes Inc	Fall 2023
	Residential New Construction	841-843 Brenner Ave	New duplex	Lee Homes Inc	Fall 2023
	Residential New Construction	692 Skillman Ave	New single family home	Cara Builders LLC	Spring 2024
RETAIL	Rosedale Center South Wing	1595 Highway 36	Demo of South Wing Entry	VCC LLC	Fall 2022
	Old Panera Bread	1595 Highway 36 #940	Interior Demo	P.R.M. Contracting	Summer 2023
	Rocco	1595 Highway 36	Interior Remodel	P.R.M. Contracting	Summer 2023
	Dicks Sporting Goods	1675 Highway 36	Footing & Foundation	VCC LCC	Summer 2023
	JLL	1595 Highway 36	Exterior Remodel	Cy-Con Inc	Spring 2024
	Activate Games	1955 County Road B2	Interior Remodel	Arco Murray	Spring 2024
	HomeGoods	2480 Fairview Ave	Interior Remodel	Innovative Construction Solutions	Spring 2024
	Centro	1901 Highway 36	Interior Demo	Lucky Seven LLC	Spring 2024
	Laurus Athletic Rehab & Performance	2130 County Road C	Interior Remodel	Sever Construction Company	Spring 2024
	Rosedale Center	1595 Highway 36	EV Charging Stations	Casco Contractors	Spring 2024
NON-RETAIL/OFFICE	MnDOT Waters Edge	1500 County Road B2	Mechanical upgrades	Versacon Inc	Fall 2023
	Everyday Church	2420 Cleveland Ave	Interior Remodel of former LA Fitness	Zeman Construction	Fall 2023
	Roseville Estates	2735-2755 Rice St	Demo old parking structure, add parking and garages	Welsh Construction	Fall 2023
	Eaglecrest Apartments	2945 Lincoln Dr	Remodel	Window World	Summer 2023
	Bimbo Bakery	2745 Long Lake Rd	Interior Remodel	Montgomery Brinkman	Summer 2023
	Rebiotix	2680 Patton Rd	Interior Alteration	McGough Construction Company	Fall 2023
	Kargo Delivers	2500 Cleveland Ave	Interior Remodel	Tile MSP DBA Dandy	Spring 2024
	Horton Incorporated	2565 Walnut St	Interior Remodel	Bauer Design Build	Spring 2024
	Minnesota Construction Law	3030 Centre Pointe Dr #100	Interior Remodel	J.G. Hause Construction Inc	Spring 2024
	Fairfield Inn	3045 Centre Pointe Dr	Interior Remodel	Fairfield Inn	Winter 2023
	Twin Lakes IV	2778 Cleveland Ave	Interior Remodel	The Bainey Group	Winter 2023
	University of Northwestern-St Paul	2993 Snelling Ave	Interior Remodel	PCL Construction Services Inc	Spring 2024
	St.Croix Hospice	1751 County Road B #105	Interior Remodel	St. Paul Construction Company	Spring 2024
	Western & Southern Financial Group	1700 Highway 36 #380	Tenant Remodel	Encompass Properties	Spring 2024
	AbleNet	2625 Patton Rd	Interior Remodel	Montgomery Brinkman LLC	Spring 2024
	Gustave A Larson	2280 Walnut St	Interior Remodel	Lindee Construction	Spring 2024
	Able Hose & Rubber	2340 County Road C	Interior Remodel/Expansion	Sever Construction	Spring 2024
	Global Health Link	2277 Highway 36	Interior Remodel/Expansion	VY Management LLC	Spring 2024
	Old Dutch	2375 Terminal Rd	Interior Remodel	Langer Construction Company	Spring 2024
	Woodstone Inc	2361 Highway 36 #110	Tenant Remodel	Fixed Assets Inc	Spring 2024

Roseville Public Works, Environment and Transportation Commission

Agenda Item

DATE: June 25, 2024

ITEM: 5.a.

ITEM DESCRIPTION: Civic Campus Project Update

Background

The City of Roseville developed a Civic Campus Master Plan to provide an overall strategy for the City's civic campus. This allows the City to have an overall vision as it looks to replace existing buildings and build new facilities on the Campus. The plan includes these primary goals:

- Address space needs with recommendations for facility sizing, renovations, and growth.
- Support functionality with recommendations for key adjacencies.
- Provide clear and convenient access for citizens with revised planning of key service areas and parking.
- Enhance the overall quality of space, indoors and out, with an overall vision for a unified civic campus.

The [Civic Campus Master Plan Study](#) was approved by the City Council on Monday, April 12, 2021. The next step in the process was the Civic Campus Pre-Design Study, which was completed in 2022. The City Council adopted the [Civic Campus Pre-Design Study](#) on October 10, 2022.

In the 2023 Legislative Session, Roseville was given the authority to have a referendum to enact a local option sales tax to pay for the Civic Campus improvement. The referendum will be on the ballot this November.

City Manager Patrick Trudgeon will present an update to the Commission on the project and the local option sales tax.

Additional information on the work done to date is on the website.
<https://www.cityofroseville.com/3472/Civic-Campus-Master-Plan>

Recommendation

Receive update and provide feedback to staff.

Attachments

None

Roseville Public Works, Environment and Transportation Commission

Agenda Item

DATE: June 25, 2024

ITEM: 6.a.

ITEM DESCRIPTION: Bike Plan Update

Background

Roseville was awarded an Active Transportation Planning Assistance grant from MnDOT that Roseville is using to create a bike plan that complements our existing Pathway Master Plan. We held our Bike Summit June 10-12 that included bike audits, planning for a demonstration project, and a networking workshop. A presentation will be given to update the Commission on happenings to date, next steps and to seek their input.

In addition, the website includes a survey, an interactive map, and a way to subscribe for updates. The survey has been extended until the end of June 2024. Please share this link with your networks:

<https://talk.dot.state.mn.us/roseville-bike-plan>

Recommendation

Receive update and provide feedback to staff.

Attachments

None

Roseville Public Works, Environment and Transportation Commission Agenda Item

DATE: June 25, 2024

ITEM: 7.a.

ITEM DESCRIPTION: 2024 Community Survey – Public Work Item Review

Background

At the June 3, 2024 City Council meeting, The Morris Leatherman Company presented the 2024 Community Survey to the City Council. This survey is completed every few years and provides feedback on a variety of topics in the city.

Since there are a few public works survey items, we will do a quick presentation to get the Commission up to date on the results. The public works items we will review are highlighted in the full report.

Recommendation

Receive update and provide feedback to staff.

Attachments

1. The Morris Leatherman Company Residential Survey

THE MORRIS LEATHERMAN COMPANY
 3128 Dean Court
 Minneapolis, Minnesota 55416

City of Roseville
 Residential Survey
 FINAL APRIL 2024

Hello, I'm _____ of the Morris Leatherman Company, a polling firm located in Minneapolis. We have been retained by the City of Roseville to speak with a random sample of residents about issues facing the community. This survey is being conducted because the City Council and City Staff are interested in your opinions and suggestions about current and future city needs. I want to assure you that all individual responses will be held strictly confidential; only summaries of the entire sample will be reported.

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. Approximately, how many years have you lived in Roseville? | TWO YEARS OR LESS.....9%
THREE TO FIVE YEARS....17%
SIX TO TEN YEARS.....20%
11 TO TWENTY YEARS.....18%
21 TO 30 YEARS.....17%
OVER THIRTY YEARS.....19% |
| 2. As things stand now, how long in the future do you expect to live in Roseville? | TWO YEARS OR LESS.....5%
THREE TO FIVE YEARS....11%
SIX TO TEN YEARS.....17%
OVER TEN YEARS.....55%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....12% |
| 3. How would you rate the quality of life in Roseville - excellent, good, only fair, or poor? | EXCELLENT.....33%
GOOD.....54%
ONLY FAIR.....10%
POOR.....3%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....0% |
| 4. What do you like most, if anything, about living in Roseville? | DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....0%
NOTHING.....3%
CONVENIENT LOCATION....11%
NEIGHBORHOOD/HOUSING...13%
SAFE.....6%
FRIENDLY PEOPLE.....13%
CLOSE TO FAMILY/
FRIENDS.....17%
CLOSE TO JOB.....13%
SCHOOLS.....5%
PARKS/TRAILS.....9%
SHOPPING.....3%
QUIET AND PEACEFUL.....7%
SCATTERED.....1% |

5. What do you think is the most serious issue facing Roseville today?
- DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....0%
 NOTHING.....22%
 HIGH TAXES.....16%
 RISING CRIME.....25%
 POOR CITY SPENDING.....2%
 LACK OF JOBS/BUSINESS...7%
 AGING POPULATION.....9%
 AGING INFRASTRUCTURE....6%
 STREET REPAIR.....7%
 SCATTERED.....6%
6. All in all, do you think things in Roseville are generally headed in the right direction, or do you feel things are off on the wrong track?
- RIGHT DIRECTION.....85%
 WRONG TRACK.....13%
 DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....3%
- IF "WRONG TRACK," ASK: (n=50)
7. Please tell me why you feel things have gotten off on the wrong track?
- DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....0%
 HIGH TAXES.....14%
 POOR CITY SPENDING.....6%
 RISING CRIME.....60%
 GROWING DIVERSITY.....6%
 TOO MUCH RETAIL.....4%
 TOO MANY RENTALS.....2%
 SCATTERED.....8%
8. How would you rate the sense of community identity among residents in Roseville - would you say it is very strong, somewhat strong, not too strong, or not at all strong?
- VERY STRONG.....28%
 SOMEWHAT STRONG.....58%
 NOT TOO STRONG.....10%
 NOT AT ALL STRONG.....3%
 DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....2%
9. Please tell me which of the following do you feel the closest connection to - the City of Roseville as a whole, your neighborhood, your School District or something else? (IF "SOMETHING ELSE," ASK:) What would that be?
- CITY OF ROSEVILLE.....18%
 NEIGHBORHOOD.....43%
 SCHOOL DISTRICT.....7%
 CHURCH.....3%
 WORKPLACE.....6%
 FAMILY/FRIENDS.....23%
 DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....1%

10.	How welcome do you feel in the City of Roseville - very welcome, somewhat welcome, not too welcome, or not at all welcome?	VERY WELCOME.....59%
		SOMEWHAT WELCOME.....29%
		NOT TOO WELCOME.....6%
		NOT AT ALL WELCOME.....2%
		DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....5%

IF A RESPONSE IS GIVEN, ASK: (n=382)

11.	Why do you feel that way?	UNSURE.....2%
		FRIENDLY PEOPLE.....49%
		UNFRIENDLY PEOPLE.....3%
		WATCH OUT FOR EACH OTHER.....3%
		DON'T KNOW NEIGHBORS....5%
		LOTS OF COMMUNITY EVENTS.....7%
		WELCOME DIVERSITY.....3%
		FRIENDLY SCHOOLS.....2%
		FEELS LIKE HOME.....6%
		RACISM.....4%
		WELCOMING.....2%
		FAMILY & FRIENDS HERE...2%
		LOT OF LONG TERM RESIDENTS.....2%
		GREAT SERVICES.....2%
		SCATTERED.....8%

Let's spend a few minutes discussing the future of the City of Roseville.

12.	When thinking about a city's quality of life, what do you think is the most important aspect of that quality?	DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....1%
		SAFETY.....24%
		SENSE OF COMMUNITY.....17%
		GOOD SCHOOLS.....16%
		UPKEEP OF CITY.....9%
		OPEN SPACE/NATURE.....9%
		PARKS/RECREATION.....8%
		UPKEEP OF HOUSING.....4%
		QUIET AND PEACEFUL.....12%
		SCATTERED.....1%

13. What aspects, if any, of the community should be fixed or improved in the future?	DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....1% NOTHING.....16% LOWER TAXES.....16% BETTER ROADS.....11% MORE JOBS.....8% MORE PUBLIC TRANSIT.....6% MORE SENIOR HOUSING.....7% LESS AFFORDABLE LOW INCOME HOUSING..3% SIDEWALKS.....8% REDUCE CRIME.....21% SCATTERED.....3%
---	--

14. What, if anything, is currently missing from the City of Roseville which, if present, would greatly improve the quality of life for residents?	DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....1% NOTHING.....36% MORE PUBLIC TRANSIT....10% MORE JOBS.....17% MORE ENTERTAINMENT.....10% MORE AFFORDABLE HOUSING.....11% SIDEWALKS.....14% SCATTERED.....1%
--	--

I would like to read a list of characteristics others have mentioned that indicate a city has a high quality of life.

15. Please tell me which one you think is most important for a city to have? (ROTATE AND READ LIST)

16. Which is second most important? (RE-READ LIST; OMITTING FIRST CHOICE)

17. Which is least important? (RE-READ LIST; OMITTING FIRST TWO CHOICES)

	MOST	SEC	LST
HIGH PROPERTY VALUES.....	6%	4%	10%
WELL MAINTAINED PROPERTIES.....	10%	9%	10%
LOW PROPERTY TAXES.....	8%	8%	9%
LOW CRIME RATE.....	26%	22%	7%
GOOD SCHOOL SYSTEM.....	18%	15%	7%
VARIETY OF SHOPPING OPPORTUNITIES.....	4%	5%	11%
VARIETY OF PARK AND RECREATION OPPORTUNITIES.....	5%	8%	8%
JOB OPPORTUNITIES.....	6%	10%	7%
COMMUNITY EVENTS AND FESTIVALS.....	4%	7%	11%
SENSE OF COMMUNITY.....	13%	11%	10%
ELSE.....	1%	1%	0%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%	0%	10%

Let's discuss recreational opportunities in the community....

18. How would you rate park and recreational facilities in Roseville - excellent, good, only fair, or poor?
EXCELLENT.....28%
GOOD.....66%
ONLY FAIR.....6%
POOR.....0%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....0%
19. Which Roseville recreation facilities, if any, do you or members of your household use most frequently?
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....0%
NONE.....18%
TRAILS.....38%
NEIGHBORHOOD PARKS.....34%
ATHLETIC FACILITIES.....10%
20. How would you rate the upkeep and maintenance of Roseville City Parks - excellent, good, only fair, or poor?
EXCELLENT.....31%
GOOD.....62%
ONLY FAIR.....7%
POOR.....1%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....0%
21. In the past year, have you or any members of this household participated in any city-sponsored park and recreation programs?
YES.....34%
NO.....66%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....0%

IF "YES," ASK: (n=137)

22. Were you satisfied or dissatisfied with your experience?
SATISFIED.....96%
DISSATISFIED.....2%
NEUTRAL (VOL.).....2%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....0%

23. Are there any park and recreation programs you would like to see offered or expanded?

UNSURE, 10%, NO, 84%; PICKLEBALL, 2%; SCATTERED, 4%.

- | | |
|--|----------------------------|
| 24. How often do you or members of your household use the trail system, weather permitting - twice or more per week, weekly, two or three times per month, monthly, quarterly, less frequently, or not at all? | TWICE OR MORE A WEEK...15% |
| | WEEKLY.....22% |
| | TWO/THREE PER MONTH...22% |
| | MONTHLY.....13% |
| | QUARTERLY.....3% |
| | LESS FREQUENTLY.....11% |
| | NOT AT ALL.....14% |
| | DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....0% |

25. Which of the following would be your top priority for the city's trails and sidewalk system? (ROTATE)

CONSTRUCTION OF ADDITIONAL TRAILS FOR EXERCISE WITHIN PARKS.....	33%
CONSTRUCTION OF TRAILS CONNECTING NEIGHBORHOODS AND PARKS.....	38%
CONSTRUCTION OF TRAILS CONNECTING NEIGHBORHOODS AND SHOPPING AND BUSINESS AREAS.....	21%
ELSE.....	1%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	8%

The City has park buildings at Autumn Grove, Lexington, Rosebrook, Oasis, Sandcastle and Villa Parks, as well as a newer community building at Cedarholm Golf Course, the Cedarholm Community Building.

- | | |
|--|---------------------------|
| 26. Are you aware of Roseville's park buildings and the newer Cedarholm Community Building? | YES.....65% |
| | NO.....35% |
| | DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....0% |
| 27. Have you or members of your household visited or used one of the park buildings or the new Cedarholm Community Building? | YES.....36% |
| | NO.....64% |
| | DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....1% |

IF "YES," ASK: (n=143)

- | | |
|--|---------------------------|
| 28. How would you rate your experience - excellent, good, only fair or poor? | EXCELLENT.....32% |
| | GOOD.....68% |
| | ONLY FAIR.....1% |
| | POOR.....0% |
| | DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....0% |

29. Would you consider using one of the park buildings or the new Cedarholm Community Building again? YES.....95%
NO.....2%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....3%

IF "NO,"ASK: (n=3)

30. Why won't you use one of the park buildings or the new Cedarholm Community Building again?

NO NEED, 100%.

31. Do you feel the current mix of recreational or sports facilities meet the needs of members of your household? YES.....95%
NO.....1%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....4%

IF "NO," ASK: (n=4)

32. What recreational or sports facilities do you feel are missing?

PICKLEBALL COURTS, 100%.

Moving on....

I would like to read you a list of a few city services. For each one, please tell me whether you would rate the quality of the service as excellent, good, only fair, or poor? (ROTATE)

	EXCL	GOOD	FAIR	POOR	DK/R
33. Police protection?	46%	43%	11%	0%	0%
34. Fire protection?	43%	51%	4%	0%	2%
35. Emergency medical services?	47%	41%	5%	1%	6%
36. Sewer and water?	24%	67%	7%	1%	2%
37. Drainage and flood control?	25%	62%	10%	1%	2%
38. Building inspections?	26%	56%	6%	0%	12%
39. Animal control?	34%	57%	7%	1%	2%
40. Code enforcement?	27%	64%	5%	0%	5%

IF ANY SERVICES WERE RATED "ONLY FAIR" OR "POOR" IN QUESTIONS #33-40, ASK: (n=109)

41. Why did you rate _____ as (only fair/poor)?	DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....0%
	COULD IMPROVE.....8%
	FLOODING.....18%
	MORE PATROLLING.....31%
	POOR INSPECTIONS.....3%
	LOOSE ANIMALS.....16%
	RUNDOWN HOMES.....6%
	RUDE/UNFRIENDLY.....1%
	POOR TASTE OF WATER....11%
	SLOW SERVICE.....6%

Now, for the next six city services, please consider only their job on city-maintained streets and roads in neighborhoods. That means excluding interstate highways, state and county roads that are taken care of by other levels of government. Therefore, Interstate 35W, Highway 36, County Road C or Lexington Avenue, should not be considered. How would you rate (ROTATE)

	EXCL	GOOD	FAIR	POOR	DK/R
42. Street repair and maintenance?	22%	57%	21%	0%	0%
43. Snow plowing?	32%	57%	11%	1%	0%
44. Trail and pathway plowing in parks?	32%	50%	16%	1%	2%
45. Trail and pathway plowing in neighborhoods?	30%	57%	13%	1%	0%
46. Pathway repair and maintenance in the parks?	30%	55%	14%	1%	1%
47. Pathway repair and maintenance in neighborhoods?	21%	62%	11%	1%	6%

48. Do you consider the city portion of your property taxes to be very high, somewhat high, about average, somewhat low, or very low in comparison with neighboring cities?	VERY HIGH.....16%
	SOMEWHAT HIGH.....30%
	ABOUT AVERAGE.....45%
	SOMEWHAT LOW.....2%
	VERY LOW.....0%
	DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....7%
49. Would you favor or oppose an increase in YOUR city property tax if it were needed to maintain city services at their current level?	FAVOR.....57%
	OPPOSE.....37%
	DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....7%

50. When you consider the property taxes you pay and the quality of city services you receive, would you rate the general value of city services as excellent, good, only fair, or poor?

EXCELLENT.....	14%
GOOD.....	71%
ONLY FAIR.....	13%
POOR.....	1%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	2%

For each of the following long-term infrastructure projects, please tell me if you strongly support the City continuing to invest in it, somewhat support, somewhat oppose, or strongly oppose. (ROTATE)

	STS	SMS	SMO	STO	DKR
51. Water and sewer pipes?	42%	44%	11%	2%	1%
52. City buildings?	29%	48%	16%	5%	3%
53. Pedestrian pathways?	33%	47%	16%	3%	1%
54. Bikeways?	31%	44%	21%	3%	1%
55. City roads?	45%	49%	4%	1%	2%

In Minnesota, cities and counties are permitted to ask the Legislature for permission to hold a public vote on an increase to the local sales tax to pay for improvements that are regionally significant. The sales tax is assessed in the same way as the state sales tax, meaning that items such as clothes and groceries are exempt from the tax. During the 2023 Legislative session, the City of Roseville was given permission to hold a sales tax referendum this November for the construction of a Public Works and Parks and Recreation maintenance facility and a new license and passport center.

56. Prior to this survey, were you aware of the sales tax referendum this November?

YES.....	56%
NO.....	43%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	1%

The City will ask voters to approve two questions for a new local HALF cent sales tax increase for up to twenty years. For your information, a HALF cent sales tax increase would be 5 cents on every \$10 of taxable purchases in the City of Roseville. The local sales tax would expire once the approved projects are fully funded.

57. First, if the election were today, STRONGLY SUPPORT.....13%
would you support or oppose a ref- SUPPORT.....56%
erendum for a HALF cent sales tax OPPOSE.....19%
increase for the construction of a STRONGLY OPPOSE.....5%
Public Works and Parks and Recrea- DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....7%
tion maintenance facility? (WAIT
FOR RESPONSE) Do you feel strongly
that way?

IF A POSITION IS TAKEN, ASK: (n=371)

58. Could you tell me one or two DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....0%
reasons why you feel that NEEDED.....5%
way? REASONABLE COST.....42%
LIKE INSTEAD OF A
PROPERTY TAX.....27%
PREFER PROPERTY TAX.....3%
NOT NEEDED.....4%
POOR SPENDING.....1%
TOO HIGH INCREASE.....1%
INFLATION/ECONOMY.....9%
NO MORE TAX INCREASE....6%
SCATTERED.....2%

A second referendum question is required to allow the funds from
the same HALF cent sales tax increase to be used to build a new
license and passport center. There would **NOT** be a second HALF
cent sales tax increase if this referendum also passes.

59. Next, if the election were today, STRONGLY SUPPORT.....14%
would you support or oppose a ref- SUPPORT.....52%
erendum to use the HALF cent sales OPPOSE.....22%
tax increase to build new license STRONGLY OPPOSE.....7%
and passport center? (WAIT FOR DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....6%
RESPONSE) Do you feel strongly
that way?

IF A POSITION IS TAKEN, ASK: (n=377)

60. Could you tell me one or two reasons why you feel that way?	DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....0% NEEDED.....8% REASONABLE COST.....39% LIKE INSTEAD OF A PROPERTY TAX.....23% PREFER PROPERTY TAX.....3% NOT NEEDED.....8% POOR SPENDING.....2% TOO HIGH INCREASE.....3% INFLATION/ECONOMY.....14% SCATTERED.....1%
---	--

A sales tax increase would not only capture sales tax from city residents, but also from people outside the city who make purchases in Roseville. A University of Minnesota study projected almost 64% of the new sales tax revenue would come from people who live outside of Roseville and use city services.

61. Does that make you much more likely to support the sales tax increase, somewhat more likely, somewhat less likely, much less likely, or does it make no difference to you?	MUCH MORE LIKELY.....21% SOMEWHAT MORE LIKELY...41% SOMEWHAT LESS LIKELY....1% MUCH LESS LIKELY.....2% NO DIFFERENCE.....35% DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....1%
--	---

It is projected with a HALF cent sales tax increase that the typical Roseville resident would pay an additional \$55.48 per year in sales tax.

62. Does this make you much more likely to support the sales tax increase, somewhat more likely, somewhat less likely, much less likely, or does it make no difference to you?	MUCH MORE LIKELY.....19% SOMEWHAT MORE LIKELY...37% SOMEWHAT LESS LIKELY....7% MUCH LESS LIKELY.....3% NO DIFFERENCE.....33% DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....1%
--	---

The current city budget does not include funding to make these improvements. If the sales tax increase is not approved, the City could consider a property tax increase which only Roseville residents and businesses would pay. These projects could cost the owner of a \$350,000 home in Roseville about \$430 per year for the improvements only.

63.	Does this make you much more likely to support the sales tax increase, somewhat more likely, somewhat less likely, much less likely, or does it make no difference to you?	MUCH MORE LIKELY.....32% SOMEWHAT MORE LIKELY...28% SOMEWHAT LESS LIKELY....3% MUCH LESS LIKELY.....3% NO DIFFERENCE.....33% DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....1%
-----	--	---

Changing topics....

64.	Other than voting, do you feel that if you wanted to, you could have a say about the way the City of Roseville runs things?	YES.....72% NO22% DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....7%
-----	---	---

65.	From what you know, do you approve or disapprove of the job the Mayor and City Council are doing? (WAIT FOR RESPONSE) And do you feel strongly that way?	STRONGLY APPROVE.....14% APPROVE.....78% DISAPPROVE.....6% STRONGLY DISAPPROVE.....0% DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....2%
-----	--	---

IF "DISAPPROVE" OR "STRONGLY DISAPPROVE," ASK: (n=25)

66.	Why do you feel that way?	DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....0% POOR JOB.....20% POOR SPENDING.....28% COULD IMPROVE.....4% HIGH TAXES.....24% DON'T LISTEN.....16% RISING CRIME.....8%
-----	---------------------------	---

67.	From what you have heard or seen, how would you rate the job performance of the Roseville City staff - excellent, good, only fair, or poor?	EXCELLENT.....16% GOOD.....76% ONLY FAIR.....5% POOR.....0% DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....3%
-----	---	---

IF "ONLY FAIR" OR "POOR," ASK: (n=21)

68.	Why do you feel that way?	DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....0% POOR SPENDING.....29% DON'T LISTEN.....57% RUDE/UNPROFESSIONAL.....14%
-----	---------------------------	---

Thinking about another topic....

69.	How would you rate the general condition and appearance of Roseville - excellent, good, only fair, or poor?	EXCELLENT.....21%
		GOOD.....72%
		ONLY FAIR.....6%
		POOR.....0%
		DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....0%

IF "ONLY FAIR" OR "POOR," ASK: (n=26)

70.	Why do you feel that way?	DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....0%
		MESSY YARDS.....50%
		JUNK CARS.....8%
		VACANT BUSINESSES.....23%
		RUNDOWN HOMES.....19%
71.	Over the past two years, has the appearance of Roseville improved, declined, or remained the same?	IMPROVED.....44%
		DECLINED.....6%
		REMAINED THE SAME.....49%
		DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....1%
72.	How would you rate the job the City does enforcing city codes on nuisances - excellent, good, only fair, or poor?	EXCELLENT.....13%
		GOOD.....78%
		ONLY FAIR.....8%
		POOR.....0%
		DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....1%

IF "ONLY FAIR" OR "POOR," ASK: (n=31)

73.	What nuisances does the City need to do a better job of enforcing?	DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....0%
		MESSY YARDS.....45%
		RUNDOWN HOMES.....10%
		JUNK CARS.....3%
		LOOSE ANIMALS.....19%
		VACANT BUSINESSES.....13%
		NOISE.....10%

Turning to the issue of public safety in the community....

I would like to read you a short list of public safety concerns.

74. Please tell me which one you consider to be the greatest public safety concern in Roseville? If you feel that none of these problems are serious in Roseville, just say so.

Violent crime.....2%
 Drugs.....15%
 Youth crimes and vandalism.....13%
 Break-ins and theft from automobiles.....13%
 Business crimes, such as shop-
 lifting and check fraud.....4%
 Residential crimes, such as
 burglary, and theft.....10%
 Traffic speeding.....14%
 Reckless driving.....5%
 Identity theft.....2%
 Car Jacking/Auto Theft.....7%
 ALL EQUALLY.....7%
 NONE OF THE ABOVE.....8%
 DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....1%

IF "NONE OF THE ABOVE," ASK: (n=31)

75. Is there something not mentioned you consider to be the
 greatest public safety concern in Roseville?

NO, 90%; ASSAULTS/MUGGINGS, 10%.

76. How would you rate the amount of TOO MUCH.....3%
 patrolling the Roseville Police ABOUT RIGHT AMOUNT.....71%
 Department does in your neighbor- NOT ENOUGH.....25%
 hood -- would you say they do too DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....1%
 much, about the right amount, or
 not enough?

Changing topics...

I would like to read you a list of characteristics of a community.
 For each one, please tell me if you think Roseville currently has
 too many or too much, too few or too little, or about the right
 amount. (ROTATE)

	MANY /MCH	FEW/ LITT	ABT RGHT	DK/ REF
77. Affordable rental units?	21%	27%	49%	3%
78. Market rate rental units?	11%	25%	52%	13%
79. Condominiums?	14%	18%	66%	3%
80. Townhomes?	18%	16%	63%	3%
81. Affordable owner-occupied housing?	11%	25%	58%	6%
82. "Move up" housing?	17%	24%	56%	3%
83. Higher cost housing?	28%	18%	52%	2%

	MANY /MCH	FEW/ LITT	ABT RGHT	DK/ REF
84. Assisted living for seniors?	8%	33%	52%	8%
85. Parks and open spaces?	14%	17%	70%	0%
86. Trails and bikeways?	13%	19%	67%	2%
87. Service and retail establishments?	15%	19%	66%	1%
88. Entertainment and dining opportunities?	15%	23%	61%	1%
89. If you were going to move from your current home for upgrading, how committed would you be to stay in Roseville - very committed, somewhat committed, not too committed, or not at all committed?	VERY COMMITTED.....35% SOMEWHAT COMMITTED.....54% NOT TOO COMMITTED.....7% NOT AT ALL COMMITTED....3% DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....2%			
90. And, if you were going to move from your current home for downsizing, how committed would you be to stay in Roseville - very committed, somewhat committed, not too committed, or not at all committed?	VERY COMMITTED.....36% SOMEWHAT COMMITTED.....52% NOT TOO COMMITTED.....7% NOT AT ALL COMMITTED....3% DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....3%			

IF "NOT TOO COMMITTED" OR "NOT AT ALL COMMITTED" IN QUESTIONS
 #89 OR #90, ASK: (n=40)

91. Is there anything missing or that could be improved in Roseville that would make you committed to staying?

NO, 73%; MORE AFFORDABLE HOUSING, 8%; REDUCE CRIME, 5%; LOWER PROPERTY TAXES, 15%.

The City of Roseville works with organizations to offer a variety of different housing programs for residential homeowners. This includes foreclosure protection, home improvement loans for interior and exterior remodeling and a land trust program.

92. Prior to this survey, were you aware of this housing programs?	YES.....58%
	NO.....42%
	DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....0%

Changing topics....

The City contracts with a local company for curbside recycling services. Currently, residents are provided a single-sort recycling cart, and recyclables are picked up every two weeks.

93. Do you participate in the curbside recycling program by separating recyclable items from the rest of your garbage? YES.....81%
NO.....19%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....0%

IF "NO," ASK: (n=74)

94. Could you tell me one or two reasons why your household does not participate in the curbside recycling program?

TOO BUSY/HASSLE, 15%; NOT ENOUGH WASTE, 22%; TAKE ELSEWHERE, 9%; RENTER/ASSOCIATION, 46%; COST TOO MUCH, 3%; AGE/HEALTH, 2%; LACK OF INFORMATION, 4%.

95. Are there any changes or improvements in the service which could be made to induce you to participate in it?

UNSURE, 8%; NO, 89%; LARGER CARTS, 2%; MORE INFORMATION, 2%.

IF "YES" IN QUESTION #93, ASK: (n=325)

96. How often do you put recyclables out for collection - EVERY TWO WEEKS.....74%
MONTHLY.....19%
every two weeks, monthly, or LESS OFTEN.....7%
less often? DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....0%

When you think of the recyclables your household generates...

97. Would you favor or oppose a change to an every week collection schedule for recyclables for an additional fee? STRONGLY FAVOR.....11%
FAVOR.....39%
OPPOSE.....47%
STRONGLY OPPOSE.....2%
(WAIT FOR RESPONSE) Do you feel strongly that way? DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....2%

98. Are there any changes or improvements in the curbside recycling program you would like to see?

UNSURE, 6%; NO, 90%; SCATTERED, 4%.

Most communities have one of two systems for trash collection.

Roseville operates under an open collection system, in which residents choose from a list of haulers licensed by the City to provide residential trash collection. Some cities use an arrangement in which the City manages a collection system, negotiates prices and standardizes services for residential trash collection.

99. Would you favor or oppose the City of Roseville changing from the current system, in which residents choose their trash hauler to a system where the City manages trash collection? (WAIT FOR RESPONSE) Do you feel strongly that way?

STRONGLY FAVOR.....	11%
FAVOR.....	37%
OPPOSE.....	31%
STRONGLY OPPOSE.....	6%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	16%

IF A RESPONSE IS GIVEN, ASK: (n=338)

100. Could you tell me one or two reasons for your decision?

UNSURE, 2%; LIKE CURRENT HAULER, 13%; PREFER TO CHOOSE, 25%; CITY/LESS TRUCKS, 18%; CHOICE/CHEAPER, 5%; CITY/CHEAPER, 13%; CITY/LESS POLLUTION, 9%; CITY/LESS STREET REPAIR, 4%; CITY/BETTER SERVICE, 8%; SCATTERED, 3%.

In 2019, the City of Roseville, in partnership with Ramsey County, opened an organics recycling drop-off site at the Leaf Recycling Center on Dale Street just south of County Road C. Roseville residents can now collect food scraps and other organic waste in their home and take it to a drop-off site.

101. Prior to this survey, were you aware Roseville has a drop-off site for residents to recycle food scraps and other organic waste?

YES.....	67%
NO.....	32%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	1%

IF "YES," ASK: (n=268)

102. Have you used this drop-off site? (IF "YES," ASK:) Do you use this site - more than once a week, once a week, every other week, once a month, or less often?

NO.....	32%
MORE THAN ONCE A WEEK...	4%
ONCE A WEEK.....	10%
EVERY OTHER WEEK.....	16%
ONCE A MONTH.....	20%
LESS OFTEN.....	18%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%

IF "NO" IN QUESTION #102, ASK: (n=86)

103. Why don't you use the food scraps and organics recycling drop-off site?

UNSURE, 2%; NO INTEREST/HASSLE, 40%; NOT ENOUGH WASTE, 28%; COMPOST AT HOME, 11%; BAD ODOR, 13%; ATTRACTS ANIMALS, 2%; MESSY, 5%.

IF "NO" IN QUESTION #101, ASK: (n=126)

104. Now that you are aware of the organics drop-off site, how likely would your household be to use the site for recycling compostable waste - very likely, somewhat likely, not too likely, or not at all likely?

VERY LIKELY.....	7%
SOMEWHAT LIKELY.....	41%
NOT TOO LIKELY.....	28%
NOT AT ALL LIKELY.....	18%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	6%

IF "NOT TOO LIKELY" OR "NOT AT ALL LIKELY," ASK: (n=58)

105. Why would you not use the food scraps and organics recycling drop-off site?

NO INTEREST/HASSLE, 36%; NOT ENOUGH WASTE, 24%; COMPOST AT HOME, 7%; BAD ODOR, 7%; ATTRACTS ANIMALS, 10%; MESSY, 5%; RENTER/NO WHERE TO STORE, 10%.

106. When a curbside collection program for compostable waste is available, how likely would your household be to participate in it - very likely, somewhat likely, not too likely, or not at all likely?

VERY LIKELY.....	11%
SOMEWHAT LIKELY.....	42%
NOT TOO LIKELY.....	24%
NOT AT ALL LIKELY.....	16%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	8%

On another topic....

107. How would you rate the City's overall performance in communicating key local issues to residents in its publications, website, mailings, and on cable television - excellent, good, only fair, or poor?

EXCELLENT.....	11%
GOOD.....	76%
ONLY FAIR.....	13%
POOR.....	0%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%

108. What is your primary source of information about the City of Roseville?
- | | |
|-------------------------|-----|
| DON'T KNOW/REFUSED..... | 0% |
| NONE..... | 1% |
| CITY NEWSLETTER..... | 42% |
| EMAIL/E-NEWSLETTER..... | 11% |
| CITY WEBSITE..... | 20% |
| CABLE TV..... | 2% |
| WORD OF MOUTH..... | 13% |
| SOCIAL MEDIA..... | 10% |
| SCATTERED..... | 2% |
109. How would you most prefer to receive information about Roseville City Government and its activities - (ROTATE) email, information on the city website, city publications and newsletters, mailings to your home, local weekly newspaper, cable tv programming, the City's Facebook, the City's Twitter feed or Nextdoor?
- | | |
|--------------------------|-----|
| EMAIL..... | 9% |
| CITY WEBSITE..... | 21% |
| PUBLICATIONS/NEWSLTRS.. | 43% |
| MAILINGS TO HOME..... | 8% |
| LOCAL WEEKLY PAPERS..... | 1% |
| CABLE TV..... | 5% |
| CITY FACEBOOK..... | 10% |
| CITY TWITTER..... | 2% |
| NEXTDOOR..... | 1% |
110. Do you recall receiving the City's printed publication -- "Roseville City News" - in the mail during the past year?
- | | |
|-------------------------|-----|
| YES..... | 76% |
| NO..... | 24% |
| DON'T KNOW/REFUSED..... | 1% |
- IF "YES," ASK: (n=302)
111. Do you or any members of your household regularly read it?
- | | |
|-------------------------|-----|
| YES..... | 92% |
| NO..... | 8% |
| DON'T KNOW/REFUSED..... | 0% |
112. How effective is this City publication in keeping you informed about activities in the city - very effective, somewhat effective, not too effective, or not at all effective?
- | | |
|--------------------------|-----|
| VERY EFFECTIVE..... | 50% |
| SOMEWHAT EFFECTIVE..... | 43% |
| NOT TOO EFFECTIVE..... | 6% |
| NOT AT ALL EFFECTIVE.... | 0% |
| DON'T KNOW/REFUSED..... | 1% |

I would like to ask you about information sources. For each one, tell me if you currently use that source of information; then, for each you currently use, tell me if you would be likely or unlikely to use it to obtain information about the City of Roseville.
(ROTATE)

	NOT USE	USE LIK	USE NLK	DK/ REF
113. Facebook?	39%	46%	15%	0%
114. Twitter?	60%	26%	14%	0%
115. YouTube?	52%	28%	20%	0%
116. Nextdoor?	63%	27%	10%	0%
117. Email?	38%	48%	14%	0%
118. City website?	23%	73%	4%	0%
119. Other social media sites?	65%	27%	8%	0%

Now, just a few more questions for demographic purposes....

Could you please tell me how many people in each of the following age groups live in your household.

120. Persons 65 or over?	NONE.....70%
	ONE.....16%
	TWO OR MORE.....14%
	REFUSED.....0%
121. Adults between the ages of 50 and 64 years of age?	NONE.....72%
	ONE.....13%
	TWO MORE.....15%
	REFUSED.....0%
122. Adults between the ages of 18 and 49 years of age?	NONE.....46%
	ONE.....19%
	TWO.....33%
	THREE OR MORE.....2%
	REFUSED.....0%
123. School-aged children and pre- schoolers?	NONE.....74%
	ONE.....10%
	TWO.....13%
	THREE OR MORE.....3%
	REFUSED.....0%
124. Do you own or rent your present residence?	OWN.....68%
	RENT.....32%
	REFUSED.....0%

125. What is your age, please? (READ CATEGORIES, IF NEEDED)	18-24.....11% 25-34.....16% 35-44.....15% 45-54.....16% 55-64.....15% 65 AND OVER.....27% REFUSED.....0%
126. Which of the following best describes your household: (READ) A. Single, no other family at home. B. Single parent with children at home. C. Married or partnered, with children at home. D. Married or partnered with no children or no children at home. E. Something else.	SINGLE/NO OTHER.....31% SINGLE PARENT.....5% MAR/PARTN/CHILDREN.....21% MAR/PARTN/NO CHILD.....43% SOMETHING ELSE.....1% DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....0%
127. Which of the following categories represents your ethnicity - White, African-American, Hispanic-Latino, Asian-Pacific Islander, Native American, or something else? (IF "SOMETHING ELSE," ASK:) What would that be?	WHITE.....66% AFRICAN-AMERICAN.....11% HISPANIC-LATINO.....6% ASIAN-PACIFIC ISLAND...10% NATIVE AMERICAN.....1% SOMETHING ELSE.....0% MULTI/BI-RACIAL.....7% DON'T KNOW.....0% REFUSED.....0%
128. Do you live north or south of Highway 36? (WAIT FOR RESPONSE) Do you live east or west of Snelling Avenue?	NORTHWEST.....15% NORTHEAST.....44% SOUTHEAST.....26% SOUTHWEST.....15% DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....0%

129. Finally, thinking about your household finances, how would you describe your financial situation, would you say that -	STATEMENT A.....6%
A) Your monthly expenses are exceeding your income;	STATEMENT B.....41%
B) You are meeting your monthly expenses but are putting aside little or no savings;	STATEMENT C.....47%
C) You are managing comfortably while putting some money aside;	STATEMENT D.....4%
D) Managing very well?	DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....2%
130. Gender (DO NOT ASK)	MALE.....48%
	FEMALE.....52%

Roseville Public Works, Environment and Transportation Commission Agenda Item

DATE: June 25, 2024

ITEM: 8.a.

ITEM DESCRIPTION: City Council Joint Meeting Discussion Items

Background

The PWETC is scheduled for its annual joint meeting with the City Council on July 22, 2024. We ask that the Commission create a list of topics to discuss with the City Council and staff will include them in the July 22 Council packet. Attached is the 2023 Council Action from the Commission's discussion with the Council last year. Also attached is a list of topics presented at the PWET Commission meetings over the last 12 months.

Each year, the Public Works, Environment, and Transportation Commission meets with the City Council to review activities and accomplishments and to discuss the upcoming year's work plan and issues that may be considered. During the meeting, the Commission will fill in the blanks below for the report to the City Council.

Activities and accomplishments:

-
-
-
-

Recommended actions for Council:

-
-
-
-

Work Plan items for the upcoming year:

-
-
-
-

Questions or Concerns for the City Council:

-
-
-
-

Recommendation

Create a list of accomplishments and discussion items for the City Council meeting.

Attachments

1. 2023 Council Action
2. 2023-2024 PWETC Meeting Topic Review

ROSEVILLE

REQUEST FOR COUNCIL ACTION

Date: July 10, 2023

Item No.:

Department Approval



City Manager Approval

Item Description: Public Works, Environment, and Transportation Commission Joint Meeting with the City Council

1 BACKGROUND

2 Each year, the Public Works, Environment, and Transportation Commission meets with the City
3 Council to review activities and accomplishments, and to discuss the upcoming year's work plan and
4 other potential issues to consider. The following are activities over the past year and issues the
5 Commission would like to take up in the next year.

6 Activities and accomplishments:

- 7 ○ Less Mow May
- 8 ○ Sustainability Topics – 3rd Annual Sustainability Super Meeting
- 9 ○ Transit Update from Met Council
- 10 ○ Numerous Staff Updates – Recycling Updates, MS4, Sustainability, Utility Rates, Pavement
- 11 Management

12 Work Plan items for the upcoming year:

- 13 ○ Continue Speed Limit Discussion with input from Council
- 14 ○ Discuss the Scope of the Commission
- 15 ○ Development of Bike Network Plan
- 16 ○ Eureka Recycling Contract
- 17 ○ Update on the Roseville area transit system

18 Questions or Concerns for the City Council:

- 19 ○ Any feedback on speed limit discussion to date? What type of engagement with the public
- 20 would the Council like to see?
- 21 ○ Does Council want the Commission to look into organized waste collection?
- 22 ○ Is there a need to look at regulating small electric motor vehicles (scooters, etc.) in the right-
- 23 of-way and on pathways?
- 24 ○ Should we review public safety, as related to transportation and infrastructure?
- 25 ○ Does Council want the PWET Commission to look into the mowing ordinance?
- 26 ○ Does Council want the PWET Commission to look into ideal street design standards?

- What other topics would the Council like the PWET Commission to address over the next year?

Over the past year, the PWET Commission has made a few recommendations for Council to consider. Below is a brief discussion of each recommendation:

- Take Out Containers

- At the March 2022 and August 2022 PWETC meetings, Take Out Containers were a topic. Both meetings resulted in recommendations to the Council. March 2022 PWETC meeting recommended a ban on Polystyrene, Plastic #6, in food take-out containers. Our August 2022 recommendation was to follow the St. Louis Park Ordinance as a base for Roseville's Take Out Container Ordinance. Going forward, staff would modify the name to be the same as surrounding cities' ordinances, called "Green to Go." The minutes of the PWETC discussion are included as Attachment B. A memo on the topic is included as Attachment C.

- Speed Limits

- Over the last year, the Commission has discussed possible changes to the speed limit on the City of Roseville streets. The Commission discussed this topic at the September, November, and April PWETC meetings. Before the Commission begins engagement with the public, the Commission and staff would like feedback on the speed limit discussion. Staff and the Commission want to make sure Council supports what will be proposed to the public during engagement and get feedback on the types of engagement the Council would like to see. Information on the speed limit discussion to date is included in Attachment D. The presentation from the April meeting is included as Attachment E.

- PWETC Scope Change

- At the March PWETC meeting, the Commission discussed the PWETC scope and duties. This review was in response to discussions last year about the name change, prior to the direction Council gave to the Commission in May. At the meeting, the Commission made recommendations to change the scope of the Commission. The recommendations are included as Attachment F.

- Sewer Service Lateral Revolving Loan Policy

- At the February PWETC meeting, the Commission discussed sanitary sewer laterals and water services and how the City can help residents replace their private services. The Commission supported the concept of establishing a revolving loan fund to help residents. The Commission thought this was something that maybe the Finance Commission would like to review. The minutes and background of the discussion are included as Attachment G.

- Street Name Change Policy

- At the June PWETC meeting, the Commission discussed a policy for if residents want to change the name of the street. This review was in response to residents on County Road B, west of Cleveland, inquiring about changing the name of the road since it is no longer a county road. The Commission recommended the Council adopt the draft policy. Draft minutes of the discussion are included as Attachment H. The draft policy is included at Attachment I.

70 **POLICY OBJECTIVE**

71 Per City Code 201.07.B - At least once a year, each Commission shall meet with the City Council to
72 report on the previous year's work and to discuss work plans and pending issues for the upcoming
73 year.

74 **BUDGET IMPLICATIONS**

75 There are no budget impacts.

76 **RACIAL EQUITY IMPACT SUMMARY**

77 There are no equity impacts associated with this joint meeting.

78 **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

79 Staff recommends the City Council hold the joint meeting and provide feedback.

80 **REQUESTED COUNCIL ACTION**

81 Hold joint meeting and provide feedback.

Prepared by: Jesse Freihammer, Public Works Director
Attachments: A: PWETC 2022-2023 Meeting Topic Summary
B: Take Out Container Discussion Minutes
C: Take Out Container Discussion Memo
D: Speed Limit Discussion Minutes
E: Speed Limit Presentation - April
F: PWETC Scope Change Recommendations
G: Sewer Service Lateral – Revolving Loan Fund Recommendation
H: Draft Street Name Change Policy Minutes
I: Street Name Change Policy Recommendations

Roseville Public Works, Environment and Transportation Commission 2023-2024 Review

Below is a list of topics discussed at the PWET Commission Meetings from July 2023 – June 2024.

2022

July:

SPRWS Presentation
Climate Action Planning Update

August:

Green To Go Introduction and Overview
Street Name Change Update
Discuss Commission Scope
Street Design Standards
State Fair Parking

September:

EAB update
AARP Walk Audit
Bench Ordinance
CEE Program Update

October:

CR B Update
TH 36 Update
Lead Free Roseville
2024 Proposed Utility Rates

November:

2024 Work Plan
Recycling RFP
City Campus Solar Update

2023

January:

Street Name Change Policy
Public Works Code Updates
Lighting Policy

February:

Sustainability Super Meeting! (4th Annual)
Green Team Update/Gold Leaf Program

March:

Bike Plan Introduction
Dale St Update
Envision Roseville Update

April:

2024 Eureka Recycling Update
RCD 4 Ditch Soils Study Award
Bike Plan Update
County Road C 4:3 Update

May:

Trout Brook Interceptor Flood Analysis
MS4 Annual Meeting
Forestry/EAB Update

June:

Civic Campus Master Plan Update
Bike Plan Update
City Survey – PW Review

Roseville Public Works, Environment and Transportation Commission Agenda Item

DATE: June 25, 2024

ITEM: 9.a.

ITEM DESCRIPTION: Future Agenda Items

Background

Suggested Items:

Looking Ahead:

- July 1 - Tour – SPRWS Water Plant @ 1:00 PM
- July 23
 - Green To Go Update
 - Pavement Management Funding – Asset Management
 - Joint Council Meeting Follow-up/Update Work Plan
- August 27
 - Public Safety Update
 -
- Future
 - Transit/Micro Transit Update
 -

Recommendation

Set preliminary agenda items for the July 23, 2024 Public Works, Environment & Transportation Commission meeting.

Attachments

None