

Roseville Public Works, Environment and Transportation Commission Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, July 28, 2026, at 6:30 p.m.
City Council Chambers, 2660 Civic Center Drive
Roseville, Minnesota 55113

1. Introduction / Roll Call

Vice Chair Hodder called the meeting to order at approximately 6:30 p.m. and at his request, Assistant Public Works Director/City Engineer Jennifer Lowry called the roll.

Present: Chair Bryant Ficek, Vice Chair Edwin Hodder, and Members Daniel Fergus, Allison Luongo, Luke Sandstrom, and Charles Tedder

Youth Commissioners:

Absent: Member Katie Brokaw Palalay and Alexis Jendro (Excused)

Staff Present: Assistant Public Works Director/City Engineer Jennifer Lowry

2. Approve Agenda

Motion

Member Luongo moved, Member Fergus seconded, approval of the July 28, 2026 Agenda as presented.

Ayes: 6

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

3. Public Comments

No one wished to address the commission.

Vice Chair Hodder did inquire about a recent news report describing cyberattacks that had affected several municipal water systems throughout the region. He asked whether Roseville had been impacted or whether staff had received any information regarding the incident.

Ms. Lowry responded that they had not heard of any impacts involving Roseville but would follow up with neighboring agencies, including St. Paul, to determine whether any local systems had been involved.

4. Business Items

a. Communication Items

Assistant Public Works Director/City Engineer Lowry provided a brief review and update on projects and maintenance activities listed in the staff report dated July 23, 2026.

Chair Ficek asked how residents receive notification when emergency water main repairs or roadway work temporarily affect neighborhoods.

Ms. Lowry explained that construction projects require contractors to post advance-notice signs about seven days before work and notify residents of access restrictions. Emergency repairs usually involve direct notification to impacted households due to brief water service interruptions. The City also distributes notifications to emergency responders, law enforcement, the Postal Service, school transportation, and other agencies via an established email system.

b. Streetlight Policy

Assistant Public Works Director/City Engineer Lowry provided a brief presentation of the streetlight policy and some questions staff sought direction on regarding the implementation of, or potential changes to, the existing Streetlight Policy.

Member Tedder asked whether all three proposed lighting options satisfied current dark-sky requirements.

Ms. Lowry responded that all of the proposed fixtures utilized LED technology with cutoff lighting to reduce light spillover. However, she indicated staff was still confirming whether every fixture met formal DarkSky certification requirements. She added that lighting could also be adjusted to better shield neighboring properties regardless of the certification status of an individual fixture.

Public Comment

Vice Chair Hodder opened the public comment and asked anyone wishing to speak to come forward, state their name and address for the record, and limit comments to approximately three minutes.

Ms. Jean Peterson, 600 Terrace Court, representing one of the Owasso Hills homeowners associations, addressed the commission and explained that her association had already submitted a petition about the decorative streetlights.

She asked whether residents who signed the petition would remain committed if the City's final proposal differed significantly from what homeowners had originally anticipated.

Ms. Peterson stated that she believed homeowners requesting enhanced decorative lighting should expect to pay the additional cost of those improvements. Still, she wanted residents to understand their obligations before the process moved forward fully.

Mr. Todd Larson, 2920 Hillview East, questioned the staff's estimated replacement costs. He encouraged the city to investigate whether competitive bidding or requests for proposals could reduce project costs rather than relying solely on Xcel Energy's estimates. He also asked whether the existing decorative fixtures could be refurbished rather than completely replaced, noting that many appeared structurally sound. Based on the preliminary estimates, he calculated that replacement costs approached \$10,000 per fixture and believed additional analysis was warranted before making a final decision.

Ms. Alicia House, 542 Owasso Hills Drive, explained that Owasso Hills residents were not requesting additional streetlights or a higher level of service. Rather, they hoped to preserve a defining neighborhood feature that had existed since the subdivision's development. She stated that many homeowners believed the original installation costs had already been paid under the developer's agreement and questioned whether residents should again be assessed to replace the same lighting system twenty-five years later.

Ms. House also encouraged the City to partner with Xcel Energy to identify longer-term replacement strategies that would reduce future costs, preserve the neighborhood's appearance, and protect property values.

Mr. Christer Cedarberg, 534 Owasso Hills Drive, an original homeowner in the development, explained that decorative streetlighting was one of the features that attracted him to the neighborhood. After reviewing the homeowners association governing documents, he found detailed provisions on landscaping and common areas but no language assigning long-term responsibility for replacing the decorative lighting after the Xcel Energy lease expired. He suggested that the City replace the existing system without assessing current homeowners and then ensure that future development agreements clearly identify maintenance and replacement responsibilities so future property owners fully understand those obligations.

Mr. David Trapp, 2990 Highcourt, explained that the neighborhood is divided among multiple homeowners associations and noted that only three streetlights in his area would be replaced. He emphasized the importance of maintaining both the neighborhood's appearance and public safety. Mr. Trapp

expressed concern that if some HOAs selected enhanced lighting. In contrast, others chose standard lighting, it could create an inconsistent appearance across the community and raise questions about how associated costs would be distributed. He encouraged the HOAs to work together to reach a coordinated decision.

Vice Chair Hodder closed the public comment and returned the matter to the commission for further discussion and consideration.

The commission generally agreed that the Owasso Hills project highlighted an issue that had not been fully contemplated when the City's updated Streetlight Policy was adopted. The discussion focused on balancing neighborhood expectations, public safety, long-term maintenance responsibilities, and equitable treatment of taxpayers throughout the city.

Member Tedder asked whether the petition requirement and the assessment process should be treated as two separate policy decisions.

Ms. Lowry said the commission could recommend letting an existing enhanced neighborhood keep decorative lighting and decide whether homeowners should pay for the extra cost through assessments. She explained staff presented those issues separately because multiple policy options were still available.

Member Fergus asked whether the estimated homeowner assessment represented a recurring expense or a one-time obligation.

Ms. Lowry said the assessment was a one-time fee for the twenty-five-year lease, not annual. She noted the City might revisit this at the next lease expiration unless a new long-term policy is adopted. She also said that since Owasso Hills has four homeowners associations, each could independently decide on enhanced lighting.

Member Luongo questioned how the original enhanced lighting districts had been established and why existing development documents did not address long-term replacement responsibilities.

Ms. Lowry said staff reviewed development records and found no responsibility clauses after the Xcel Energy lease ended. She noted future projects will likely include detailed agreements, as City policies on public infrastructure are now clearer than during the original subdivision.

The commission also discussed maintenance responsibilities associated with decorative lighting.

Ms. Lowry explained that replacing the Owasso Hills system via a new Xcel Energy lease would grant twenty-five years of maintenance from Xcel Energy. Conversely, decorative systems owned by the City require Public Works staff to find replacement fixtures and coordinate repairs themselves, which becomes harder as fixtures become obsolete. She noted that obtaining replacement parts is often a challenge as lighting technology advances.

The commission reviewed the City's assessment policy and the concept of "special benefit."

Ms. Lowry explained assessments are linked to the property, not the homeowner, and Roseville provides deferral programs for qualifying owners, including seniors, veterans, and disabled residents, allowing deferred payments until sale or transfer.

The commission next considered whether enhanced lighting districts should be subject to maximum spacing requirements similar to those applied under the City's standard streetlight policy.

Member Tedder observed that the standard policy generally evaluates whether mid-block lighting is warranted when spacing between intersections exceeds approximately 600 feet.

Ms. Lowry explained that no comparable spacing standards currently exist for enhanced lighting districts and that staff was seeking guidance on whether such standards should be incorporated into future policy revisions.

Several commissioners expressed concern that eliminating assessments for decorative lighting could establish a precedent encouraging similar requests throughout Roseville. Members observed that decorative lighting provides aesthetic benefits that many neighborhoods might desire if the City absorbed the additional costs entirely.

Ms. Lowry acknowledged the possibility but noted neighborhood preferences differ. Some residents want more lighting for safety, others prefer darker streets. She said the City's policy should balance neighborhood preferences with citywide equity and fiscal responsibility.

The commission generally recognized that Owasso Hills represented a unique situation because decorative lighting had been an established feature of the neighborhood since its original development. Members distinguished between preserving an existing neighborhood characteristic and creating entirely new enhanced lighting districts. The commission indicated that future policy revisions should recognize that distinction while remaining flexible enough to provide consistent guidance for similar situations that may arise in the future.

The commission generally recommended that the revised policy clearly defines when streetlight improvements would be considered a citywide public benefit and when the associated costs would be assigned to benefiting property owners through an assessment.

The commission also encouraged staff to develop a more consistent and transparent process for evaluating requests for enhanced lighting, including consideration of safety, neighborhood character, lighting uniformity, maintenance responsibilities, and long-term replacement costs.

The commission further recommended that staff review how costs would be allocated when a lighting project affected multiple neighborhoods, homeowner associations, or property types, particularly when those groups did not agree on the preferred lighting style or level of improvement.

The commission emphasized the importance of avoiding inconsistent lighting designs within the same general area and encouraged coordination among affected homeowner associations before a project moved forward. They also recommended that residents receive clear information regarding available lighting options, estimated costs, assessment procedures, and the potential consequences if portions of a neighborhood selected different lighting standards.

Ms. Lowry indicated that the commission's comments would be used to refine the proposed Streetlight Policy revisions. Staff would also coordinate the policy changes with the City's broader assessment policy review to ensure that the two policies used consistent standards for determining public benefit, private benefit, eligibility, and cost responsibility. Updated policy language and recommendations would be returned to the commission for additional review before the matter was presented to the City Council for formal consideration and possible adoption.

c. Intern Presentations

This item was postponed to a future meeting.

d. City Council Joint Meeting Review

This item was postponed to a future meeting.

e. Pathway Master Plan Segment Review

This item was postponed to a future meeting.

f. Future Agenda Items

Ms. Lowry reviewed the commission's upcoming work plan and future agenda items. She explained that staff intended to return in August with a Metro Transit update, including information on the Roseville Transit Center, Metro's

microtransit program, the City's assessment policy (covering alleys, streetlights, traffic signals), and a summary of Streetlight Policy discussions. The City's sustainability intern was also scheduled to present on summer projects.

Ms. Lowry stated that work on the Pathway Master Plan would stay flexible, allowing staff to postpone it if other policy issues needed attention, without affecting other projects.

The commission also agreed that the work from the recent Joint City Council meeting required more time, as councilmembers had listed many topics for future review.

Vice Chair Hodder suggested organizing the Joint City Council follow-up into a more structured work plan before bringing the topics back to the commission.

The commission agreed that presenting the topics in a "yes or no" format would help streamline future discussions and assist the commission in establishing priorities for the coming year.

The commission expressed consensus with staff's proposed work plan and agreed to continue refining priorities as additional projects progressed.

5. Commission Direction on Member-Initiated Agenda Items

6. Approval of May 19, 2026, and June 23, 2026, 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 Ficek moved, Member Sandstrom seconded, approval of the May 19, 2026, meeting minutes as presented.

Ayes: 6

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

Motion

Member Tedder moved, Member Fergus seconded, approval of the June 23, 2026, meeting minutes as presented.

Ayes: 5

Nays: 0

Abstain: 1 (Luongo)

Motion carried.

7. Adjourn

Motion

Member Tedder moved, Member Luongo seconded, adjournment of the meeting at approximately 8:43 p.m.

Ayes: 6

Nays: 0

Motion carried.