



CITY OF SAINT ANTHONY VILLAGE  
**PARKS AND ENVIRONMENTAL COMMISSION  
WORKSESSION AGENDA**

Monday, May 21, 2025 at 7:00 PM

Members of the public who wish to attend the meeting may do so in person.

**I. Approval Of PK Worksession Minutes**

Documents:

[PK 04-02-2025 WORK SESSION.PDF](#)

**II. Worksession Topics**

**A. Climate Plan Overview: Transportation**

Minette Saulog, Sustainability Coordinator, presenting.

Documents:

[PRESENTATION.PDF](#)

**B. Ordinance 2025-0x- DRAFT- EV Charging**

Stephen Grittman, City Planner, presenting.

Documents:

[COVER MEMO - EV CHARGING ORDINANCE LANGUAGE.PDF](#)  
[EV CHARGING ORDINANCE LANGUAGE DRAFT 1.PDF](#)

**III. Commission Reports**

**IV. Other Business**

**V. Adjournment**

If you would like to request special accommodations or alternative formats, please contact the City Clerk at 612-782-3313 or email [city@savmn.com](mailto:city@savmn.com). People who are deaf or hard of hearing can contact us by using 711 Relay.

**Our mission is to promote a high quality of life to those we serve through outstanding city services.**



**CITY OF ST. ANTHONY  
PARKS AND ENVIRONMENTAL COMMISSION WORK SESSION MEETING  
APRIL 2, 2025  
7:00 p.m.**

## **I. CALL TO ORDER.**

Chairperson Fee called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

## II. ROLL CALL.

Commissioners Present: Chair Lily Fee, Commissioners Yaacoub Hark, Kristen Peterson, and Natalie Synhavsky.

Absent: Commissioner Jessica Swiontek

Also Present: Assistant City Manager Ashley Morello and Sustainability Coordinator Minette Saulog,

**III. APPROVAL OF THE APRIL 2, 2025, PARKS AND ENVIRONMENTAL COMMISSION MEETING AGENDA.**

Motion by Commissioner Hark, seconded by Commissioner Synhavsky, to approve the April 2, 2025, Parks and Environmental Commission agenda.

### **Motion carried unanimously.**

**IV. APPROVAL OF THE MARCH 10, 2025, WORK SESSION PARKS AND ENVIRONMENTAL COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES.**

Motion by Commissioner Peterson, seconded by Commissioner Hark, to approve the March 10, 2025, Work Session Parks and Environmental Commission Meeting Minutes as presented.

## **Motion carried unanimously.**

## V. PRESENTATIONS.

## A. Climate Plan Overview: Energy Focus Area

Sustainability Coordinator Minette Saulog reviewed a PowerPoint presentation, “Climate Plan Overview Energy Focus Area”. Ms. Saulog provided the background:

- The Energy section is a Climate Plan focus area for the City in 2025, along with the Transportation section.
- PEC will be most focused on supporting action items and strategies that are policy-oriented, which are being covered tonight. The Climate Plan includes the full list of strategies that include these as well as education and operations-oriented strategies being owned by staff.

Parks and Environmental Commission Work Session Meeting Minutes

April 2, 2025

Page 2

- 1     • The previous PEC group completed a ranking activity in Dec 2024 to provide input on  
2     how the City should consider prioritizing the pursuit of these strategies (\*=highest  
3     priority actions).
- 4     • The Energy Action Plan has several strategies mirroring those in the Climate Plan,  
5     creating parallels and stronger initiative for the City to make progress in those areas.  
6     (\*\*=Energy Action Plan mirror strategy).

7     Ms. Saulog reviewed the Energy Initiatives along with actions and current status.  
8  
9

10    Energy Initiative 1 – Improve efficiency of homes, businesses, and public facilities in St.  
11    Anthony Village.

12    Energy Initiative 2 – Increase usage of renewable energy.

13    Energy Initiative 3 – Increase the purchasing of electric devices and appliance alternatives.

14  
15    Commissioner Peterson asked about fuel switching and would those switches to electrification  
16    be incorporated into Initiative 1. Ms. Saulog stated that focus would be more on building  
17    usage – City facilities.

18  
19    Commissioner Hark asked who conducts the energy audits, and is there a plan for that. Ms.  
20    Saulog stated the home energy audits are done by Xcel Home Energy Squad. Commissioner  
21    Hark asked if it is a one-time audit, and Ms. Saulog stated it is a one-time visit.

22    Chair Fee shared her experience when a home audit was done.

23  
24    Commissioner Synhavsky asked what the potential funding sources are to provide the home  
25    audit for free. Ms. Saulog stated a cost-share program could be set up through the City,  
26    possibly through a grant program. It is important not to make it just a one-time thing. It should  
27    be a resource that will be around to continue efforts to improve sustainability and education  
28    efforts.

29  
30    Assistant City Manager Ashley Morello stated Xcel also has programs available for no cost  
31    audits for individuals. Ms. Morello stated Staff wanted to update the Commission on what is  
32    being done.

33    **VI. COMMISSION REPORTS.**

34  
35    Ms. Morello suggested doing Other Business before Commission Reports on the agenda.

36  
37    **VII. OTHER BUSINESS.**

38  
39    **A. Sustainability Building Policy Discussion**

40  
41    Sustainability Coordinator Minette Saulog reviewed as part of the Climate Plan, an identified  
42    action item under the Energy focus area is to “Consider adopting a sustainable building policy  
43    for all new and remodeled construction projects.” This is a policy-coded Climate Plan action

Parks and Environmental Commission Work Session Meeting Minutes

April 2, 2025

Page 3

1 that will eventually require a recommendation from the PEC to move forward with the City  
2 Council.

3  
4 Sustainable building policies are those that establish minimum sustainability criteria beyond  
5 existing state code for new constructions or significant renovations, targeting pollution  
6 reduction, resource conservation, and environmental responsibility. These can also be referred  
7 to as green building policies.

8  
9 This evening the Commission is requested to have discussion to begin outlining what criteria  
10 would apply to a potential sustainable building policy in St. Anthony Village, the types of  
11 projects for which it would apply, and other possible requirements. The City has no existing  
12 policy aside from a brief section for sustainability considerations in the language for general  
13 regulations for R-4 zoning district multi-family developments.

14  
15 The Center for Energy and Environment and Hennepin County published a sustainable  
16 building policy guide in 2021, with recommendations for policy frameworks and best  
17 practices. There are three approaches that may be considered: a mandatory approach, scoring  
18 approach and suggestion approach. All three have been used in other Minnesota cities.

19  
20 A city can activate its existing sustainable building policy due to the following triggers:  
21 funding incentives, land use incentives, process incentives, and building size. Staff is  
22 considering enforcement of the policy and how to ensure compliance as part of the  
23 development process.

24  
25 Third-Party Rating Systems – To encourage standardization across the region, compliance  
26 with a third-party rating system is recommended. These rating systems are well-known in the  
27 construction industry and allow for developer flexibility to meet policy requirements.

28  
29 Ms. Saulog provided a table showing an informational overview of the most common and  
30 recommended third-party rating systems for a sustainable building policy. These systems are  
31 comprised of sustainability criteria and prescriptive pathways for meeting the criteria. They  
32 are generally broad and cover different sustainability areas (e.g. water, energy, waste,  
33 materials). Rating systems are often similar but not identical and each system has strengths  
34 and weaknesses relative to one another. Making different systems acceptable for various  
35 projects can help the city address priority impact areas being targeted in the sustainable  
36 policy.

37  
38 Ms. Saulog reviewed the St. Anthony Village Overlay. The PEC has the opportunity to  
39 provide input on criteria for the St. Anthony Village overlay. An overlay describes the criteria  
40 specific to the City and is typically in addition to the third-party rating system. A list of  
41 recommended overlay criteria and rules were provided. These are the most common city  
42 overlay criteria as seen in other cities' policies and demonstrates recommended rules that  
43 would fulfill those criteria. Cities are advised to prioritize criteria for adoption that balance  
44 needs for implementation with city goals to ensure policy success.

45  
46 Ms. Saulog provided the specific items for discussion and feedback:

Parks and Environmental Commission Work Session Meeting Minutes

April 2, 2025

Page 4

1  
2 Chair Fee asked if there is a timeframe for presenting this to the City Council, and Ms.  
3 Morello stated the timeframe is TBD, depending on the conversation from this meeting. It  
4 would most likely go to a Council work session when appropriate.

5

- 6     • Which type of approach would work best for St. Anthony? (Mandatory approach,  
7         scoring approach or suggestion approach).

8  
9 Commissioner Peterson asked if a mandatory approach would apply to all buildings, and Ms.  
10 Saulog stated that is correct in the way it is defined.

11  
12 Commissioner Hark asked how this differs from the scoring method, and Ms. Saulog  
13 reviewed the scoring criteria. The scoring approach is ranking.

14  
15 Commissioner Peterson noted that buildings in Minnesota are not allowed to exceed the State  
16 building code and asked if this is the reason additional criteria would be allowed to be  
17 mandatory. Ms. Saulog stated the State building code is separate from the Sustainable  
18 building policy. There cannot be a City building code that is not in alignment with the State  
19 building code. Commissioner Peterson asked if the suggested approach would also require a  
20 change in ordinance or would that just be for the mandatory option. Ms. Morello stated she  
21 could not really answer that. More information on that will be forthcoming.

22  
23 Chair Fee noted the mandatory approach was recommended, and from a sustainability point  
24 she would like compliance. If there is more standardization, it helps everyone in terms of  
25 competition and cost control. She would not want to turn off and have developers reconsider  
26 developing within the City.

27  
28 Commissioner Peterson asked which neighboring cities have something similar to this. Ms.  
29 Saulog stated in the Appendix provided there is a summary of policies within the State of  
30 Minnesota. There are no policies in directly adjacent cities to St. Anthony. The difficulty is  
31 that other cities policies are very specific and would not apply to St. Anthony. Ms. Morello  
32 stated that we do not want to deter any development within the City.

33  
34 Commissioner Synhavsky noted some standardization is taking shape and asked if there is a  
35 boilerplate language we can work from for St. Anthony. Ms. Saulog stated they are referring  
36 to that structure in the guide. Commissioner Synhavsky stated developers generally prefer a  
37 straightforward policy that is clear. It is less confusing if something is written in Code and  
38 mandatory. Ms. Saulog stated she has been spending more time on the mandatory approach  
39 rather than the suggested approach. There are opportunities to provide outreach and education.

40

- 41     • What priority impacts do we want to target in a City overlay?
- 42     • What types of projects do we want this policy to apply to? (such as zoning and/or size  
43         of building).

44  
45 Chair Fee stated she does not know how many new buildings or renovations would be done in  
46 a year and how big of an impact would be created from this policy. Ms. Morello stated we do

Parks and Environmental Commission Work Session Meeting Minutes

April 2, 2025

Page 5

1 not know the impact as St. Anthony is a fully built-out City. If policy is set, we will be  
2 prepared for any development in the future.  
3

4 Commissioner Hark asked if this has been discussed before, and is there a benchmark. Ms.  
5 Morello stated there has not been a policy discussion.  
6

7 Chair Fee stated it seems evenly split between industrial, commercial, and residential.  
8

9 Commissioner Hark suggested multi-family may be a target since that has been the  
10 development the City has been seeing recently. He would prioritize multi-family zoning over  
11 the others, then commercial and industrial. The residential homeowners would have access to  
12 the audits.  
13

14 Commissioner Peterson agreed with Commissioner Hark's comment on multi-family and  
15 thinks that would be key.  
16

17 Chair Fee asked if there is a way to create policies that relate to the different zones. Ms.  
18 Saulog stated that is an option that can be considered.  
19

20 Commissioner Hark asked if the policies would be regardless of the funding source, and  
21 would this apply to privately funded projects. Ms. Morello stated if a mandatory approach was  
22 selected it would not relate to funding.  
23

24 Commissioner Synhavsky stated she does not want to leave single-family out of this. She  
25 wants to make sure sustainability is taken into account for renovations. If it's a full knock-  
26 down rebuild would the policy apply versus a renovation of a portion of the home. Ms.  
27 Morello stated a policy on new construction could be considered. She suggested size of the  
28 building be discussed.  
29

30 Chair Fee asked if other cities include single-family homes. Ms. Morello stated Staff will do  
31 more research on single-family residential and multi-family. Staff will come back with a  
32 suggested approach and research on other cities' mandatory approaches. Multi-family is the  
33 highest priority from a mandatory approach.  
34

35 Commissioner Peterson referred to the policy triggers – PUD Development and the incentives  
36 (page 18 of the PDF provided).  
37

38 Chair Fee highlighted five as a higher priority as she felt they are more impactful. The  
39 recommended criteria seemed like retroactive or passive criteria. She reviewed the five she  
40 had selected.  
41

42 Commissioner Hark agreed. If a project followed the guidelines, it would be close to  
43 becoming a LEED-certified building. He especially likes the EV Charging capability. Ms.  
44 Morello stated at the next PEC Work session EV Charging will be discussed. Commissioner  
45 Hark stated water and energy monitoring in multi-family housing is also important.  
46

Parks and Environmental Commission Work Session Meeting Minutes

April 2, 2025

Page 6

1 Chair Fee stated if monitoring is done, and it is above the estimate what happens. Ms. Saulog  
2 stated that it is part of the compliance aspect. Some buildings are required to report to the City  
3 their monitoring results. If the results are more than expected the developer can research.  
4

5 Commissioner Hark stated he was thinking of requiring some sort of monitoring to be done so  
6 the owner of the building can incentivize himself to make corrections to address.  
7

8 Commissioner Peterson agreed that emissions and charging are high priorities. With Climate  
9 Change in mind, stormwater management is important.  
10

11 Chair Fee referred to the water criteria and was unclear how that would be achievable.  
12 Commissioner Hark suggested that may relate to predicted use. Chair Fee referred to the  
13 landscaping criteria and relates to the types of landscaping on a particular site.  
14

15 Ms. Morello stated she and Ms. Saulog will do research and come back to the PEC with  
16 suggestions. Commissioner Synhavsky asked them to consider what triggers a mandatory  
17 policy. Commissioner Peterson asked what the timeline will look like as far as  
18 responsibilities. Ms. Morello stated Staff will take the lead to research and provide next steps.  
19

20 The Minnesota Municipal Sustainable Building Policies Guide and appendix of local  
21 sustainable building policies was provided for Commission review.  
22

## 23 **COMMISSION REPORTS**

25 Commissioner Peterson stated she has been doing a lot of trash clean-up along Silver Lake  
26 Road.  
27

28 Commissioner Synhavsky stated she has been talking about the grand rounds trail with  
29 neighbors, and she is very excited about that.  
30

31 Chair Fee stated regarding partnering with CFS for park cleanup and Earth Day. She got some  
32 balls started in cleaning some of the areas. They are targeting April 26 for clean-up.  
33

34 Commissioner Hark had no report.  
35

## 36 **VIII. COMMUNITY FORUM - NONE.**

38 No one appeared to address the Commission.  
39

## 40 **IX. ADJOURNMENT.**

42 Motion by Commissioner Hark, seconded by Commissioner Peterson, to adjourn the April 2,  
43 2025, Work Session Meeting of the Parks and Environmental Commission at 8:30 p.m.  
44

45 **Motion carried unanimously.**  
46

Parks and Environmental Commission Work Session Meeting Minutes

April 2, 2025

Page 7

1      **X.      NEXT MEETING.**

2

3      The next meeting of the Parks and Environmental Commission will be a Worksession held on

4      May 21, 2025 with a Regular meeting scheduled for June 2, 2025.

5

6

7      Respectfully submitted,

8

9

10     Debbie Wolfe

11     *TimeSaver Off Site Secretarial, Inc.*



# Climate Plan Overview

## Transportation Focus Area

Presented  
May 21, 2025

1

### Background

- The Transportation section is a Climate Plan focus area for the City in 2025, along with the Energy section.
- PEC will focus on supporting action items and strategies that are *policy-oriented*, which are being reviewed tonight. The Climate Plan includes the full list of strategies that include these as well as *education* and *operations-oriented* strategies being owned by staff.



2

## Background

- The previous PEC group completed a ranking activity in Dec 2024 to provide input on how the city should consider prioritizing the pursuit of these strategies.
  - (\* = highest priority actions)



3



Improve accessibility and  
safety of non-motorized  
transportation infrastructure

Transportation  
Initiative 1

4

## Initiative 1

Action	Current Status
Discuss incentivizing residents to use alternative modes of transportation by zoning for limited parking at facilities and event spaces that have sufficient pedestrian infrastructure connecting to existing nearby parking.	1. May be a component of our Active Transportation Plan (education/outreach) 2. Case by case consideration for each development
Develop a bike and pedestrian plan to develop specific goals and infrastructure opportunities and participate in regional planning initiatives.*	Participating in MnDOT's Active Transportation Planning grant program this year. A consultant is being provided to assist with developing an AT plan. Internal kick-off in late May.



5



Increase electric vehicle ownership across SAV

Transportation Initiative 2

6

## Initiative 2

Action	Current Status
Consider adopting a policy on publicly-facing charging infrastructure. Determine the most effective locations for EV charging stations at public facilities in SAV. Integrate predicted installation expenses into the budget. Identify a vendor and develop an installation plan.	A policy for this would be separate from the multi-use ordinance in the action shown on the next slide.  More internal discussions are needed regarding a potential policy and installation planning, but identifying possible locations for EV charging at city facilities could be done by end of year.  If considering partnerships with privately owned facilities accessible to the public, this would take longer-term planning.



7

## Initiative 2

Action	Current Status
Consider adopting a policy encouraging or requiring new multi-use developments to install EV infrastructure.	City Council work session happened in Nov 2024 where an initial discussion took place about what an EV ordinance could look like, how it would apply, and other Council preferences.  Planning Commission and City Planner took that feedback to draft an initial EV ordinance included in our work session materials this evening.  Tonight's agenda item includes PEC review of the proposed ordinance language! This ordinance language would eventually go back to Planning Commission and Council for review and approval.



8



## Reduce avoidable vehicle emissions

Transportation Initiative 3

9

### Initiative 3

Action	Current Status
Collaborate with Metro Transit on public transit planning, trends, and options for future services to advance goals in this plan.*	Staff has been in contact with Metro Transit regarding BRT opportunities and Kenzie Terrace.  In April, Metro Transit hosted planning level workshops to identify future BRT routes.  The City does not have the final say on any plans but will continue to advocate with the Counties and Met Council to consider inclusion of services in/through Saint Anthony.



10

## Initiative 3

Action	Current Status
Collaborate with local schools and businesses to redesign drop-off and pick-up areas, and install signage to encourage drivers to limit idling.*	Staff are working on overall strategy for establishing contact with schools and businesses to propose these changes that make sense for the nature of their facility. There will also be an opportunity for public education about the reason for those changes. PEC may be interested in engaging with those efforts.



11



THANK YOU

12



## MEMORANDUM

To: Saint Anthony Village Parks and Environmental Commission  
From: Stephen Grittman, City Planner  
Date: May 21, 2025  
Request: SAV Electric Vehicle Charging – Code Amendment Draft

---

### BACKGROUND

At a previous City Council work session, the City Council discussed EV charging and whether to regulate for new multi-family projects. In addition to being an action item in the City's Climate Plan, exploring the topic was identified as one of the City's 2024 goals during the annual Goal Setting. The following models were considered:

1. Incentives to encourage – but not require – EV charging installation.
2. Requirements for installing infrastructure (such as power supply and site plan provisions, but forgoing installation of chargers until a future date. That future date sometimes relates to a fixed period, or a time at the owner's discretion.
3. Requirements for installing EV charging facilities as a component of new or upgraded development. These requirements often create a tiered standard for the number of charging facilities based on size of the project.

During the work session, the City Council agreed to focus on option 3 - requirements for installing EV charging facilities as a component of new or upgraded development. Staff agreed to draft ordinance language to this option for Commission and Council review. Commission members are tasked with reviewing the ordinance language and providing feedback.

### STAFF RESEARCH

This memorandum forwards an initial draft of an amendment to the zoning ordinance providing for a requirement to install Electric Vehicle (EV) charging equipment when parking lots are being constructed or reconstructed. The draft follows the models used by Roseville and New Brighton in many details, but proposes some modifications to address aspects of Saint Anthony's code, and with the goal of simplifying the process where practical.

Both Roseville and New Brighton establish a basic threshold of 30 spaces as the lower threshold for requiring EV charging. Below that size, no requirement would be applicable. Additionally, both communities exempt certain levels of parking lot maintenance from triggering the addition of EV charging – essentially, only full reconstruction or major patching project (25% or more of the parking surface) would require a retrofit with EV charging facilities.

In practical terms, a new parking lot supporting a residential project of fewer than about 20 units would be exempt. Further, a parking lot supporting a new commercial development of about 8,000 square feet or less would also be exempt. These thresholds would typically require parking lots of fewer than 30 vehicles.

The one aspect of the comparison codes that raises a potential administrative issue is the suggestion that a project may choose to only develop the electrical infrastructure for EV charging, but without going the final step to provide the charging equipment. The language in the attached code draft referring to that option is highlighted. In this version, the draft language is modified in an attempt to create some limitation around that choice by inserting a timing deferral for final construction.

As with any deferral of this sort, there is an administrative burden in tracking the deferral, and then enforcing the construction at a later date. The alternative would be to disallow the option for “electric infrastructure only”. This approach could be simpler to administer, although it would offer less flexibility for the property owner.

Apart from these exceptions, the draft creates a fixed percentage of charging units, distinguishing between Level 1 and Level 2 requirements, based on land use (multi-family residential v. commercial/industrial), and parking lot size (0-29 spaces, 30-49 spaces, and 50+ spaces). This draft follows New Brighton’s structure, which is slightly less complex than the Roseville model, although the two communities have comparable standards.

## **DRAFT ORDINANCE**

The proposed ordinance would add to the existing Parking section of the code (§154.179). The proposed language is a new section that reflects the ordinance models by Roseville and New Brighton. Proposed language specific to Saint Anthony is highlighted in yellow. See the Draft Ordinance for specific language.

## **DISCUSSION ITEMS FOR COMMISSION FEEDBACK**

- What input does the Parks & Environmental Commission wish to provide after reviewing the draft language of the EV Charging Ordinance?
- With regards to the highlighted sections (A)(12)(f) of the draft ordinance, what feedback does PEC have for the option to defer equipment installation apart from the initial development of EV-ready infrastructure?

## **NEXT STEPS**

PEC’s comments and suggestions from this work session will be considered as discussions continue forward with the Planning Commission and City Council.

## **ATTACHMENTS**

- Draft Ordinance

**CITY OF SAINT ANTHONY VILLAGE  
ORDINANCE 2025-0X  
AN ORDINANCE**

**THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SAINT ANTHONY VILLAGE HEREBY  
ORDAINS:**

**Section 1.** **Section §154.179 (Parking) is hereby amended to add the following:**

**(A)(12) Electric Vehicle Charging**

(a) All new developments that require Multi-family Parking Lots as defined in this Section, and any existing Multi-family Parking Lots being reconstructed that are not exempt under Subp. (b) of this Section, shall include one or more locations to allow for electric vehicle charging, or place electrical infrastructure nearby to facilitate future station installation, with completion pursuant to Subp. (f) of this Section. The thresholds for adding EV charging spaces to new developments are as follows:

EV Charging Space Thresholds	
# of Parking Spaces Planned/Existing	Required # of EV Spaces and Level of Charging
29 or fewer	None Required
30-49	Multi-family: 5% at Level 1 or greater Non-residential: 2 spaces at Level 2 charging or greater
50+	Multi-family: 10% at Level 1 or greater; 1 space at Level 2 or greater Non-residential: 5% at Level 2 charging or greater

(b) These requirements shall not apply to maintenance of existing parking areas when that maintenance consists only of restriping, seal-coating, patching of less than 25% of the total area of the parking lot, or “mill and overlay” projects.

(c) Spaces designated as EV charging spaces shall be included in meeting the property’s required parking quantities per this code.

(d) EV charging spaces shall be placed in locations easily accessible to tenants of, or visitors to, the property, and shall be designed so at least one of the provided EV charging spaces is accessible to vehicles requiring handicapped access.

(e) If EV charging equipment, including charging stations, transformers, and other above-ground mechanical equipment, is proposed to be located in the front yard, such equipment shall be screened from view of the public right-of-way with fencing or landscaping consistent with applicable provisions of the Zoning Ordinance.

(f) When electric infrastructure is installed, but charging equipment (including charging stations and transformers and other similar facilities) is not installed at the same time, the property owner shall provide for equipment installation to be installed and operational within two years of the date of infrastructure installation.

**ADOPTED BY** the City Council of Saint Anthony Village, Minnesota this \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2025.

---

Mayor Webster

ATTEST:

---

City Clerk

AYES:

NAYS: