Roseville Public Works, Environment and Transportation Commission Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, September 24, 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., as requested; Public Works Director Jesse Freihammer called the roll.

   Present: Chair Bryant Ficek; Vice Chair Edwin Hodder; Members Jarrod Cicha, Daniel Fergus, Allison Luongo, Sarah Rudolf, and Des Mueller; Youth Commissioners Carson Bauer and Alexi Jendro

   Absent: None

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

2. **Public Comments**
   None

3. **Approval of August 27, 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 Luongo seconded, to approve the August 27, 2024, meeting minutes as presented.

   Ayes: 7
   Nays: 0
   Motion carried.

4. **Communication Items**
   Public Works Director Freihammer provided a brief review and update on projects and maintenance activities listed in the staff report dated September 24, 2024.

5. **Metro Transit Update**

Public Works Director Jesse Freihammer introduced Cyndi Harper, Ben Picone, and Barrett Clausen from Metro Transit, who presented the Metro Transit update.

Member Mueller indicated that the presentation touched upon the routes that are being discontinued, and she wondered what Metro Transit was doing with park-and-ride sites like Route 272 from Rice Street.

Ms. Harper stated the park-and-ride will stay open. The G line will serve it, as will Route 270, which is the express service from Maplewood Mall to Hwy 36 into downtown Minneapolis.

Member Rudolf explained that her job encompasses transit and land use and encounters people across the country who make decisions about those matters. She found that people who ride transit speak about it differently than people who do not. She wondered if Metro Transit has ways to distinguish riders from non-riders regarding the feedback offered as it solicits feedback on its plan.

Ms. Harper explained that their survey comment form asks some demographic questions and asks how often the person rides transit. They are interested in all feedback, particularly on the local routes. Those riders tend to come from underrepresented communities that will not attend a public meeting or have conversations about this. Metro Transit is also working with a consulting firm to help target those underrepresented groups with specific events and working within the communities to get the word out about what Metro Transit plans on doing.

Member Fergus thought it was interesting that Ms. Harper noted the change in ridership during morning and evening rush hours. These were both at the same level, and he wondered who was riding in the evening.

Ms. Harper reviewed the current ridership with the Commission.

Member Luongo indicated that Route 62 has been fare-free for a while and wondered if that impacted ridership.

Ms. Harper explained that two routes, Route 32 and Route 62, both of which serve Roseville, are currently fare-free on the pilot program. She indicated they were unsure if they would return to charging fares or what would happen once the program expires. She explained that ridership has increased on both routes, which is higher than the percentage seen across other routes. One exciting thing is it is free to board either of those two routes, but if a transfer is needed, there is still a fee for that, and the only customers who are getting an utterly fare-free ride are those who do not have to transfer.

Chair Ficek asked how long the pilot program will run.

Mr. Picone explained that the pilot program will run for 18 months, allowing Metro Transit to be more flexible in setting the zone's parameters.

Chair Ficek thanked Metro Transit for the presentation.

6. Recycling RFP

a. 2024 Recycling RFP Proposal Discussion

Environmental Manager Ryan Johnson presented the 2024 Recycling RFP proposal to the Commission.

Chair Ficek asked what the base price was used to determine this.

Mr. Johnson explained that the base proposal gave them a three-year or five-year lease, city-owned or vendor-owned, and no revenue share. Those were the significant components the staff was looking for in that.

Mr. Johnson continued his presentation on the 2024 recycling RFP proposal review of current annual costs and proposed a low bid for three-year and five-year comparing city-owned carts and vendor-owned carts.

Member Rudolf asked if the City went with City-owned carts, would there be a cost to the mobilization part?

Mr. Johnson indicated that it is already included in the cart quote. He reviewed how the plan would work.

Member Mueller asked how the cart replacement would work if the carts were City-owned.

Mr. Johnson explained the process the City would follow to add more carts and replace carts in the program.

Mr. Freihammer noted that the Toter quote the City received included a twelve-year warranty, which was higher than the other quotes. The warranty would cover repairs and replacements, and there would not be a mass cart purchase like this the first time.

Mr. Johnson reviewed random notes that each proposer brought to the table and the price escalator from each one.

Vice Chair Hodder asked where the different recyclers dispose of the material. He wondered if they were all disposed of in the same place if these were set up differently, and what the market was for the materials that were sent off.

Mr. Johnson reviewed the different recycler sites that are used.

Member Mueller indicated she was curious about what the City is collecting for this and what it is looking at for fees. She noted she was trying to figure out what the City was looking at for a yearly rate versus the revenue as a community, what everyone is contributing to the pool, and how that shakes out.

Mr. Freihammer explained that the City has been planning for carts to generate a little more revenue than expenditures. The City was shooting for an additional $40,000 in revenue. If this goes through, the rates will be lower, and the rates will be able to go down, but the City will have to buy the carts, which will hurt the City's cash balance.

The Commission discussed awarding the best value bid to the City Council with staff and a recommendation.

Member Mueller indicated she was all about saving money but struggled with this. She explained that the City needed to know how they impact families and businesses. She explained she was working with exceptions to what these proposers would collect. She explained how residents may have difficulty understanding what is recyclable and not, which may discourage them from recycling. She thought there would need to be additional education done because the general public does not understand what is recyclable and what is not versus what the vendor has a market for versus what is recyclable.

Mr. Freihammer indicated that the proposer could accept the recyclable items, but this might also increase the costs, so it would need to be negotiated.

Member Mueller felt that the Commission needed that information before a recommendation could be made to the City Council.

Mr. Freihammer reviewed the process before the City Council would vote on this.

Chair Ficek offered public comment, but no one came forward.

The Commission discussed and deliberated on the recommendation for the City Council.

Motion
Member Fergus moved, Member Cicha seconded, to recommend that the City Council approve proposer 4; the expanded materials are a requirement, and the term is three years. City-owned carts also include the composition study listed in the RFP and are pending the price increase compared to the proposer's bid.

Ayes: 7
Nays: 0

Motion carried.

7. **Future Agenda Items**
   Discussion ensued regarding the October 2024 PWETC agenda:
   - Update on utility rates
   - Public Safety update
   - Pavement funding – Asset Management

8. **Adjourn**

   Motion
   Member Rudolph moved, Member Hodder seconded, adjourning the meeting at approximately 9:22 p.m.

   Ayes: 7
   Nays: 0
   Motion carried.