



Community Engagement Commission Agenda

Thursday, August 14, 2014

6:30 p.m.

City Council Chambers

- 6:30 p.m. **1. Introductions/Roll Call**
 2. Approve Agenda
 3. Approval of July 10 Minutes
 4. Public Comment on Items Not on Agenda
- 6:40 p.m. **5. Review & Revisions to Current Status of Commission Organization
(Operations Committee)**
 a. Overview of Commission Purpose and Functions according to City Ordinance
 • Discussion on the Commission's role as an advisor to the Council on encouraging
 and facilitating community engagement
 b. Confirmation of Work Groups for Assessing 2012 Task Force Recommendations
 and Consideration of New Commission Initiatives (Commissioner Gardella)
 c. Proposed Process for Work Groups (Gardella & Grefenberg)
- 7:10 p.m. **6. Chair and Committee Reports**
 a. Chair's Report (Chair Grefenberg)
 i. City Survey on Community Issues
 ii. Scope of Next Few Months Work
- 7:25 p.m. b. Website Redesign Committee
 i. Current Update (Staff Liaison Bowman)
 ii. Current Status of Committee Work (Vice-Chair Becker)
- 7:40 p.m. c. Outreach & Communications Committee (Commissioner Manke)
 i. Talking Points for Commissioners
 ii. Preliminary Audience Analysis Grid
- 8:00 p.m. **7. Old Business**
 8. New Business
 9. Staff Report
 a. Upcoming Items on Future Council Agendas
 b. Other Items
- 10. Commission Communications, Reports, and Announcements**
- 8:20 p.m. **11. Commissioner-Initiated Items for Future Meetings**
 12. Recap of Commission Actions This Meeting
- 8:30 p.m. **13. Adjournment**

Public Comment is encouraged during Commission meetings. You may comment on items not on the agenda at the beginning of each meeting; you may also comment on agenda items during the meeting by indicating to the Chair your wish to speak.

46 City Attorney Gaughan stated the Commissioner who is not going to be able to attend should
47 contact Staff Liaison Gary Bowman and he can include those comments in the materials for the
48 meeting. He stated it would also be good practice to have all email communications included in
49 the meeting materials for the public to access. If all the Commissioners receive the same
50 information it is good practice to receive this information and discuss it during the meetings.

51
52 Commissioner [Kathy](#) Ramundt asked if there could be a problem with the open meeting law if
53 two (2) other Commissioners decided to attend one of the Discover Your Park functions because
54 there were already two (2) Commissioners present.

55
56 City Attorney Gaughan stated if they were not conducting business or discussing official
57 business then it would not be in violation. The open meeting law does not trump an individual's
58 First Amendment rights.

59
60 Chair Grefenberg clarified adding an item to the agenda during the meeting is not in violation of
61 the open meeting law.

62
63 Commissioner Manke asked what the best procedure would be to “brain dump” or have a brain
64 storming session.

65
66 City Attorney Gaughan explained best practice would be to have individuals do this activity prior
67 to the meeting and send it to Staff Liaison Gary Bowman so he can put the information together
68 and put it on an agenda for discussion.

69
70 Chair Grefenberg ~~stated~~ [said](#) the Chair approves the agenda with ~~the~~ input from the Operations
71 Committee and Staff. He asked if this was in violation of the open meeting law.

72
73 City Attorney Gaughan stated this is not in violation of the open meeting law. The Commission
74 can meet outside of their regular meetings by holding a special meeting and positing the time and
75 location three (3) days prior to meeting.

76
77 Chair Grefenberg stated he would like to be notified as well as Staff Liaison Gary Bowman of
78 any meetings being noticed as well as any other communication with Staff.

79
80 Commissioner Manke asked if it would need to be noticed if there were three (3) members from
81 one Commission and another member from another Commission.

82
83 City Attorney Gaughan stated this should not pose a problem but would be addressed on a case-
84 by-case basis.

85
86

87 4. APPROVAL OF JUNE 12, 2014 MINUTES

88

89 Commissioner Manke made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Gardella to approve the June
90 12, 2014 minutes as amended. **The motion carried unanimously.**

91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135

5. PUBLIC COMMENT ON ITEMS NOT ON AGENDA

There was no public input.

6. OLD BUSINESS

- a. **Process Recommendations on Organizing Work Groups for 2012 Task Force Recommendations and New Commission Initiatives (Commissioner Gardella)**
 - i. Next Steps

Discussion: Commissioner Gardella suggested the Commission work towards an agreement on a process. She clarified she had talked with Commissioners Becker and ~~Commissioner~~ Miller in order to gather their input because they were not going to be at the meeting. She clarified this was not done to violate the open meeting law but rather to ensure their opinions regarding these suggestions were included in the discussion.

Chair Grefenberg ruled that Commissioner Gardella’s actions did not intentionally violate the Open Meeting Law. There was no objection to his ruling.

~~She~~ Gardella clarified she is proposing seven (7) groups ~~or committees~~ that each of the Commissioners could participate in. This will facilitate working through the Task Force Recommendations and New Commission Initiatives and assist the Commission in being effective. She reviewed the seven (7) groups and what the groups would focus on.

The Education grouping was not only on educating staff and council, but also on educating residents on city issues and operations.

In response to a question from Commissioner Manke regarding the Neighborhoods grouping, Gardella said the Task Force had spent some time on how intentional should we be on helping neighborhoods form. The intent of these proposals was on how the City could help neighborhoods form, not necessarily on the Commission directly helping neighborhoods form.

Commissioner Ramundt added that as a former Task Force member she believed that neighborhood associations was one of the main ways the Task Force envisioned this working.

Chair Grefenberg enquired as to the meaning of the designation for Work Group E: Council/Commissions/Staff in the Community. He asked if there was anything beyond “place” that distinguishes ~~Council/Commissioners/Staff in the Community~~ this group from the others.

Commissioner Gardella stated it is mostly distinguished by place but this does speak to a lot of a different ways to do business outside of City Hall. She referenced the 2012 Task Force’s intent to change the culture of City Hall.

136
137 Commissioner Manke ~~stated~~ expressed her opinion that this would be putting the cart before the
138 horse; ~~and~~ the Commission first needs to determine what they are as a Commission before
139 ~~going~~ and talking to people. ~~but~~ The Commission does not have a clear and consistent message
140 about who they are and what they want residents to take away from the encounter. The
141 suggested groupings do not define who the audience is and have the necessary data available in
142 order to talk to them effectively. The Commission will need to market to the community.

143
144 Commissioner Gardella stated one of the tasks of the Communications and Outreach Committee
145 was to determine how the Commission communicates with the public and the message they
146 convey. The audience for these groups is the City of Roseville, she suggested. Based on these
147 broader work group categories ~~the~~ each Commissioner ~~could~~ would decide ~~to work~~ on a
148 particular group ~~Committee~~ and ~~if there are recommendations~~ then these groups or ~~Committees~~
149 ~~could~~ would do the work to bring their recommendations to the full Commission.

150
151 Commissioner Manke stated Community outreach is really outreach and is a broad term. She
152 stated the audience should be identified prior to the ~~categories~~ Work Groups being identified and
153 ~~being~~ established.

154
155 Commissioner Gardella stated the audiences would be identified in each work group under for
156 each broader topic. Each group would identify the audiences and determine if the
157 recommendations provided are incomplete or if additional data would be needed and then bring
158 recommendations to the Commission for consideration. This would be a way for the
159 Commission to work through the 74 recommendations that were provided by the Task Force in
160 an efficient manner.

161
162 Commissioner Ramundt clarified the groups would not be limited to the recommendations listed.
163 This is a starting point for what the Commission can do. ~~Things~~ Categories are broad and the
164 Commission does need to know what they are doing.

165
166 Chair Grefenberg ~~stated~~ agreed these groups would be able to look at new recommendations.

167
168 Commissioner Desiree Mueller ~~stated~~ commented this approach ~~makes~~ sense and a clear
169 message that is shared by the group is needed. The demographics and audiences would be
170 different for each group and the group would need to identify who their audience is. She stated
171 she would recommend breaking into the proposed groups but the Commission should be clear
172 have one clear message.

173
174 Commissioner Manke stated she would recommend breaking into groups based on the audience.
175 She would like to work with seniors and engaging them in the community and in order to do this
176 she would need to be on each of these groups in order to do this. She also added that the
177 Commission would first need information or data on seniors. She would not like to see these
178 groups tied to these recommendations only. From her perspective the 2012 recommendations
179 were created to determine if there was a need for the Commission.

180

181 Gardella said the identification of audiences would be a task for the Work Groups themselves.

182
183 Commissioner Ramundt commented that the work group proposal is for work groups because
184 this is just a starting point for the Commission to get at exactly where these recommendations go
185 and whether other recommendations should be added.

186
187 Commissioner Mueller said that she understood the proposal before the Commission was
188 organized well, made sense, and built upon the information gathered during the previous Excel
189 process which the Commission went through. She also could see the point Commissioner
190 Manke was raising, about having a clear message, but that could be the parameters within which
191 each of the work groups proceeded. We needed to proceed along both paths, the work group
192 process, and the audience identification and messaging effort.

193
194 Commissioner Manke suggested just having a few talking points to start out with for people
195 understand what the Commission is and who they represent and what they were established for.

196
197 Public Comment: At this point the Chair asked if anyone in the audience had any comments to
198 make related to this discussion. Member of the Audience Roseville City Council member Lisa
199 LaLiberte stated said the Task Force Report is still very relevant and although some things of its
200 recommendations have been acted upon, but certainly not all of them. She suggested that the
201 Commission proceed There is opportunity for to both focus on things that are broad engagement
202 and communications issues, and those things that need more targeting.

203
204 LaLiberte suggested the Commission proceed in this way so it doesn't have to prioritize and pick
205 small units to focus on at the expense of broad engagement and communications for the entire
206 city.

207
208 Continuation of Process Recommendations on Organizing Work Groups: Chair Grefenberg
209 stated the standing Outreach and Communications was established to deal with the broad concept
210 of raising standard messages of what the Commission itself is about.

211
212 Commissioner Ramundt suggested Commissioner Manke write up her comments on a standard
213 message on what the Commission is about and what their charge was for the Commission to
214 respond to. This would be a good starting point for the Commission. She would recommend the
215 Commission review this and take action at the next meeting on the written message and who
216 would be interested in working on the other groups.

217
218 Chair Grefenberg said he did not perceive it as an either/or situation before the Commission, that
219 is, whether to use work groups or focus on the Commission's audience and message. He
220 suggested establishing the work groups at this time and have the Communications and Outreach
221 messages available for the August meeting for review and potential approval. He stated
222 prioritization of the group's recommendations should occur at the Commission level.

223

224 Commissioner Manke explained once the audience is identified then the data can be collected
225 and the means of communicating and engaging this group can be established. It will help the
226 Commission to prioritize.

227
228 Chair Grefenberg stated the ~~Communication and Outreach~~ [and Communications](#) Committee
229 establishes the message and should also devise the tools the Commission would use. He would
230 like to see the work groups to have their recommendations available for the Commission to make
231 recommendations to the Council by October.

232
233 Commissioner Mueller stated she does understand Commissioner Manke's view and does want
234 to be sure there are no groups in the community that are overlooked.

235
236 Chair Grefenberg ~~clarified~~ [said he understood](#) Commissioner Manke ~~is~~ [was](#) recommending not to
237 take action on the work groups at this time, and at the next meeting the Commission gets a report
238 on the issues of what the general message is, what the talking points are and the demographics.
239 [He asked Commissioner Manke if that was a fair representation of her opinion.](#)

240
241 Commissioner Manke responded [affirmatively](#), the groupings should be looked at to determine
242 what items have already taken place and what items no longer concern the Commission and
243 eliminate them.

244
245 Commissioner Gardella stated these items have been identified already.

246
247 Chair Grefenberg stated he would like to review the general groupings. He explained he had
248 spent ~~several~~ hours reviewing the information and feels the groupings could be merged into 3 [or](#)
249 4 groups.

250
251 **Commissioner Manke made a motion** to table the groupings discussions and request each
252 Commissioner provide a list of audience ~~groupings~~ for the next meeting.

253
254 [During discussion on the motion](#), Commissioner Mueller asked ~~what input~~ [whether](#)
255 Commissioner Miller and Vice-Chair Becker ~~had provided~~ [were in agreement with the groupings](#)
256 [outlined by Commissioner Gardella.](#)

257
258 Commissioner Gardella stated they had both liked the groupings that were presented and
259 expressed interest in working with a couple of them.

260
261 Commissioner Mueller asked if they should move forward with the groups identified and then
262 identify the audiences in those groups.

263
264 Chair Grefenberg stated the problem he ~~would have~~ [had with this approach](#) is he would like to
265 have the Operations Committee ~~to~~ review the work groups he has identified. He stated he had
266 identified fewer groups and moved some tasks to ~~the~~ existing Committees.

267

268 Commissioner Mueller asked why the Commission had Commissioner ~~Mueller~~ Gardella break
269 out the recommendations into groups and have the Commission spend time discussing it when
270 Chair Grefenberg was planning to have the Operations Committee review it.

271
272 Chair Grefenberg ~~stated~~ clarified he had suggestions on merging some of the work groups and
273 assigning the last two groups to the Operations Committee. He said since and that time for
274 further discussion was running out the Commission he was concerned there would not time to
275 review his changes, which he had assumed was the purpose of tonight meeting and thus he
276 would could not agree to the groupings ~~that are~~ presented.

277
278 Commissioner Mueller asked if the Commission would be provided an opportunity to review the
279 groupings Chair Grefenberg had compiled.

280
281 ~~Chair Grefenberg suggested having the Operations Committee compile the groupings and make a~~
282 ~~recommendation to the Commission on what these should be.~~

283
284 Commissioner Ramundt stated the Commission could group and regroup several times. This is
285 now the second attempt to group the Task Force Recommendations so that the Commission can
286 start to work on them. She ~~stated she~~ would recommend trying the recommended work groups
287 in order to get started.

288
289 Chair Grefenberg stated he is frustrated because he had spent hours refining the work groups'
290 tasks, and but the Commission ~~has~~ had not yet finished the review of the first excel evaluation
291 and the questions ~~that were~~ raised ~~with~~ in that step. The Commission ~~feels~~ seems-compelled to
292 get things done. He would like an opportunity to discuss the groupings specific topics, but ~~it is~~
293 ~~getting late~~-meeting time was running out. He thus suggested a special meeting of the
294 Operations Committee ~~and invite~~ with Commissioner Ramundt ~~and invited to~~ review the
295 groupings and merge some, ~~and~~ as well as to bring in the role of the Outreach and
296 Communications Committee.

297
298 Commissioner Mueller stated she had understood the Chair Grefenberg was supportive of the
299 layout presented and the working groups. She was not aware that there would be another part to
300 this discussion or another set of groupings to look at.

301
302 Chair Grefenberg ~~stated~~ clarified he had not participated in the drafting of what was being
303 presented at this time except for suggesting some name changes for two groups. He reviewed his
304 suggestions for ~~the groupings~~ name changes: change the work group name “Outreach” to
305 “Community Outreach”, add “Community Communications” to distinguish it from ~~other~~ the
306 standing committee. As for the number and process for the work groups, he felt Groups A and E
307 be merged, the Operations Committee play a role in Group G: *Complete/Responsibility of Other*
308 *Commission and/or Staff* and they come up with recommendations for this grouping, and the
309 Group *Low Hanging Fruit* ~~should~~ be moved to the Operations Committee as well. The he would
310 suggest a “Volunteerism” working group because this issue is hardly ever covered even though it
311 is included in the Commission’s charge from the Council.

312

313 Commissioner Ramundt stated the working groups being presented is a refinement of the Excel
314 information that was reviewed previously by the Commission. The Commission could continue
315 to refine this and look at other suggestions including those by Chair Grefenberg. She suggested
316 Commissioner Manke prepare a list of talking points, look at merging the two (2) work group
317 documents, and the Commissioners identify the audiences within the City. She would
318 recommend moving forward with the work groups for the next couple of months taking into
319 account the different audiences.

320

321 **There being a motion made but not seconded**, Chair Grefenberg asked twice for a second to
322 the motion made by Commissioner Manke to postpone the groupings and each Commissioner
323 define the audiences. **The motion failed due to lack of a second.**

324

325 Chair Grefenberg made a motion, ~~S~~seconded by Commissioner Ramundt, to proceed with the
326 work groups as outlined by Commissioner Gardella with the following exceptions: Sections F
327 and G is moved to the Operations Committee for coordination purposes and Community
328 Outreach (Section A) and Commissioners in the Community (Section E) are merged into one
329 work group. **The motion carried 4-1** (Manke voting no).

330

331 Chair Grefenberg asked how the Commission wanted to proceed with volunteering for the work
332 groups.

333

334 After discussion **it was the consensus of the Commission, the Chair ruled**, to ~~coordinate~~
335 ~~volunteering~~ for work groups through email communications.

336

337 Commissioner Gardella asked to have the discussion on audiences on the agenda for the next
338 meeting.

339

340 Commissioner Mueller asked if there would be value in having the Outreach and
341 Communications Committee ~~in~~ to developing a list of audience demographics in order to
342 facilitate discussions at the next meeting.

343

344 Commissioner Manke ~~stated~~ asked everyone ~~should~~ to develop a list and provide it to Chair
345 Grefenberg and Staff Liaison Gary Bowman; ~~and~~ a final listing will be put together for the next
346 meeting. The target audience and talking points would be worked on by the Communications
347 and Outreach Committee and presented to the Commission at the next meeting.

348

349 Commissioner Mueller made a motion, ~~S~~seconded by Commissioner Gardella, to direct the
350 Outreach and Communications Committee establish a target audience list and present this to the
351 Commission for review at the next meeting. **The motion carried unanimously.**

352

353 **b. Other Old Business: Commission Must Do's and May Do's according to City**
354 **Ordinance**

355

356 Time running out, Chair Grefenberg ~~stated~~[asked](#) the Commission ~~is requested~~ to review the
357 information provided [independently](#) and understand that the Commission must advise the
358 Council on the effective and meaningful involvement of Roseville residents.

359

360

361 7. CHAIR AND COMMITTEE REPORTS

362

363 a. **Website Redesign Committee**

364

365 **Current Status of Committee Work:** Staff Liaison Gary Bowman provided an update on the
366 activities of the Committee including the information provided at the needs assessment meeting
367 on June 10. The Committee reviewed an initial layout to make sure they understood the
368 concepts the Committee was trying to convey. The Committee also reviewed mood pallets. The
369 website will be unveiled on August 14 or 15, which is after the next Commission meeting.

370

371 Chair Grefenberg asked if a review of the website could be done by the Commission or a
372 Committee meeting.

373

374 Staff Liaison Gary Bowman explained the website would be reviewed prior to unveiling so that
375 they have time to make any changes prior to putting the website into use.

376

377 **Framework for Evaluation of Community Engagement Module Selection:** The Committee
378 has met regarding the Community Engagement tool and Mr. Bowman has received feedback
379 from a Commissioners. ~~He~~[The Committee is](#) provided ~~ing~~-criteria on how to evaluate the
380 website.

381

382 Chair Grefenberg stated before the next ~~Committee~~ Commission meeting he would like [staff](#) to
383 schedule a [committee](#) meeting. He [also](#) asked when the Commission would take action on the
384 recommendation of the Committee.

385

386 ~~Staff Liaison Gary~~ [Mr.](#) Bowman stated this can be done separately. He is ~~updating~~ [now focused](#)
387 on the whole update of the website.

388

389 b. **Outreach and Communications Committee (Chair Grefenberg)**

390

391 Chair Grefenberg stated the Committee has met once. The people on the Committee are
392 Commissioners Manke and Miller and Mr. Gelbach. The Committee will be meeting the next
393 two (2) Thursday evenings.

394

395 Commissioner Manke stated she cannot make these Thursday meetings. She [also](#) asked if there
396 would be a problem with the open meeting rules since Mr. Gelbach was a City Commissioner on
397 the Parks and Recreation Commission.

398

399 Chair Grefenberg stated they will resolve the schedule during the week.

400

401 Staff Liaison Gary Bowman stated he would notify the City Attorney to determine if this would
402 be affected by the open meeting law since Mr. Gelbach was attending these meetings as a citizen,
403 not as a Commissioner or representative of the Commission he serves on.

404

405 **c. Discover Your Parks Committee (Commissioners Mueller and Ramundt)**

406

407 Commissioner Mueller presented a sign that had been made for the Commission to use during
408 the Discover Your Park outings. The sign and shirts have helped to identify who the
409 Commissioners are and that they are attending the event.

410

411 Referring to a conversation he had with Commissioner Mueller, Chair Grefenberg suggested
412 they put together suggestions received from residents for discussion by the Commission after the
413 events ends in August.

414

415 Commissioner Mueller stated she noticed that residents were more willing to talk to them once
416 they found out they were volunteers.

417

418 Commissioner Manke ~~stated~~ said that although this is a volunteer committee ~~but~~ they were still
419 Commissioners; ~~and~~ this message needs to be clear and concise for everyone to convey when
420 ~~they are~~ talking with residents. She expressed concerns about having everyone ~~do~~ design their
421 own signs, literature, and other materials. This will create a fragmented Commission and
422 message.

423

424 Commissioner Mueller agreed with Commissioner Manke's concerns regarding a cohesive and
425 clear message, noting that her degree was in marketing, but the Discover Your Parks event had
426 already started and the Commission did not want to miss the opportunity to meet with residents.
427 What they are using right now is not meant to be long term but rather something to identify the
428 new Commission until cohesive marketing materials can be established.

429

430 Commissioner Manke stated the message needs to be clear and they materials need to be
431 consistent and this may not convey be the case if everyone does their own thing.

432

433 Chair Grefenberg stated the expenditure for the purchase of the sign and t-shirts had been
434 approved appropriately ~~through~~ by the Operations Committee ~~for the expenditure~~.

435

436 **d. Chair's Report (Chair Grefenberg)**

437

i. Current Status Report

438

ii. Scope of Next Few Months Work

439

iii. Possible Joint Meeting with City Council this Fall

440

441 Chair Grefenberg stated he had me with the Volunteer Coordinator and she will be on the
442 Commission's September agenda. She is focused on working with Staff to determine what
443 volunteer opportunities are available there. She also understands her relationship with the
444 Community Engagement Commission.

445

446 He Grefenberg reviewed the tentative schedule of work the Commission would have over the
447 next few months. He recommended everyone watch the presentation on the Community Survey
448 to the City Council, which will be on Monday July 14. He recommended postponing the August
449 discussion with Advocates for Human Rights on Chapter 7 of 2014 Report *Moving from*
450 *Exclusion to Belonging*, dealing with civic engagement and political participation by immigrants.
451 In addition in September ~~he thought~~ the Commissioner would give their recommendation on the
452 Community Engagement module for the website. He stated he had developed the chart he
453 presented in the packet as a way to inform the City Council of the Commission's activities and
454 plans. Mayor Roe suggested the Commission prepare a presentation for the Council potentially
455 scheduled in November.

456

457 8. STAFF REPORT

458

459 There are no agenda items of relevance to the Commission on future Council meetings.

460

461 Staff Liaison Gary Bowman encouraged the Commissioners to attend the meeting on Monday
462 for the Community Survey presentation.

463

464

465 9. NEW BUSINESS

466

467 a. **Night to Unite**

468

469 Chair Grefenberg would like to see Commissioners be available to attend a couple of Night to
470 Unite events and encourage residents to sign up for updates.

471

472 Commissioner Gardella stated she would be attending her neighborhood Night to Unite event.

473

474 Commissioner Ramundt stated she is hosting her neighborhood Night to Unite event.

475

476 Commissioner Manke stated she would be hosting her neighborhood Night to Unite event. She
477 stated even though she was hosting she would try to go to a neighbor's Night to Unite event.

478

479 Chair Grefenberg stated he had plans to attend to events. He encouraged everyone to wear their
480 t-shirts.

481

482 b. **Other Items**

483

484 Commissioner Manke asked Mr. Bowman suggested whether having nametags could be done for
485 the Commissioners to wear at events.

486

487 Chair Grefenberg moved, Seconded by Commissioner Mueller, to ~~direct~~ authorize
488 Commissioner Manke to developing and ordering seven (7) plastic pin-on nametags for
489 Commissioners with the approval of the Administration Department and with an upset maximum
490 budget not to exceed \$80. **Motion carried unanimously.**

491
492 Chair Grefenberg stated there will be a Granicus [webinar](#) on the Edina Civic Engagement Project
493 [within the next few weeks](#), and he encouraged people to watch it. He stated he would send out a
494 reminder to the Commissioners.

495
496
497
498 **a. Upcoming Items on Future Council Agendas**
499

500 (Discussion focused on items on the Commission Agendas) Chair Grefenberg ~~stated~~ [said some](#)
501 [of](#) these future agenda items have been reviewed and are ~~included~~ [listed](#) on the chart in the
502 meeting packet ~~that was previously distributed in the packet~~. He removed the Advocate for
503 Human Rights [presentation once scheduled for the August Commission meeting](#).

504
505 Commissioner Gardella suggested having a [half-hour](#) standing agenda item for different City
506 Staff to attend the meeting and answer questions for the Commission.

507
508 Chair Grefenberg stated this suggestion should go to the Operations Committee because he
509 would not recommend a full half hour every meeting because the next few meeting agendas are
510 full. He ~~stated~~ [added](#) he would like to have an Operations Committee meeting in ~~the next~~ a week
511 [or so](#).

512
513 Commissioner Gardella stated she would work with Staff Liaison Gary Bowman to determine if
514 the Commissioners would be able to volunteer for the work groups via email and get this process
515 started.

516
517 Commissioner Mueller suggested having the action items restated at the end of each meeting.

518
519 Chair Grefenberg stated this could be done through the Operations Committee or a standing
520 agenda item at the end of each agenda.

521
522 Commissioner Manke stated Chair Grefenberg had received communication ~~for~~ [from](#) a resident
523 and his response should be reviewed. She stated she did not agree that it was the Commissions
524 place to ask someone to volunteer for an event without knowing if the City already has
525 something arranged or anything about the person. There is a process for volunteering.

526
527 Chair Grefenberg stated he is the Chair and he is responsible for correspondence and if he is
528 expected to respond with the consent of the full Commission then he would not continue as
529 Chair. The point is well taken but the primary purpose of the response was to thank him and let
530 him know it was received and also one of his goals is to involve others in the work. He stated he
531 did not intend to make it sound like he expected this person to volunteer to do something.

532
533 Commissioner Gardella stated this would be a good topic for the ~~Communication and Outreach~~
534 [and Communications](#) Committee to discuss.

535

536 Chair Grefenberg suggested a more generic thank your for your interest letter in response to
537 inquiries from residents.

538

539 Commissioner Ramundt stated she would like to see the communication be more personalized
540 and encourage people to participate. A form letter is not engaging and this should be discussed
541 by the Communication and Outreach Committee.

542

543 Chair Grefenberg stated he did not feel the Committee could have a recommendation ready on
544 this subject by the August meeting.

545

546 Commissioner Ramundt stated this does not have to be done right now but it is something that
547 would be appropriate for the Committee to work on.

548

549 **b. Business Cards**

550

551 Chair Grefenberg stated business cards were available.

552

553 He stated the City Council does not currently have any items on their agenda that are relevant to
554 the Community Engagement Commission.

555

556 **c. Other Items**

557

558 There were no other items [to be discussed](#).

559

560

561 **10. ADJOURNMENT**

562

563 Commissioner Gardella made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Manke to adjourn. **The**
564 **motion carried unanimously**. The meeting was adjourned at 8:49 p.m.

565

566

567

568 [Corrected and Revised by Grefenberg](#)

569

570 *4,831 words*



Community Engagement Commission



What the Community Engagement Commission **Must Do's** and **May Do's** *As Excerpted from City Ordinance 1462*

WHAT THE COMMISSION **MUST DO** ACCORDING TO CITY ORDINANCE

THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE ORDAINS:

208.02: Organization:

The Commission **shall** annually elect one member to serve as chairperson and one member to serve as vice chairperson.

208.03 Meetings and Reports:

The Commission **shall** annually adopt a regular meeting schedule...

The Commission **shall** request a record of its meetings and action.

The commission **shall** request a joint meeting with the City Council when deemed necessary and a minimum of once a year.

208.04 Scope, Duties and Functions:

The City Council has created the Community Engagement Commission to **serve in an advisory capacity regarding the effective and meaningful involvement of Roseville residents in their community.**

The Commission **shall** make recommendations, review policies, and suggest strategies that will help to improve City communication and increase a sense of community.

WHAT THE COMMISSION MAY DO ACCORDING TO CITY ORDINANCE

The duties and functions of the Commission **may** include:

- A. Review and recommend opportunities to collaborate with neighborhood, community, educational, business, and social services groups and organizations.
- B. Recommend strategies for and actively promote and encourage effective and meaningful volunteerism as well as participation on advisory boards, task forces, commissions, and other participatory civic activities.
- C. Review and recommend ways to improve the City's public participation process and policies, identify under-represented groups, remove any barriers, and engage and promote increased participation of all residents (both homeowners and rental populations), businesses, and community and neighborhood organizations.
- D. Review and recommend ways to improve the City's communication efforts, both printed and electronic, to facilitate effective **two-way** communication between the City and its residents, businesses, community and neighborhood organizations including making information available in multiple languages.
- E. Collaborate with City staff to explore and inform the City Council regarding other government efforts in the area of community engagement, as well as the latest trends, technologies, tools, methods, and information used to facilitate community engagement, communication, and volunteer efforts.
- F. Advise the City Council on the community's visioning process.

In Addition, at the All-Commissions Orientation in April 2014 the Department of Administration gave us the following advice as follows:

Role of Commission Members

(From in the Handbook for Roseville Councilmembers, Advisory Commission Members..., page 8-9)

Citizens Advisory Commission members are residents and community volunteers who help the Council by making recommendation regarding certain important issues.

1) Commissioners Act as a Group

You work with your fellow commission members on the issues the City Council as a body has assigned to your commission. The Council has assigned issues to us through the City Code (Chapter 208).

As an individual commission member you should work cooperatively with your fellow commissioners. Staff do not work with individual commissioners but for the commission as a body....

- At its discretion a Commission may form committees and/or task forces which report to the Commission any recommended actions or programs. (A committee is an organizational entity whose majority of members are Commissioners; a task force is an entity whose majority are not sitting Commissioners.)
- At its July 10, 2014, meeting the Commission formed Work Groups to assess the 2012 Task Force Policies and recommended strategies and consider new Commission initiatives. (A work group is an internal short-term entity focused on a specific task, and as such falls under the category of Task Forces as outlined in the Department of Administration's Guidelines for Commissions.)

2) Commissioners are a Link to the Community

Citizen advisor commissions are an important link between the City Council and City Residents. Individual commission members can be the eyes and ears of the Council, helping Councilmembers understand the perspective of City residents on City issues.

3) Commission Members May Have Special Expertise in a Subject

In addition certain commission members may have special training or experience regarding some aspect of City operations. Their service on a commission, therefore, brings informed insight to bear on the important issues facing the City.

Community Engagement Commission
Task Force Recommendations – Work Groups
Commissioner Interest
(As of July 31, 2014)

	Gary	Scot	Kathy	Des	Jonathan	Michelle	Theresa
COMMUNITY OUTREACH AND COUNCIL/COMMISSIONS/STAFF IN THE COMMUNITY			X	X			
EDUCATION/AWARENESS							X
COMMUNITY COMMUNICATIONS		X			X	X	
NEIGHBORHOODS	X		X	X			
COUNCIL/DEPT. – LOW HANGING FRUIT (Operations Committee)	X	X					X
COMPLETED/RESPONSIBILITY OF OTHER COMMISSIONS AND/OR STAFF (Operations Committee)	X	X					X

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT COMMISSION (CEC)

Work Groups to Assess 2012 Task Force Recommendations and New CEC Initiatives

August 6, 2014

[Comments and Annotations by Grefenberg building upon Gardella's 07-11-2014 draft and in accordance with 07-10-2014 Commission Work Group decisions, with Instructions and Process prepared by Operations Committee]

Instructions

1. Should the 2012 policies and strategic recommendations stay?
2. Should any be revised?
3. What's needed to accomplish this?
4. Is there anything missing, both in the policies and strategic recommendations?
5. What's the suggested timeline for addressing these?

Process:

Each work group will be asked to present their ideas to the full Commission for vetting and discussion. A written report will be required, due one week prior to the Commission meeting at which it will be reviewed, if necessary revised, and approved. (See schedule below.)

Schedule

September 4, 2014

Work Group A & E (Community Outreach & Council/Commissions/Staff in the Community)

Work Group B (Education/Awareness)

Work Group F/Operations Committee ('Low-Hanging Fruit')

October 2, 2014

Work Group C (Community Communications)

Work Group D (Neighborhoods)

Work Group G/Operations Committee (Completed /Responsibility of Other Commissions or Staff)

A.. COMMUNITY_OUTREACH & E. COUNCIL/COMMISSIONS/STAFF IN THE COMMUNITY

1.0 Policy: Integrate Citizen Engagement into City Hall Culture

1.1 Policy: The City should work to enrich and strengthen civic engagement at city hall, and encourage employees and elected officials to appreciate civic engagement as an asset.

1.1.a.i Continue its practice of forming resident task forces to assess significant issues and make recommendations to the city council or city manager.

1.1.b Host two or three general community meetings per year in various locations (outside of city hall) to talk with citizens about issues of concern, update citizens on upcoming events and development proposals, and build trusting relationships within the community. We encourage the city to seek cosponsors for such meetings if there are neighborhood associations in those areas.

1.1.c Recognize and reach out to the changing demographics of Roseville (increasing communities of color, aging population, and other marginalized groups) in order to understand how best to keep them informed and involved.

2.0 Policy: Increase Effective Public Participation in City Council and Commissions

2.1 Policy: The City should foster public participation at both the Council and Commission level.

2.1.a Schedule occasional city council and commission meetings in neighborhoods provided that meeting locations are well publicized, ADA-compliant, and accommodate cable television coverage.

2.2.b Pursue outreach efforts aimed at underrepresented groups.

First need to determine who underrepresented groups are.

4.0 Policy: Provide Public Participation Support, Training, and Resources.

4.1.b Revised: Create a new city executive position to support ~~volunteerism and~~ effective public engagement across all departments. This position would direct and coordinate ~~volunteer opportunities and~~ neighborhood and community relations; he/she could develop procedures and methods to provide clear and consistent two-way communication between city government and residents and businesses (improve communication and find opportunities for more effective civic engagement). We recommend that this position report to the City Manager and Council.

Note: The public engagement responsibilities above are not included in the job description of the Volunteer Coordinator, nor were they considered by the Council in establishing this position. The Commission needs to respect these decisions and recognize their reality by separating out the civic engagement role from the Volunteer Coordinator, and keep that a separate item under Outreach (Community Involvement), or have the Commission delete it.

4.1.c Provide opportunities for City staff, council members, and commissioners to discuss key issues with citizens, including the City's progress on increasing civic engagement (such as occurred at the March 13, 2012 Task Force meeting with City Manager Bill Malinen and City Planner Bryan Lloyd).

5.1 Policy: The city should continue to disseminate information via printed material, keeping in mind that many residents rely solely on print media for news and information.

5.1.c Work with Nextdoor.com or other appropriate non-profits to find ways to include residents without computer access in community-building and communications.

Note: NextDoor's business model is web-based. Therefore Grefenberg is unsure NextDoor is a resource for including residents not on the web.

7) Enhance Overall City Communication

7.1 Policy: The City should go beyond the legal requirements for public notification and provide information on issues critical to Roseville's development

7.1.a Organize/host an ~~open house~~ or community meeting for projects that pose issues of substantial community or neighborhood-wide impact to engage in dialogue before the Council or any commission takes any formal action. This would allow the city or commission to explain the project, answer any questions, identify pros and cons, and get a feel for residents' viewpoints.

Who organizes or hosts?

Note: We need to now differentiate between the terms open house, community meeting, and neighborhood meetings, and relocate Open House references (a term of art used in the Planning Department) to Section COMPLETED/RESPONSIBILITY OF OTHER COMMISSIONS AND/OR STAFF under its Planning Category. This relocation of 7.1 was not covered during July 10th Commission meeting due to lack of time, so Grefenberg suggests the above revision to cover Council or Commission dialogues of issues of community wide concern.

7.1.b Aggressively communicate these ~~open house~~ opportunities meetings in local media, as well as through existing communications systems and networks.

Note: Same rationale as above for the deletion of the term open house.

7.1.c Encourage staff to consult with community and neighborhood leaders on issues critical to Roseville's development.

7.2.d Reinstate the "Welcome Packet" for new residents of Roseville and incorporate information needed to foster volunteerism and effective civic engagement in the "Welcome Packet". If printing costs are prohibitive, the city might offer these resources online and provide a postcard to new residents inviting them to visit the web link or request a printed packet.

Note: First of all we need to determine if the Welcome Packet need reinstatements since it is appears that some new residents—such as Jonathan Miller—have received it. The issue of incorporating new information could still be addressed independently of the first part of this recommendation (Reinstate the Welcome Packet...)

Final Note: On 07-21-2014 Garry Bowman informed GRG that the status of the welcome packet is currently in transition. "Previously the city mailed a rather extensive (and expensive) brochure package. The HRA has run out of copies of the welcome package in recent months and is currently reassessing what form the welcome packet will take moving forward as it consider both cost and branding implications."

7 addl 1 Other: Establish communication links with Condos and Senior Residences

*Original purpose was to make sure the governing units of these associations were aware of development proposals affecting their residences. Thus RECOMMEND **transferring** this recommendation to G: Completed/Responsibility of Other Commissions and/or Staff under Planning Commission.*

B EDUCATION/AWARENESS

1.0 Policy: Integrate Citizen Engagement into City Hall Culture

1.1 Policy: The City should work to enrich and strengthen civic engagement at city hall, and encourage employees and elected officials to appreciate civic engagement as an asset.

1.1.d ~~Sponsor~~ Collaborate with city staff on an annual training/conference on the latest trends, technologies and tools used to engage citizens. City staff and residents should jointly plan and publicize the event, and be encouraged to participate. [

The term Sponsor has been superseded by City Ordinance establishing the Commission which gives initial responsibility for this task to staff: Collaborate with City staff to explore and inform the City Council regarding other government efforts in the area of community engagement, as well as the latest trends, technologies, tools, methods, and information used to facilitate community engagement, communication, and volunteer efforts.(208.04 City Ordinance)

Policy 4.2: The City should invest in civic engagement training for public officials and city staff to foster a climate of public participation.

4.2.a Offer periodic (annual at a minimum) training to city officials and staff on civic engagement principles and best practices, including leadership and public participation

Policy 4.3: the City should develop educational and information resources for citizens to learn how best to participate in civic issues.

4.3.a Expand on the information available to citizens re: how a city council and/or commission meeting is run and what procedures citizens need to know in order to testify. This may be in the form of a “how-to” video tutorial sharing some basic information, such as how to sign up for email alerts, how to locate the agenda on the city’s website, how to prepare your comments for public testimony, etc. [Some of this has already been achieved, such as the printed materials available at the entrance to the Council chambers and the Planning Commission’s web site.]

Roseville University

Update: At the July 7th Council meeting some council members expressed desire to see this program return to the City’s calendar. City Manager Trudgeon said it was staff’s intent to work with the Community Engagement Commission in reintroducing this program later this year or next.

4.3.b.i Expand on its successful Roseville University program by offering collaborative workshops specifically focused on civic engagement for residents both new to and seasoned in public participation. The “How-to” material suggested above could be repurposed for this format.

4.3.b.ii Expand on its successful Roseville U program by offering a “graduate” course that focuses entirely on the city’s budgeting process, as this is critical information for engaged citizens to understand.

CEC Chair suggested to Finance Commission at its June 10th meeting that it might want to take over this aspect of the Commission's 2012 Recommendations.}

4.3.b.iii Expand on its successful Roseville U program by offering more flexible scheduling or informal one evening seminars so that individuals who can't make the full seven-week commitment can still participate.

C. COMMUNITY COMMUNICATIONS

General

Policy 2.2: The city should widely publicize openings on all commissions and ad hoc groups and encourage residents to apply.

2.2. a: Fully utilize existing print and electronic means to announce openings on city commissions and task forces. Such means include but are not limited to the Roseville City News, Roseville Patch, Roseville Review, Roseville Issues Forum, [various social media](#), and the neighborhood network NextDoor.

Jonathan Miller: I would specifically add social media to this list. (1st round of Excel Evaluations.

Policy 5.1: The city should continue to disseminate information via printed material, keeping in mind that many residents rely solely on print media for news and information.

5.1.b Print any electronic updates pertaining to City Council decisions in Roseville City News so that people without email are able to access this information.

Jonathan Miller: Is this feasible with the size of the publication. (1st round of Excel Evaluations)

Policy 5.2: The City should include pertinent information and stories related to civic engagement and neighborhoods in its print communication.

5.2.c: Invite volunteer residents to advise city staff on items of interest for City News and possibly other communications such as the biweekly electronic newsletter. For instance, the City should consider establishing a Residents' News Advisory Committee to serve in this capacity.

7) Enhance Overall City Communication

7.1 Policy: The City should go beyond the legal requirements for public notification and provide information on issues critical to Roseville's development.

8.1.e: Explore opportunities to use Cable 16 to promote neighborhoods.

Could be relocated to Neighborhoods section below.

Website/Electronic ALREADY ASSIGNED TO WEBSITE REDESIGN COMMITTEE

Currently underway by staff in collaboration with the Website Redesign Committee of the Commission

6.1 Policy: The City should continuously improve its website to make it more user-friendly, thereby fostering civic engagement.

6.1.a Improve the organization and presentation of content so the website is easy to use.

Underway by Administration, with assistance of Web Redesign Committee

6.1.b Improve the search feature to yield more relevant keyword matches. (Underway)

6.2 Policy: The city should maximize two-way communications technologies (Web 2.0) to facilitate timely public participation and engagement.

6.2.a: Make use of existing electronic communications channels and networks (website, email alerts, Roseville Community Forum, Nextdoor, Patch, etc.) to connect with and actively engage Roseville citizens with an emphasis on two-way communication.

6.2.c: Create an area of the website (or web-based communications) focused specifically on public engagement information and resources for citizens, including two-way communication (see Edina's Citizen Engagement blog as an example).

6.2.b: Explore new media channels (Facebook, YouTube, blogging, etc.) to connect with and actively engage Roseville citizens with an emphasis on two-way communication.

6.3 Policy: The City should enhance access to City Council and commission agenda items, minutes, and recorded meetings through its website and CTV cable television.

6.3.a: Publish approved city council and commission meeting minutes on the city website in a timely manner, such as within one week of approval. If public meeting minutes are not approved in a timely manner, such as within one month, publish draft minutes on its website until minutes are finalized.

6.3.b.: Offer the full text of meeting agendas in the body of email alerts and meeting notices rather than requiring the extra step to click a link to learn of the full agenda.

Currently under way by staff since this recommendation was made in 2012.]

6.3.c: Include a link to the specific recorded televised city meeting on the same page as the meeting minutes and/or agenda. Currently it takes at least 8 clicks through 2 different websites to access a specific recording, and these links are difficult to find.

6.3.d: Ensure online video streaming is optimized for citizens at average connectivity.

Already achieved since this recommendation was made in 2012.

6.4 Policy: The City should foster direct and efficient email communication with public officials.

6.4.a: Create and publish public, city-domain email addresses for city council members and commissioners to directly receive email from and send email to citizens on public matters

without requiring city staff to manually forward such messages. (The online contact form may still be useful for individuals without email.)

Note: Policy currently under consideration by City Council. May no longer be applicable, or may simply need our reinforcement.

Print

5.1 Policy: The City should continue to disseminate information via printed material and other means, keeping in mind that many residents rely solely on print media.

5.1.a: Continue to disseminate Roseville City News and ensure all residents including renters and those living in non-single family homes receive the paper.

Note: First need to determine how City News is disseminated in apartment buildings.

5.2 Policy: The City should include pertinent information and stories related to civic engagement and neighborhoods in its print communications.

5.2.a: Include information related specifically to neighborhoods and their activities in the Roseville City News.

5.2.b: Include information related specifically to commission activities and civic engagement opportunities in the Roseville City News.

Policy 8.1: The City should support residents' efforts to build community within their neighborhood.

8.1.d Create a neighborhood profile column in the City News. Solicit content from residents and neighborhood groups.

8.1.e Explore opportunities to use Cable 16 to promote neighborhoods.

Note: This may also be discussed under Neighborhoods section below, since

3.1.b Include renters/leasers (both residential and business) and residents of co-ops and assisted living facilities in the notifications process pertaining to zoning changes and planning issues (as with property owners).

Transfer to G. COMPLETED or NEARLY COMPLETE/RESPONSIBILITY OF OTHER COMMISSIONS AND/OR STAFF, under Planning Department and Commission.

This Community Communications work above could await the development of a framework by the Outreach and Communications Committee established by the Commission in June. This standing committee will meet twice in July after the July 10th Commission meeting.

D. NEIGHBORHOODS

to facilitate/support information sharing and the development of neighborhoods and neighborhood groups

7.0 Policy: Enhance Overall City Communication

7.1.a Organize/host an open house neighborhood or community meetings for projects that pose issues of substantial community or neighborhood-wide impact to engage in dialogue before the Council or any commission takes any formal action. This would allow the city or commission to explain the project, answer any questions, identify pros and cons, and get a feel for residents' viewpoints.

Question remains: who organizes or hosts?

7.2 Policy: The City should emphasize communications utilizing existing systems more proactively and effectively with the intention of engaging residents.

7.2.a: Connect Nextdoor neighborhood leads to facilitate communication between them on issues of city-wide significance. This will need the cooperation of Nextdoor.

Note: Grefenberg suggests that this could also be discussed under the first category of Community Outreach since the intent of this recommendation is to facilitate NextDoor becoming a tool in informing residents on community-wide events and issues.

7.2.b: Use neighborhood networks such as homeowner associations, SWARN (Solidarity of West Area of Roseville Neighborhoods), the Lake McCarron's Neighborhood Association, and possibly the City's Neighborhood Watch block captain system to supplement existing information systems and to invite residents' responses. When a City Department organizes an informational meeting it should seek out an association or neighborhood group with which to collaborate and organize said meeting.

Grefenberg suggests adding the underlined language above to the policy.

8.1 Policy: The City should support residents' efforts to build community within their neighborhood.

8.1.a: Support the creation of resident-defined neighborhoods. The City, in asking residents to adopt NextDoor.com as their online neighborhood networking tool, established neighborhood boundaries.

Gary Grefenberg: The operative word here is 'neighborhood defined'. (from 1st round of Excel evaluations) The City imposed these neighborhood names and boundaries without consulting any residents. See Edina example of allowing residents to determine their neighborhoods names and boundaries.

8.1.b: Evaluate the success of Nextdoor.com and include goal-related metrics such as its overall effectiveness in building community. Solicit input from residents on their satisfaction with the tool as it pertains to community building within pre-defined neighborhoods.

8.1.c: Provide materials to support neighborhood gatherings throughout the year, similar to the Night to Unite materials offered through the Neighborhood Watch Program.

8.1.e Explore opportunities to use Cable 16 to promote neighborhoods.

Relocated from Community Communications below

8.2. Policy: The City should support residents in developing more formalized neighborhoods and/or neighborhood organizations.

Comment: Need to incorporate this policy into the recommendations so as to provide direction for future action recommendations.

8.2.a.i Provide residents wishing to formalize their neighborhood or neighborhood organization with the following: definition of a neighborhood, network, and association.

8.2.a.ii Provide residents wishing to formalize their neighborhood or neighborhood organization with the following: definition of a neighborhood, network, and association, example of forming a neighborhood, network, or association, clear process to formalize a neighborhood, network, or association, recognition of neighborhoods, networks, and associations.

8.2.a.iii Provide residents wishing to formalize their neighborhood or neighborhood organization with the following: clear process to formalize a neighborhood, network, association

8.2.a.iv Provide residents wishing to formalize their neighborhood or neighborhood organization with the following: recognition of neighborhoods, networks, and associations.

8.2.a.iv.1 A page on city's website with the neighborhood's name, boundaries, characteristics, events, and contact person. (Example at <http://www.stlouispark.org/wolfe-park.html>).

8.2.a.iv.2 Signage in the physical neighborhood.

8.2.b By utilizing various neighborhood networks and organizations to disseminate information relevant to the city and its neighborhoods, the City will assist these groups in providing value to their members and neighbors.

E. COUNCIL/COMMISSIONS/STAFF IN THE COMMUNITY

Items in this category were MERGED INTO Community Outreach per Commission action 07-10-2014

These can be collapsed into one recommendation: Encourage council and staff to regularly be in the community – listening, informing and building relationships. Consider making this a Policy statement.

F. COUNCIL/DEPT. – LOW HANGING FRUIT *[Transferred to Operations Committee per Commission Action 07-10-2014]*

2.1 Policy: The City should foster public participation at both the Council and Commission level.

2.1.b: ~~Formalize~~ Encourage future councils to continue the current mayor's practices of recognizing members of the public in city council meetings and asking if there is any public comment after each substantive decision item is presented by staff and prior to discussion and final vote. This will help ensure that future mayors and councils follow this example of inviting public participation.

Not feasible, since state law prohibits 'formalization' in that it is illegal for one council to establish rules for all future councils.

The only way this proposal could be retained is with the wording changed as indicated above.

2.1.c: Have commission meetings follow these same rules and procedures as the city council, and as described above.

Included in position taken by CEC at its first meeting in May.

2.3.a: Request staff report to the City Council when any commissioner misses more than four meetings in a rolling twelve month period.

Included in CEC position taken at its first meeting.

2 addl 1 Other: In so far as possible staff to advise Commissions on items on Council agenda which fall under their purview according to City Ordinance. (Adopted by CEC 05-08-2014)

Included in CEC position taken at its first meeting.

2 addl 2 Other: Direct contact info for each commission on it web page and printed materials such as Brochures. (CEC adopted 05-08-2014).

Every application for a Commissioner position includes the following statement: Under state law Commissioner's names, addresses and either a phone number or an electronic address are public information.

2 addl 3 Other Tweak the Commission interview process to make certain applicants are aware of interviews and consider providing alternative dates if necessary.

4.0 Policy: Provide Public Participation Support, Training, and Resources

4 addl1 Other: Each year the City should host a picnic for all commissioners and staff liaisons, possibly in connection with Rosefest.

Rationale: Currently Commissioners are only honored by the Council after their term is over or when they resign.

4 addl 1(2) Other: Reimburse Commissioners for direct costs incurred by them in printing and paper, not travel.

6.4.b: Automatically forward messages sent to the City Council's single email account to these new public addresses for council members. *[Already done for Council members.]*

6.4.c: Create a group email account for each commission and automatically forward messages sent to each commission to the respective commission members. *[Already done for Commissions.]*

6 addl 1 Other: Allow each Commission control over their web page and Facebook entries, with proper disclaimer and controls for elimination of whatever staff worries about. [If necessary include a disclaimer and/or a time lag for Staff Liaison review.](#)

The above suggested addition to the policy language is from Grefenberg.

7.2.c: Create and publish a policy for staff to respond to residents' requests and comments within 2 business days/, and where applicable, inform residents of any relevant Roseville mailing (or emailing) lists they can join for updates on issues of concern. – *Addressed on website*

G. COMPLETED or NEARLY COMPLETE/RESPONSIBILITY OF OTHER COMMISSIONS AND/OR STAFF [Commission Transferred to Operations Committee on 07-10-2014]

Finance Commission

1.1.a.i Continue its practice of forming resident task forces to assess significant issues and make recommendations to the city council or city manager. ~~In particular, consider establishing a residents' task force to assess and make recommendations regarding the transparency and accessibility of the Council's budgeting process.~~

Relocate first part to Community Involvement above.

Delete last part since it is now the responsibility of the newly-established Finance Commission.

1.1.a.i Make the budget process more transparent and understandable to residents, and utilize other resources such as a Roseville U course on budgeting, neighborhood workshops, and/or webinars to engage residents in budgeting well before the budget is finalized. (Also see Recommendation 6.1 d.)

{TRANSFER TO Group F. COUNCIL/DEPT. – LOW HANGING FRUIT above}

During the first Excel ratings round Jonathan Miller asked This was one we were thinking the new financial commission would tackle? Answer: Yes.

~~Volunteer Coordinator~~ **Volunteerism [Consider Making a New Working Group]**

Rationale for Making A New Volunteerism Working Group: The area of Volunteerism was not thoroughly covered by the 2012 Civic Engagement Task Force, whereas the 2014 City Ordinance establishing the Commission under Duties and Functions, subsection B. has the following language;

Recommend strategies for and actively promote and encourage effective and meaningful volunteerism as well as participation on advisory boards, task forces, commissions, and other participatory civic activities.

This effort will need to be closely collaborated with the City Volunteer Coordinator.

4.1.a Create and promote more volunteer opportunities for citizens to actively contribute to the Roseville community.

4.1.B Create a new city executive position to support volunteerism and effective public engagement across all departments. This position would direct and coordinate volunteer opportunities and neighborhood and community relations; he/she could develop procedures and methods to provide clear and consistent two-way communication between city government and residents and businesses (improve communication and find opportunities for more effective civic engagement). We recommend that this position report to the City Manager and Council.

Note: The creation of a Volunteer Coordinator has been realized this year. The public engagement responsibilities, however, are not included in the job description of the Volunteer Coordinator, nor were they considered by the Council in establishing this position. The Commission needs to separate out the civic engagement role from the Volunteer Coordinator, and keep that a separate item under Outreach (Community Involvement).

8.3.a Compile, maintain, and make readily available a list of meeting places for Roseville residents to use when organizing neighborhood meetings.

New: Utilize the life experiences and skills of our Senior Community to volunteer in areas where their contributions are needed, applicable, and useful.

Planning/HRA-Department and Commission:

Delete the Housing and Redevelopment Agency since it has no relation to the goals of this section.

3.0 Policy: the City should engage renters as it does homeowners.

3.1.b Include renters/leasers (both residential and business) and residents of co-ops and assisted living facilities in the notifications process pertaining to zoning changes and planning issues (as with property owners). . **Transferred from COMMUNITY COMMUNICATIONS**

This one might belong with zoning/notification recommendations, or is taken care of when we have renters/leasers identified

7.1 Policy: The City should go beyond the legal requirements for public notification and provide information on issues critical to Roseville's development.

7.1.b Aggressively communicate these open house opportunities meetings in local media, as well as through existing communications systems and networks.

Note: The open house opportunities referred to herein only occur in the Planning Department as required by the City's Zoning Ordinance.

7 addl 1 Other: Establish communication links with Condos and Senior Residences

Editorial Note: Transferred from Sec. A

9.0 Policy: Improve the Notification Process

Notes: The Notification Process referred to herein is the responsibility of the Planning Department and Commission.

9.1Policy: The city should expand the notification area and methods for developments that have greater impact and/or involve issues of probable concern.

9.1.a.i Expand the notification radius for projects reaching a threshold of having significant impact, based on those proposals that meet certain criteria. We recognize developing such criteria is challenging and therefore recommend the following as a starting point: Environmental impact including any use that will generate air emissions beyond normal heating and cooling or restaurant exhaust; and noise that may be heard beyond a 500 foot radius or at any distance from the property before 7:00 am or after 5:00 pm weekdays or anytime on weekends and holidays; any proposal requiring a mandatory Environmental Assessment Worksheet (EAW) or a proposal that would require an EAW on its own if an Alternative Urban Area-wide Review (AUAR) had not been prepared

9.1.a.ii Expand the notification radius for projects reaching a threshold of having significant impact, based on those proposals that meet certain criteria: Any proposal requiring a change to the Comprehensive Plan or an interpretation of the intent of the Comprehensive Plan

9.1.a.iii: Expand the notification radius for projects reaching a threshold of having significant impact, based on those proposals that meet certain criteria. We recognize developing such criteria is challenging and therefore recommend the following as a starting point: Any proposal requiring a rezoning for a site of more than one acre.

9.1.a.iv: Expand the notification radius for projects reaching a threshold of having significant impact, based on those proposals that meet certain criteria. We recognize developing such criteria is challenging and therefore recommend the following as a starting point: any subdivision creating more than 20 residential lots or more than 40 residential dwelling units.

9.1.b: Require notification for such proposals be provided to any established neighborhood organization any part of which falls within 500 feet of the proposal and to all residents and businesses within 1500 feet of the proposal and solicit their input. Highway and freeway rights of way shall not be included in the measured radius and the city will liberally interpret this notice criteria.

9.1.c : Work with governing associations of condominiums and townhomes to notify residents, and advise neighborhood groups and associations of pending development issues as soon as legally-allowable and solicit their input.

9.1.d: Co-host (with the proper) informal public communications meetings in the community to display renderings, drawings and maps of the proposal and set aside time to respond to residents' questions and concerns. [\(These meetings are explicitly referred to as Open Houses in the City's Zoning Ordinance and Planning Department.\)](#) These should include site plans, landscaping plans, lighting plans with off-site impacts shown, and in the case of buildings higher than 35 feet, site cross-section drawings showing the relationship of the proposed buildings to existing adjacent buildings.

9.1.e: Provide administrative and communications supports for the above mentioned information meetings, such as maintaining an attendance list and taking notes; providing information on the proposed schedule, future public meetings, and review and decision processes; and informing the public on how to access staff reports and other information regarding the proposal.

If you have any questions on the comments and notes please contact Gary Grefenberg (ggrefenberg@comcast.net) or Theresa Gardella (theresagardella@gmail.com). Don't be shy.

YELLOW = POSSIBLE RELEVANCE TO COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT COMMISSION

THE MORRIS LEATHERMAN COMPANY
 3128 Dean Court
 Minneapolis, Minnesota 55416

**City of Roseville
 Residential Survey**
 FINAL APRIL 2014

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? | LESS THAN TWO YEARS.....3%
TWO TO FIVE YEARS.....14%
FIVE TO TEN YEARS.....21%
TEN TO TWENTY YEARS....23%
20 TO 30 YEARS.....20%
OVER THIRTY YEARS.....20%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....0% |
| 2. | As things stand now, how long in the future do you expect to live in Roseville? | LESS THAN TWO YEARS.....3%
TWO TO FIVE YEARS.....8%
SIX TO TEN YEARS.....12%
OVER TEN YEARS.....67%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....10% |
| 3. | How would you rate the quality of life in Roseville - excellent, good, only fair, or poor? | EXCELLENT.....48%
GOOD.....51%
ONLY FAIR.....1%
POOR.....0%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....0% |
| 4. | What do you like most, if anything, about living in Roseville? | DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....0%
NOTHING.....1%
CONVENIENT LOCATION....15%
NEIGHBORHOOD/HOUSING ...18%
SAFE.....18%
FRIENDLY PEOPLE10%
CLOSE TO FAMILY.....8%
CLOSE TO JOB.....8%
SCHOOLS.....8% |

PARKS/TRAILS.....8%
 SHOPPING.....3%
 QUIET AND PEACEFUL.....2%
 SCATTERED.....2%

5. What do you think is the most serious issue facing Roseville today?

DON'T NOW/REFUSED.....5%
 NOTHING.....24%
 HIGH TAXES.....13%
 RISING CRIME.....13%
 POOR CITY SPENDING.....5%
 LACK OF JOBS/BUSINESS...2%
 AGING POPULATION.....11%
 AGING INFRASTRUCTURE...7%
 STREET REPAIR.....12%
 SCATTERED.....8%

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.....93%
 WRONG TRACK.....5%
 DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....3%

IF "WRONG TRACK," ASK: (n=18)

7. **Please tell me why you feel things have gotten off on the wrong track?**

DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....6%
 HIGH TAXES... ..17%
 POOR CITY SPENDING.....11%
 STREET REPAIR.....6%
 RISING CRIME.....22%
GROWING DIVERSITY.....17%
 CITY PLANNING.....11%
 TOO MUCH RETAIL.....11%

8. How would you rate the sense of community identity among residents in Roseville—would you say it very strong, somewhat strong, not too strong, or not at all strong?

STRONG.....34%
 SOMEWHAT STRONG...57%
 NOT TOO STRONG.....8%
 NOT AT ALL STRONG..0%
 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 what would that be?)

.....CITY OF ROSEVILLE.....21%
NEIGHBORHOOD.....51% !!
 SCHOOL DISTRICT.....9%
 CHURCH. 6%
 WORKPLACE.....4%
 FAMILY/FRIENDS.....9%
 DON'T KNOW/REFUSED....1%

10. **Do you feel accepted in the City OF Roseville?**

YES.....98%
 NO.....1%
 DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....2%

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

11. Why do you feel that way?

DON'T KNOW NEIGHBORS, 33%; UNFRIENDLY PEOPLE, 67%.

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.....32% 1st
SENSE OF COMMUNITY.. .15% 3rd
 GOOD SCHOOLS.....17% 2nd
 UPKEEP OF CITY.....14%
 OPEN SPACE/NATURE.... .6%
 PARKS/RECREATION.....3%
 UPKEEP OF HOUSING... .2%
 QUIET AND PEACEFUL.. .10%
 SCATTERED..... .1%

13. What aspects, if any, of the community should be fixed or improved in the future?

DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.5%
 NOTHING.....29%
 LOWER TAXES.....15%
 BETTER ROADS.....26%
 MORE JOBS.....5%
 MORE PUBLIC TRANSIT.....6%

MORE SENIOR HOUSING.....4%
 LESS AFFORDABLE HOUSING.3%
 SIDEWALKS.....2%
 SCATTERED.....5%

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..6%
 NOTHING..... ..53%
 MORE PUBLIC TRANSIT.. ..10%
 MORE JOBS..... ..7%
 MORE ENTERTAINMENT..... . 9%
 MORE AFFORDABLE HOUSING 11%
 SIDEWALKS..... ..2%
 SCATTERED..... ..2%

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	LAST
HIGH PROPERTY VALUES.....	3%	4%	18%
WELL MAINTAINED PROPERTIES.....	11%	16%	7%
LOW PROPERTY TAXES.....	7%	12%	7%
LOW CRIME RATE.....	32%	19%	5%
GOOD SCHOOL SYSTEM.....	34%	19%	3%
VARIETY OF SHOPPING OPPORTUNITIES.....	2%	5%	15%
VARIETY OF PARK & RECREATION OPORTUNITIES	1%	6%	3%
JOB OPPORTUNITIES.....	4%	12%	8%
COMMUNITY EVENTS AND FESTIVALS.....	0%	2%	16%
SENSE OF COMMUNITY.....	6%	5%	10%
ELSE.....	1%	1%	3%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%	0%	6%

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

18. How would you rate park and recreational facilities in Roseville?

EXCELLENT.....36%

GOOD.....62%
 ONLY FAIR.....2%
 POOR.....0%
 DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....1%

19. Which Roseville recreation facilities of if any, do you or members of your household use most frequently?

- DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....0%.
 NONE.....30%
 TRAILS.....36%
 NEIGHBORHOOD PARKS 25%

20. How would you rate the upkeep and maintenance of Roseville City Parks

EXCELLENT.....35%
 GOOD.....60%
 ONLY FAIR.....3%
 POOR.....0%
 DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....2%

21. In the past year, have you or any members of this household participated in any city sponsored park and recreations programs?

YES.....41%
 NO.....59%
 DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....1%

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

NO, 95%; SENIOR, 2%; CONCERTS IN THE
 PARK, 1%; COMMUNITY CENTER, 1%;
 SCATTERED, 2%

23. How often do you or members of your household use the trail system, weather permitting?

TWICE OR MORE A WEEK...14%
 WEEKLY.....25%
 TWO/THREE PER MONTH...18%
 MONTHLY.....10%
 QUARTERLY.....3%
 LESS FREQUENTLY.....8%
 NOT AT ALL.....23%
 DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....0%

24. Are there any areas in the City of Roseville that are lacking trails or pathways? (IF "YES," ASK:) Where would that be?

UNSURE, 4%; NO, 91%; SIDEWALKS ALONG BUSY ROADS, 1%; COUNTRY ROAD B, 1%; NEAR LAKE OWASSO, 1%; RICE STREET, 1%, SCATTERED, 2%.

25. Which of the following would be your top priority for the City's trails and sidewalk system?

CONSTRUCTION OF ADDITIONAL TRAILS FOR EXERCISE WITHIN PARKS.....14%
CONSTRUCTION OF TRAILS CONNECTING NEIGHBORHOODS AND PARKS.....48%
 CONSTRUCTION OF TRAILS CONNECTING NEIGHBORHOODS AND SHOPPING AND BUSINESS AREAS.....22%
 ELSE (SIDEWALKS).....2%
 DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....15%

26. Are you aware of the Roseville Parks Renewal Program and its projects?

YES.....20%
 NO.....79%
 DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....1%

IF "YES," ASK: (n=81)

27. What project are you most interested in?

UNSURE, 16%; NONE, 24%;
 CONNECTING TRAILS, 16%; CONSTRUCTION OF NEW TRAILS,6%;
 NATURE CENTER, 10%; CENTRAL PARK, 15%;
 UPDATING OF PARKS, 7%; SCATTERED, 6%.

28. Do you feel the current mix of recreational or sports facilities meet the needs of members of your household?

YES.....97%
 NO.....0%
 DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....3%

IF "NO," ASK: (n=1)

29. What facilities do you feel are missing?

COMMUNITY CENTER, 100%.

There have been on-going discussions in the community about the need for a Community Center that would provide community gathering space for recreation, programs and meetings.

30. Do you support or oppose the construction of a Community Center by the City of Roseville? (WAIT FOR RESPONSE) Do you feel strongly that way?

- STRONGLY SUPPORT.....15%
- SUPPORT.....49%
- OPPOSE.....20%
- STRONGLY OPPOSE.....6%
- DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....11%

31. If a Community Center were built, how likely would you or members of your household be to use the facility?

- VERY LIKELY.....20%
- SOMEWHAT LIKELY.....32%
- NOT TOO LIKELY.....19%
- NOT AT ALL LIKELY.....25%
- DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....5%

The construction of the Community Center would use property taxes. Suppose the City of Roseville proposed a Community Center development which you considered to be a reasonable approach.

How much would you be willing to see your property taxes increase to fund this construction? Let's say, would you be willing to see your monthly property taxes increase by ____?

- NOTHING.....40%
- \$3.00.....18%
- \$6.00.....16%
- \$9.00.....12%
- \$12.00.....3%
- \$15.00.....2%
- \$18.00.....1%
- DON'T KNOW/REFUSED....9%

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?	59%	38%	1%	2%	1%
34. Fire protection?	57%	41%	1%	0%	2%
35. Emergency medical services?	56%	37%	0%	0%	7%
36. Sewer and water?	26%	67%	1%	1%	6%
37. Drainage and flood control?	22%	64%	3%	2%	10%
38. Building inspections?	17%	60%	2%	0%	21%

39. Animal control?	25%	58%	5%	1%	11%
40. Code enforcement?	19%	67%	4%	2%	9%

IF ANY SERVICES WERE RATED "ONLY FAIR" OR "POOR," ASK: (n=69)

41. Why did you rate _____ as only fair or poor?					
	DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%			
	COULD IMPROVE.....	7%			
	FLOODING.....	26%			
	MORE PATROLLING.....	3%			
	POOR INSPECTIONS.....	4%			
	LOOSE ANIMALS.....	28%			
	RUNDOWN HOMES.....	17%			
	RUDE/UNFRIENDLY.....	10%			
	SCATTERED.....	4%			

Now, for the next four 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. Hence, Interstate 35W, Highway 36, Highway 36, County Road C or Lexington Avenue, should not be considered. How would you rate

	EXCL	GOOD	FAIR	POOR	DK/R
42. Street repair and maintenance?	15%	51%	28%	6%	0%
43. Snow plowing?	34%	54%	10%	1%	0%
44. Trail and pathway plowing in parks?	23%	63%	4%	0%	10%
45. Trail and pathway plowing in neighborhoods?	20%	62%	8%	0%	11%

46. Do you consider the city portion of your property taxes to be very high, somewhat high, about normal, somewhat low, or very low in comparison with neighboring cities?

VERY HIGH.....	10%
SOMEWHAT HIGH.....	28%
ABOUT AVERAGE.....	44%
SOMEWHAT LOW.....	1%
VERY LOW.....	1%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	17%

47. Would you favor or oppose an increase in YOUR city property taxes if it were needed to maintain city services at their current level -

FAVOR.....	40%
OPPOSE.....	49%

DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.... 11%

48. 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.....9%
 GOOD.....73%
 ONLY FAIR.....7%
 POOR.....0%
 DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....11%

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.

	STS	SMS	SMO	STO	DKR
49. Water and sewer pipes?	44%	30%	12%	4%	10%
50. City buildings?	26%	41%	18%	8%	8%
51. Pedestrian pathways?	38%	37%	15%	6%	5%
52. Bikeways?	32%	44%	14%	6%	5%
53. City roads?	64%	26%	5%	2%	3%

Changing topics....

54. 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.....71%
 NO22%
 DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....7%

55. From what you know, do you approve or disapprove of the job the Mayor and City Council are doing?

STRONGLY APPROVE.....11%
 APPROVE.....77%
 DISAPPROVE.....3%
 STRONGLY DISAPPROVE.....1%
 DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....9%

IF "DISAPPROVE" OR "STRONGLY DISAPPROVE," ASK: (n=15)

56. Why do you feel that way?

IF "ONLY FAIR" OR "POOR," ASK: (n=32)

63. What nuisances does the City need to do a better job of enforcing?

DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....0%	MESSY YARDS.....41%
RUNDOWN HOMES.....25%	JUNK CARS.....16%
LOOSE ANIMALS.....19%	

The City of Roseville offers a housing program for residential home improvements.

64. Prior to this survey, were you aware of this housing program?

YES.....55%	NO.....45%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....0%	

The City also sponsors free home and garden workshops each February and fall.

65. Were you aware of these workshops?

YES.....56%	NO.....44%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....0%	

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

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

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

	FIRST
Violent crime.....	2%
Drugs.....	13%
Youth crimes and vandalism.....	21%
Break-ins and theft from automobiles.....	11%
Business crimes, such as shoplifting & check fraud.....	6%
Residential crimes, such as burglary, and theft...	10%
Traffic speeding.....	12%
Identity theft.....	3%
ALL EQUALLY.....	6%
NONE OF THE ABOVE.....	14%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	3%

67. How would you rate the amount of patrolling the Roseville Police Department does in your neighborhood?

TOO MUCH.....3% ABOUT RIGHT AMOUNT.....91%
 NOT ENOUGH.....5% DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....1%

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.

	MANY /MCH	FEW/ LITT	ABT RGHT	DK/ REFD
68. Affordable rental units?	21%	24%	53%	2%
69. Market rate rental units?	12%	17%	62%	10%
70. Condominiums and townhomes?	10%	8%	77%	5%
71. Starter homes for young families?	3%	30%	61%	6%
72. "Move up" housing?	11%	13%	69%	7%
73. Higher cost housing?	16%	10%	68%	7%
74. Assisted living for seniors?	5%	28%	57%	10%
75. Parks and open spaces?	9%	6%	85%	1%
76. Trails and bikeways?	9%	8%	82%	1%
77. Service and retail establishments?	10%	13%	77%	1%
78. Entertainment & dining opportunities?	5%	17%	78%	0%

79. If you were going to move from your current home for upgrading, how committed you be to stay in Roseville?
 VERY COMMITTED.....46% SOMEWHAT COMMITTED.....42%
 NOT TOO COMMITTED.....5% NOT AT ALL COMMITTED....4%
 DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....4%

80. And, if you were going to move from your current home for down-sizing, how committed would you be to stay in Roseville?
 VERY COMMITTED.....42% SOMEWHAT COMMITTED.....45%
 NOT TOO COMMITTED.....6% NOT AT ALL COMMITTED....3%
 DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....4%

IF "NOT TOO COMMITTED" OR "NOT AT ALL COMMITTED IN QUESTIONS #79 OR #80, ASK: (n=40)

81. Is there anything missing or that could be improved in Roseville that would make you committed to staying?
 NO, 75%; AFFORDABLE HOUSING, 15%;
 MOVE-UP HOUSING, 3%; PUBLIC TRANSIT, 3%;
 LESS TRAFFIC CONGESTION, 5%.

Changing topics....

Most communities have one of three systems for garbage collection. In an open collection system, like the City of Roseville currently has, residents choose their hauler from several different companies serving the community. Other cities use an organized collection system, where the City contracts with a hauler for collection throughout the city.

82. Would you favor or oppose the City of Roseville changing from the current system in which residents may choose from several different haulers to a system where the City chooses a specific hauler for the whole community? (WAIT FOR RESPONSE) Do you feel strongly that way?

STRONGLY FAVOR.....6%
 FAVOR.....30%
 OPPOSE.....33%
 STRONGLY OPPOSE.....13%
 DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....19%

IF A RESPONSE IS GIVEN, ASK: (n=325)

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

DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....0%?
 WANT CHOICE.....52%
 OPEN/LOWER COST.....9%
 ORGANIZED/LOWER COST...13%
 ORGANIZED/LESS TRAFFIC.21%
 ORGANIZED/SAFER.....3%
 LIKE CURRENT HAULER.....1%

84. How would you rate the City of Roseville's Recycling program—excellent, good, only fair, or poor?

EXCELLENT.....26%
 GOOD.....63%
 ONLY FAIR.....4%
 POOR.....0%
 DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....7%

Continuing....

85. How would you rate the City's overall performance in communicating key local issues to its residents in its publications, website, mailings, and on cable television?

EXCELLENT.....19%
 GOOD.....72%
 ONLY FAIR.....9%
 POOR.....0%
 DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....1%

86. What is your primary source of information about the City of Roseville?-

DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....0%
 NONE.....2%
 CITY NEWSLETTER.....48% !
 LOCAL NEWSPAPER.....28%
 CITY WEBSITE.....11%
 CABLE TELEVISION.....5%
 WORD OF MOUTH.....5%
 SCATTERED.....1%

87. How would you most prefer to receive information about Roseville City Government and its activities

E-MAIL.....6%
 CITY WEBSITE.....12%
 PUBLICATIONS/NEWSLTRS..43%
 MAILINGS TO HOME.....17%
 LOCAL WEEKLY PAPERS....17%
 CABLE TV.....4%
 CITY FACEBOOK PAGE.....0%
 TWITTER.....0%
 WORD OF MOUTH.....2%

88. Do you recall receiving the City publication "Roseville City News" during the past year?

YES.....86%
 NO.....14%
 DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....1%

IF "YES," ASK: (n=342)

89. Do you or any members of your household regularly read it?
 YES.....92% NO.....8%
 DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....0%

90. How effective is this city publication in keeping you informed about activities in the city

VERY EFFECTIVE.....33%
 SOMEWHAT EFFECTIVE.....57%
 NOT TOO EFFECTIVE.....6%
 NOT AT ALL EFFECTIVE....2%
 DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....2%

I would like to ask you about social media 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.

	NOT USE	USE LIK	USE NLK	DK/ REF
91. Facebook?	56%	19%	25%	0%
92. Twitter?	72%	11%	18%	0%
93. YouTube?	65%	10%	25%	0%
94. Nextdoor?	81%	10%	7%	3%
95. E-mail?	33%	41%	27%	0%
96. City website?	45%	44%	11%	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?

97. Persons 65 or over?
 NONE.....72%
 ONE.....16%
 TWO OR MORE.....12%

98. Adults between the ages of 50 and 64 years of age?
 NONE.....72%
 ONE.....15%
 TWO MORE.....13%

99. Adults between the ages of 18 and 49 years of age?

NONE.....37%
 ONE.....28%
 TWO.....31%
 THREE OR MORE.....4%

100. School-aged children and pre-schoolers?

NONE.....77%
 ONE.....10%
 TWO.....8%
 THREE OR MORE... ..5%

101. Do you own or rent your present residence?

OWN.....67%
 RENT.....33%
 REFUSED.....0%

102. What is your age, please?

18-24.....3%
 25-34.....14%
 35-44.....19%
 45-54.....24%
 55-64.....18%
 65 AND OVER.....23%

103. Which of the following best describes your household?: -

SINGLE/NO OTHER.FAMILY AT HOME...29%
 SINGLE PARENT.....5%
 MAR/PARTN/CHILDREN.24%
 MAR/PARTN/NO CHILD.... 39%
 SOMETHING ELSE.....4%
 DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....0%

104. Which of the following categories represents your ethnicity—White, African-American, Hispanic-Latino, Asian-Pacific, Native American, or something else?

WHITE. 77%
 AFRICAN-AMERICAN.....8%
 HISPANIC-LATINO.....4%
 ASIAN-PACIFIC ISLAND 8%
 NATIVE AMERICAN... 1%

MIXED/BI-RACIAL.....1%

SOMETHING1%

(IF "SOMETHING ELSE," ASK:) What would that be?

DON'T KNOW.....0%

REFUSED.....1%

105.Do you live north or south of Highway 36? (WAIT FOR ESPONSE)

Do you east or west of Snelling Avenue?

NORTHWEST.....14%

NORTHEAST.....49%

SOUTHEAST.....23%

SOUTHWEST.....14%

DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....0%

106. Gender (DO NOT ASK)

MALE.....48%

FEMALE.....52%

[Attachments \(Added by Grefenberg\): Two Municipal Website Descriptions from Edina and Shoreview](#)



The CITY of EDINA

...For living, learning, raising families & doing business

Tuesday, September 03, 2013

Edina receives high marks on 2013 Quality of Life survey

Edina, Minn., Aug. 28, 2013 – Residents are still proud to call Edina “home.” That’s the verdict from the latest quality of life survey of Edina residents by an independent research company.

In the survey conducted this spring by Decision Resources, Ltd., 99 percent of respondents rated the quality of life in Edina as “excellent” or “good.” The rating ties Edina with Hopkins for the best ranking among similarly surveyed cities in the metropolitan area.

“The results are extraordinary and worth sharing,” said City Manager Scott Neal. Other highlights of the survey include:

- “Good schools,” “natural beauty” and “housing/neighborhood” were the things residents say they like most about living in Edina.
- More than 30 percent couldn’t identify a serious issue facing Edina today. Other issues identified by about 1 in 10 people were taxes and housing teardowns.
- Ninety-two percent of residents polled believe things in Edina are “generally headed in the right track.”
- The job of City staff was rated “excellent” or “good” by 91 percent of respondents.
- Eighty-four percent of residents polled believe that if they wanted to, they could have a say about the way things are run in the community.

Decision Resources completed the random 194-question survey of about 400 Edina residents from around the community in May and June. The results are accurate to +/- 5 percent and will aid City decision makers going forward.

Complete survey results can be found online at www.EdinaMN.gov under “Resources.” For more information, call the City’s Communications & Technology Services Department at 952-826-0359.

Return to [list](#).

 [Print](#)

Communications & Technology Services

4801 W. 50th Street
Edina, MN 55424

Mail@EdinaMN.gov

952-826-0359

Hours:

Monday - Friday

8 a.m. - 4:30 p.m.

Shoreview Minnesota

Website www.shoreviewmn.gov/about-us/community-survey

The quality of life rating awarded the City of Shoreview is one of the highest in the Minneapolis-St. Paul Metropolitan Area.

CONTACT INFORMATION

Tom Simonson, Community Development
Director/Assistant City Manager
Phone: 651.490.4612 | [E-mail Tom](#)

Residents of Shoreview experience the highest quality of life of any community in the Minneapolis-Saint Paul region. This fact was confirmed based on the results of our most recent Quality of Life/City Services Survey conducted by a prominent professional polling firm that we undertake every 3-5 years in order to measure the satisfaction levels and service needs of our residents. Decision Resources Ltd. offers these concluding statements in their executive summary on their survey analysis and assessment:

Shoreview citizens remain very content with their community. Ninety-nine percent approve of their quality of life; 58% rate it "excellent" (an increase from 2010, when 96% percent approved of their quality of life, and 55% rated it "excellent"). This level of satisfaction is at the top of communities in the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area suburbs.

Residents express pride in key community values: sense of connection, strong neighborhoods, safe streets, exemplary park system, and sterling but cost-efficient city services.

Citizens have very high expectations; but, as in the past, the City continues to meet or exceed most residents' needs. Residents exhibit among the strongest levels of confidence in the direction of their community found within the suburbs.

The summary phrase reflecting the current mode of residents is "cost-effective excellence."

Shoreview remains overall one of the best run and smoothly functioning suburbs within the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area.

The Community Survey looks at the following areas:

Residential Demographics

General Quality of Life

Recreational Issues

City Services

Taxes and City Services

Development Issues

Communication Issues

Resident Comments

[2013 Complete Survey Results](#) [PDF]

[2013 Complete Survey Results with 2010 Comparisons](#) [PDF]

[2013 Executive Summary](#)

[2010 Complete Survey Results](#) [PDF]

[2010 Executive Summary](#) [PDF]

Free viewers are required for some of the attached documents.
They can be downloaded by clicking on the icons below.

Navigation

[Home](#)

[About Us](#)



[Home](#) | [About Us](#) | [Government](#) | [Departments](#) | [Business](#) | [Services](#) | [Site Map](#) | [Contact Us](#)

Popular Links: [Building Permits and Inspection Tools](#) | [Recycling and Refuse](#) | [Overnight Parking](#) | [Council Agendas and Packets](#) | [Jobs](#)

City Hall: 4600 Victoria St. N, Shoreview, MN 55126 | [Directions/Map](#) | Phone: 651.490.4600 | Open:
8:00 am - 4:30 pm M-F

Commission Work Scope for Next Few Months

Subject to Change
As of August 8, 2014

August

Work Group Process and Topics for Assessment of 2012 Task Force Recommendations and Consideration of New Commission Initiatives

Outreach & Community Engagement Committee present Talking Points and preliminary audience grid analysis for marketing and communications

Overview of 2014 Community Survey focusing on 'Sense of Community' Questions

Current Status Update on City Website Redesign

Site Demo on Website Redesign (?)

September

Recommendation from Website Redesign Committee on a civic engagement module to recommend to Administration Department

Meeting with new Roseville Volunteer Coordinator

Work Group Reports for Commission Review and Approval:

Work Group A & E (Community Outreach & Council/Commissions/Staff in the Community)

Work Group B (Education/Awareness)

Work Group F/Operations Committee ('Low-Hanging Fruit')

October

Discussion with Advocates for Human Rights on Chapter 7 of 2014 Report *Moving from Exclusion to Belonging*, dealing with civic engagement and political participation by immigrants

Work Group Reports for Commission Review and Approval:

Work Group C (Community Communications)

Work Group D (Neighborhoods)

Work Group G/Operations Committee (Completed /Responsibility of Other Commissions or Staff)

Outreach & Community Engagement Committee present for Commission review and approval the final audience grid analysis for marketing and communications

Preparation for Joint Meeting with Council

November

Joint Meeting with City Council to recommend strategies to achieve purpose and goals of City Ordinance establishing Commission.

Talking Points Recommended by the Outreach and Communications Committee at its July 29th meeting

Q: What is the Community Engagement Commission?

- We are a newly formed city commission with 7 commissioners all from the City of Roseville.
- Our function is to develop a process and a culture that encourages city government, residents and neighbors to work more closely together.
- We will identify and establish partnerships and alliances with business, government, education, neighborhoods and other civic groups that are productive and mutually beneficial to our community.
- We will develop strategies for engagement, civic communications and volunteerism, serving advisor to the City Council on behalf of its stakeholders.
- We will develop creative and inclusive ways to involve all of Roseville in civic governance.

Roseville Community Engagement
 DRAFT Audience Analysis Grid
 8/7/14

Audience	Profile	What can we do for this audience	What do we want this audience to do on behalf of us	
Residents of Roseville <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Private homeowners • Renters • Seniors • Businesses • Commuters into Roseville • City Staff • Visitors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People who come into contact with our City in their daily lives. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitor and respond to citizen and legislative input and issues. • Work cooperatively with residents and city departments. • Reminder information on volunteer opportunities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Volunteer • Become actively involvement in communities and civic issues • Be an advocate for the City of Roseville • Talk positively about the City of Roseville • Help identify key issues affecting Roseville 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TBD
City Government <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commissions • City Council • City Departments 				
Education <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 				
Volunteers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 				
Organizations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non Profits • Youth Groups 				

**Roseville Community Engagement
DRAFT Audience Analysis Grid
8/8/14**

Visitors •				
---------------	--	--	--	--