

**Community Engagement Commission Agenda**  
**Thursday, Oct. 8, 2015**  
**6:30 p.m.**  
**City Council Chambers**

- 6:30 p.m.      **1. Roll Call**
- 2. Approve Agenda**
- 3. Public Comment on Items Not on Agenda**
- 4. Discuss meeting minutes revision and approval process**
- 5. Approval of August 14 meeting minutes**
- 6. Approval of September 10 meeting minutes**
- 7. Old Business**
- A. Receive information from existing neighborhood associations
- 6:45 p.m.                   A. Twin Lakes Neighborhood Association
- 6:55 p.m.                   B. Lake McCarron's Neighborhood Association
- 7:05 p.m.                   C. SouthWest Area of Roseville Neighborhoods
- 7:15 p.m.                   B. Discussion on background, purposes, and benefits of neighborhood associations
- 8:00 p.m.                   C. Update on Joint Task Force on Zoning Notification
- 8:05 p.m.                   D. Update on civic engagement website module
- 8:15 p.m.                   E. CEC Social Gathering
- 8:20 p.m.      **8. Chair, Committee, and Staff Reports**
- A. Chair's Report**
- B. Staff Report**
- 8:30 p.m.      **9. New Business**
- A. Discussion on Welcome Packet
- 10. Commission Communications, Reports, and Announcements**
- 11. Commissioner-Initiated Items for Future Meetings**
- 12. Recap of Commission Actions This Meeting**
- 8:55 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.*

*Be a part of the picture....get involved with your City....Volunteer. For more information, contact Kelly at [kelly.obrien@cityofroseville.com](mailto:kelly.obrien@cityofroseville.com) or (651) 792-7028.*

# Proposed Community Engagement Commission Meeting Minutes Revision and Approval Process

1. Within <<TBD>> days after a CEC meeting, the Recording Secretary will complete the transcription of the meeting and provide the minutes of the meeting to the CEC Staff Liaison who in turn forwards the meeting minutes to the entire commission.
2. Within 1 week prior to the subsequent CEC meeting, individual commissioners may forward to the CEC Staff Liaison any "minor edits" to the minutes of the previous CEC meeting. "Minor edits" include:
  - a. Corrections to the spelling of names or other words
  - b. Corrections to grammatical errors
  - c. Formatting corrections
  - d. Corrections to portions that were erroneously transcribed that can easily be made via changing a small number of words (e.g. motions, votes, text actually stated by another person, other small corrections)
3. Prior to publishing the meeting packet for the subsequent CEC meeting, the CEC Staff Liaison will consolidate all of the above submitted corrections into a single, revised version of the meeting minutes. The CEC Staff Liaison will use his/her discretion when multiple similar-but-different edits were made to a given portion of the meeting minutes and attempt to revise the meeting minutes in such a way as to capture the intention of all of the changes submitted for that given portion of the meeting minutes. When this is not possible, the CEC Staff Liaison will provide a listing of all changes to the given portion of the meeting minutes for commission consideration.
4. The CEC Staff Liaison will publish the above revised version of the meeting minutes in the packet for the subsequent CEC meeting per the timing for meeting packet publication as required by State statute and/or City ordinance.
5. During the following CEC meeting, the commission will consider the revised meeting minutes as submitted in the meeting packet. Commission action may include:
  - a. Table consideration of the meeting minutes to a later meeting (without taking additional action during the present meeting).
  - b. Approving the revised minutes as submitted in the meeting packet via a basic motion (move second, discussion, and majority vote) without taking

1minute

basic motion (move, second, discussion, and majority vote) without taking additional action.

- c. Deciding to adopt a single revision to a given portion of the meeting minutes as submitted in the meeting packet when multiple different revisions were submitted for that same portion of the meeting minutes via a basic motion (move, second, discussion, and majority vote) and, optionally:
  - i. Approving the revised minutes as amended above via a basic motion (move, second, discussion, and majority vote) without taking additional action.
- d. Amending the revised minutes as submitted in the meeting packet via a basic motion (move, second, discussion, and majority vote). Multiple amendments may be made in this manner culminating in, optionally:
  - i. Approving the revised minutes as amended above via a basic motion (move, second, discussion, and majority vote) without taking additional action.
- e. Requesting that the Recording Secretary revise a portion of the revised minutes as submitted in the meeting packet via a basic motion (move, second, discussion, and majority vote). Multiple requests for revisions may be made in this manner culminating in:
  - i. Postponing approving the revised minutes so that requested revisions above can be made and re-submitted to the commission for consideration in a later meeting via a basic motion (move, second, discussion, and majority vote).

1 **Community Engagement Commission**  
2 **Meeting Minutes**  
3 **DRAFT – August 13, 2015 - DRAFT**  
4  
5

6 **Commissioners:** Scot Becker, Gary Grefenberg, Sherry Sanders, Theresa Gardella,  
7 Jonathan Miller, Michelle Manke and Ebony Adedayo.

8  
9 **Commissioners Absent:** None.

10  
11 **Staff Present:** Garry Bowman

12  
13 **Others Present:** Peggy Verkuilen; Lisa McCormick; and Diane Hilden (all part of  
14 meeting).  
15

16 **Call to Order**

17  
18 All Commissioners being present, the Community Engagement Commission meeting was called  
19 to order at 6:30 p.m. by Chair Scot Becker.  
20

21 **Approve Agenda**

22  
23 Chair Becker asked if there were any changes or amendments to the Agenda as mailed to the  
24 Commission; no one wished to amend the agenda.  
25

26 Commissioner Grefenberg moved and Commissioner Gardella seconded a motion to approve the  
27 agenda as distributed. **Motion passed unanimously.**  
28

29 **Approve Minutes**

30  
31 Chair Becker stated he received some feedback on possible corrections to the minutes so he  
32 asked the minutes be tabled in order for it to be reviewed by himself against the video for  
33 possible corrections where needed.  
34

35 Chair Becker moved and Commissioner Sanders seconded a motion to table the July 9, 2015  
36 meeting minutes as distributed. **Motion passed unanimously.**  
37

38 **Public Comment**

39  
40 There being no one present wishing to speak on an item not on the agenda, the Chair moved to  
41 the next agenda item.  
42

43 **Old Business**

44  
45 **a. Receive Neighborhood Association Task Force Report**  
46

47 Chair Becker noted that tonight the Commission would be receiving the Task Force Report from  
48 a Task Force co-chair of the Task Force, Jerry Stoner. Co-Chair Jerry Stoner would walk the  
49 Commission through the report and answer Commission questions, as well as some public  
50 comment. He added that that the Commission would have several future meetings to review the  
51 Report and decide what recommendations to make to the Council; because of tonight's heavy  
52 agenda he encouraged the Commission to simply receive the Report, with subsequent meetings  
53 devoted to discussion of the Report's particulars.

54 .Task Force Co-Chair Stoner walked through the various sections of the Report. The first  
55 section, the Introduction, was factual with the second and third paragraphs focused on Task  
56 Force membership changes during the course of its meetings. He reported that the Task Force  
57 spent some time on definitions, the report's second part.

58  
59 The two sections which follow, the Purposes and Benefits of Neighborhood Associations,  
60 although not necessarily part of the Task Force's original mission, took up a lot of time because  
61 it became clear that a lot of our discussion was focused on these two topics; as such the Task  
62 Force wanted to capture the content of those discussions. The Task Force discussed the different  
63 kinds of groups that people could have, from fairly informal social groups to Neighborhood  
64 Watch all the way to Neighborhood Associations with a 501c3. tax status. The second topic  
65 considered the benefits of neighborhood associations. At the end there appeared to be a broad  
66 agreement on these topics, Co-Chair Stoner indicated.

67  
68 He thought the next section, *City Recognition of Neighborhood Associations*, was probably the  
69 most controversial section d in the Report. They ended up creating footnotes for this section in  
70 order to show where there was disagreement What is now included in the Report is what the task  
71 force finally agreed upon near the end of its work, breaking City Recognition into two parts,  
72 Minimal Standards (on which there was broad agreement) and Other Neighborhood Association  
73 Recognition Criteria considered but not yet agreed upon by the Task Force. He added that there  
74 probably was a lot more to this item than the actual text conveys.

75  
76 Stoner added as an example the issue of an Annual Meeting requirement. The discussion was  
77 not about whether a Neighborhood Association should have an annual meeting, but the point was  
78 how to make sure a neighborhood association not become a paper organization organized by one  
79 person 'in their garage' and once recognized by the City would continue interminably. The Task  
80 Force thus decided to leave this up to the Commission.

81  
82 Stoner continued by noting that probably the most important section was the next section: how  
83 the City could encourage and facilitate the creation of more neighborhood associations. This  
84 was the core of the original charge to the Task Force, and a lot of this section comes from Task  
85 Force members themselves who have run neighborhood associations; focused on what they  
86 want, what they needed when they first started, and what do they feel they need today. He felt  
87 there were a lot of very strong recommendations there.

88  
89 Stoner stated the final two sections in the report were on how the City can communicate with the  
90 neighborhood associations and how the Neighborhood Associations could communicate with the  
91 City. A lot of this ends up being how do they identify themselves to the City as an association

92 and how do they communicate to the City. Some of this needs to be put together because  
93 someone who wants to form a neighborhood association might not have been on a Commission  
94 and know there is a contact form available.  
95

96 Chair Becker thanked the Task Force for all the work they have done on the report, including  
97 Donna Spencer the other Task Force Co-Chair who could not be present tonight. Commissioner  
98 Theresa Gardella added she had no idea on how complicated the charge of the task force could  
99 be in the sense that there is so much to think about and she appreciated the depth in which the  
100 Task Force went into even if it was beyond what the original scope was. She thought this was so  
101 much more valuable because of the people actually leading neighborhood associations were a  
102 part of this. She appreciated the thoroughness of the Task Force. Mr. Stoner stated he was not  
103 aware of all the work when he first volunteered for the task force entailed either.  
104

105 Commissioner Jonathan Miller stated he was curious if anyone had seen anything about  
106 requirements different municipalities might have for by-laws or election standards, and how the  
107 leadership is chosen for different organizations. He stated he would be interested to see what  
108 other entities have for suggestions regarding this.  
109

110 Mr. Stoner stated they did end up looking at Edina, Morgantown West Virginia, St. Louis Park  
111 and some consideration for Minneapolis. A lot of those were very top down so unlike in  
112 Roseville where there were neighborhood associations before the City even knew or cared, the  
113 other cities reviewed decided to have neighborhood associations before there were any in the  
114 City. In Edina's case, they set the boundaries for the different neighborhood associations in the  
115 City. Edina does have a complex system in place with by-laws listed but in Roseville's case the  
116 Task Force ended up not necessarily prescribing that there needed to be by-laws because what it  
117 really focused on was the bare minimums and how two-way communication between the  
118 neighborhood and the City could occur.  
119

120 Mr. Stoner stated they did not go with by-laws because it did not fit in the evolution of the  
121 associations in the City. Commissioner Gary Grefenberg added he did distribute the  
122 neighborhood association policy of Edina early on in the discussions and there was some Task  
123 Force review of that policy; he noted that could be made available to the Commission  
124

125 Commissioner Michelle Manke asked if there was discussion about the selection of leadership  
126 and their roles in neighborhood associations. Mr. Stoner stated the Task Force did not prescribe  
127 that level of detail.  
128

129 Commissioner Michelle Manke asked if there could be at least annual meetings and how would  
130 those be recorded and reported. Without by-laws, Manke said, there could be internal problems.  
131 Mr. Stoner replied that he was glad that Commissioner Manke was thinking about that and the  
132 Task Force had left that issue for the Commission to discuss and decide because the Task Force  
133 could not agree on that item. The Task Force pretty much decided that it could go into that detail  
134 and implode, or come up with a final report.  
135

136 Commissioner Ebony Adedayo stated she really appreciated the organic nature Task Force  
137 wanted to give to neighborhood organizations; one of the drawbacks of this approach, however,  
138 is the disparity between an organization that is really passionate, organized and has the technical  
139 expertise and know-how to form and get funding and do civic engagement, and another  
140 organization that does not. Commissioner asked if there was a possibility where there could be  
141 some co-learning or teaching other people how to become more formal. She would like to know  
142 where are the levels of support that they have within the City to provide the neighborhoods that  
143 want to be more formal. Mr. Stoner responded that that was a great idea. He thought that every  
144 step of the way in this process would allow more to be included in the report for its  
145 improvement.

146  
147 Task Force Co-Chair. Stoner stated there was some discussion about having information  
148 available on a website but there needs to be someone who can maintain it and add to it.  
149 Commissioner Sanders added there had been discussion about having a volunteer be the liaison  
150 between the City and the Associations.

151  
152 Commissioner Grefenberg asked about the process, indicated that at the last Commission  
153 meeting there were comments that the Task Force was not representing its individual members,  
154 Mr. Stoner responded that it was inevitable that there would be conflict on any complicated  
155 issue. The charge was two sentences, and with a lot of passionate members disagreement was  
156 inevitable.

157  
158 Commissioner Grefenberg commented that at the end of the Task Force there was a lot of  
159 unanimity. Mr. Stoner attributed that to the members figuring out why they disagreed and then  
160 deciding to buckle down and move on with the Report. He added they started putting in  
161 standards of appropriate conduct (for neighborhood associations) so the members did not go into  
162 ranting about an item for a long duration during the meetings.

163  
164 **Public Comment:** Chair Becker opened the meeting to public comment, indicating that said  
165 comment would be limited to five minutes or less.

166  
167 Ms. Lisa McCormick, Wheeler Street, stated she was at the meeting as a resident of the City and  
168 the only one in recent years to her knowledge to start an association. She formed Twin Lakes  
169 Neighborhood Association last summer at the request of a Councilmember. She stated she is  
170 also a former Task Member that resigned at the June Community Engagement Commission  
171 meeting. She indicated that meeting was very uncomfortable and she sited time constraints as  
172 the reason she quit during that meeting and she did not think it would surprise anyone that it was  
173 not entirely true. She stated recently she has been giving a lot of thought to accountability,  
174 responsibility and authenticity and she was at the meeting regarding a correction and she felt that  
175 what she had to say was being somewhat stifled.

176  
177 Ms. McCormick stated she knew going into that meeting that she had some issues with the report  
178 and that she may have to speak in opposition to some points and during that meeting it occurred  
179 to her that her ability to speak in opposition could be thwarted by staying on the Task Force, and  
180 that was a consideration that ultimately had her resign. The reality of the situation is that even



181 though she resigned, she continued to participate and have missed only one meeting. She not  
182 only participated but she actually contributes when asked of her opinion on certain definitions  
183 and such. She stated she wanted to acknowledge the commitment of everyone that participated  
184 and she thought the work product was good. She thought the scope of the work was expanded.  
185 She thought the original charge could have been completed in a meeting or two and she thought  
186 the question that was asked could have been answered rather simply, especially with the amount  
187 of experience and the amount of information available.

188  
189 Ms. McCormick stated she did not think, as much as she respects and appreciates Mr. Stoner's  
190 work, she did not remember as much discussion as he indicated occurred during the Task Force  
191 meetings. There were a lot of positions being presented but not a lot of discussion or invitation  
192 for input. At one point she reached out to people who had been absent and got responses back  
193 where they did not feel there was an invitation to speak and she found that to be very  
194 unfortunate.

195  
196 Ms. McCormick stated given her experience she was considering forming an umbrella, 501C-3,  
197 for the purpose of sponsorship and other things to allow other neighborhood associations that  
198 were interested in forming to come in under that umbrella and give them that liability protection  
199 because it is expensive to form a 501C-3 and is very time-consuming. She thought if they were  
200 to spread that City wide it would make it all workable. She was excited about the idea of  
201 education, partnership with the City on various projects, grants and other things. She provided  
202 that as a backdrop to what she felt possible when she got involved in this.

203  
204 Ms. McCormick stated she was a big proponent of this Task Force. She thought this was great  
205 work and Commissioner Grefenberg did a great job at editing and wordsmithing and polishing  
206 the document but she was not sure this was the right question the Task Force was asked answer.  
207 What she found was the City's Associations are a hybrid of very formal and loose associations  
208 and she cautioned the Commission to look closer at this before approving the document.

209  
210 Ms. McCormick requested the Commission pull out the one section on this specific charge and  
211 suggested providing a round table discussion where the Commission could receive more input.

212  
213 **(Ms. McCormick stated during the September Community Engagement Commission**  
214 **meeting that her public comment noted above in the minutes was incomplete. She stated**  
215 **that there were additional errors in the minutes).**

216  
217 Ms. Diane Hilden, Bayview Drive, stated she has a lot of passion for the concept for what is  
218 going on and for the discussion of this she has talked to many people over the years who wanted  
219 to start an association. She stated it is very difficult to sustain and keep an association going and  
220 they need to be organized and maintained. She stated she has been on many Task Force and  
221 Associations and she has yet to see the contention that was operating on this Task Force. It was  
222 very disturbing and it continues to disturb her that this was the case. While she thought there  
223 was lots of great work done by Mr. Stoner but she thought things have been misrepresented from  
224 the beginning. She felt they dealt with the wrong problem and she has stated before that she is  
225 opposed to this report and she thought they could archive it. She felt there was lot of good

226 information in there but she thought it needs to be really thought out in terms of this community  
227 and what is existing and how they enhance what is existing and how they look at this issue.

228

229 Ms. Hilden stated they should not presume that Roseville needs neighborhood associations all  
230 over the place. She felt this needs to be reviewed and discussed by a broad array of people from  
231 the community. This was seriously reduced by the amount of people not at the Task Force and  
232 by the fact that those that have remained. There was a change in leadership and the meetings in  
233 the beginning were quite pretentious resulting in the focus of the Task Group becoming the  
234 crafting of a neighborhood policy manual that she did not think was the intention of this  
235 Commission. She stated she was one of the dissenting voices in the beginning and remained one  
236 throughout.

237

238 Ms. Hilden agreed with a number of people that charged the report was vague and confusing  
239 which caused a lot of problems early on. One of the things that happened was it assumed that  
240 Roseville would spring forth a lot of neighborhood associations and she did not think that was  
241 the case and should be the subject of some discussion and should be looked at. The report as  
242 currently written suggests a rigidity that she fears would actually discourage the formation of  
243 neighborhood associations and she would recommend to the Community Engagement  
244 Commission and the City Council that neighborhood associations are typically hard to create,  
245 maintain and sustain.

246

247 Ms. Hilden stated she along with a number of other unsuccessfully tried to promote the concept  
248 within Roseville for a number of years. She stated she would recommend the Commission to  
249 consider this document premature and therefore suggest they convene a subsequent Task Force  
250 that is broadly represented throughout the Roseville Community using the resources provided by  
251 different committees within Roseville along with the neighborhood watch program. She thought  
252 they should use the resources they already have. She strongly encouraged the Commission to not  
253 forward this report onto the City Council as crafted at this time or in the near future and did not  
254 see any compelling reason that there is any time bound urgency for the City Council to review  
255 the document and in fact she has talked to several City Councilmembers who have indicated this  
256 is something that can be worked on over time and they are not waiting for it.

257

258 Ms. Peggy Verkuilen, Sexton Avenue, stated she was one of the original block captains in  
259 Roseville until last year. She stated when a neighborhood is organized she would like to see  
260 every individual whether they agree with their neighborhood association or not will be able to  
261 have input into this because they are taking away an individual's rights in her estimation. She  
262 stated another thing she had a problem with is they need to have a foundation before the building  
263 is started and she felt they needed to have some bullet points of what they hoped to achieve prior  
264 to starting the document and would have saved time. She indicated she was one of the members  
265 that resigned.

266

267 Ms. Verkuilen stated if they had one go to person they could go for networking would make  
268 things easier for everyone. She felt that the individual is the most important thing in the  
269 community. She indicated she wrote a letter to the Council. She stated this is America and the  
270 citizens should be able to have their input in their Government with officials seriously listening

271 and considering what the residents are saying and not just vote as one wishes but in consideration  
272 of others.

273

274 Commissioner Sanders thought Marcia Herrick sent a letter as a part of the public comments in  
275 place of coming to the meeting. Chair Becker stated he received the letter but was not aware it  
276 was to be a part of the public comment and would forward it and have it added to the minutes.

277

278 Commissioner Adedayo stated she heard some of the concerns and thought that something that is  
279 formalized like this report will be helpful for people who do not have the longevity or  
280 connections in the City and will allow them to get connected and know where to go to get  
281 involved and become connected to their neighbor.

282

283 Commissioner Manke stated she was not under the impression that the report would be submitted  
284 directly to the City Council without review by the Commission. Commissioner Gardella stated  
285 after hearing from people tonight she thought there was a lot of conversation to be had and she  
286 wondered how much they can accomplish during their regular meetings. She wondered if they  
287 needed to set a different worksession to just discuss this report or block a set amount of time to  
288 discuss this during the Commission meetings. Commission Grefenberg agreed and thought they  
289 needed to make a concerted effort to invite those who have interest to attend one or two of the  
290 meetings where they have focused public comment.

291

292 Commissioner Manke stated there is a lot of information in the report and she would like to meet  
293 outside of this meeting in order to go through the report before bringing it forward for additional  
294 public input. Commissioner Grefenberg thought that made sense and thought it would be helpful  
295 for the two co-chairs of the Task Force to be present at the meetings as well.

296

297 **b. Advocates Partnership Proposal on Promoting Civic Engagement in Diverse**  
298 **Populations**

299

300 Commissioner Gardella stated they met with Madeline from the Advocates for Human Rights to  
301 flush out the plan a little bit more and there was some good conversations and she felt the  
302 Advocates are going to be a great partner in terms of their expertise. She noted some of the main  
303 changes are they started plugging in some dates and talked a little bit more about some of the  
304 conversations. She noted in the report “CEC Staff” does not represent Staff Liaison Bowman but  
305 the Commissioners.

306

307 Commissioner Gardella noted there are still some larger questions that need to be answered but  
308 they are still thinking about three conversations. The first one being held with the Lake  
309 McCarron’s Neighborhood Association and Partnership with the Karen Organization of  
310 Minnesota, which she thought would be a great partnership event they could do and they would  
311 invite either other neighborhood associations or neighborhoods or some of the different groups  
312 referenced.

313

314 Commissioner Gardella stated in November the advocates would do some synthesizing of some  
315 of the data from the learning events. There would be an event in January with some of the City

316 staff to present some of the learnings and findings to them and discuss what they want to do with  
317 this information. What they want to do with the information is really the crux of what they want  
318 to figure out for their next steps.

319  
320 Commissioner Grefenberg thought one thing that has been missing is official approval of this  
321 and he was willing to move that they approve the promoting Civic Engagement and Diverse  
322 Populations, the plan presented by Commissioner Gardella and provided in their packet as  
323 something the Commission supports and will work on.

324  
325 Commissioner Grefenberg moved and Commissioner Manke seconded a motion to approve the  
326 Promoting Civic Engagement and Diverse Populations plan presented by Commissioner Gardella  
327 and provided in the packet. **Motion passed unanimously.**

328  
329 Commissioner Grefenberg thanked Commissioner Gardella and Sanders for the work that has  
330 been done on this. Chair Becker stated he was in support of this motion.

331  
332 Commissioner Gardella thought the Commissions role in this was to do the legwork and get and  
333 keep the process going but at this point the City really needs to be on board with this. Chair  
334 Becker thought this item needed to be brought to the City Council at one of the upcoming  
335 meetings for their support and for the buy-in.

336  
337 Commissioner Miller wondered if the report should include dates because they are already in  
338 August and the Council might be put off by that. Commissioner Gardella stated the reason for  
339 the dates was to give them an idea of the timing and processing of the items. She stated the  
340 Advocates have a grant and that is where all of the funding is coming from so they will have  
341 very little expenses involved.

342  
343 Commissioner Grefenberg thought the motion should be just to approve this in general and give  
344 them some leeway on the dates. Commissioner Gardella concurred and added with final  
345 confirmation from Lake McCarron's, the KOM, and the buy-in from the City.

346  
347 Chair Becker restated the motion "Approving this as a general concept with some leeway on the  
348 dates pending approval or buy-in from the City and final confirmation from Lake McCarron's'  
349 and KOM. This motion was made by Commissioner Grefenberg and seconded by Commission  
350 Manke if still acceptable as restated. The two Commissioners concurred.

351  
352 Commissioner Adedayo asked when the Advocates deadline is and how the outreach for the  
353 events will be done. Commissioner Gardella thought this went through the end of 2016 so they  
354 have some leeway and the Advocates take the responsibility for a lot of the flyers and  
355 notification but she thought they would want to use the established associations networks to get  
356 the information out.

357 Staff Liaison Bowman asked if this is an outreach priority or a research priority. Commissioner  
358 Gardella stated the specific goal is yet to be determined. The broader goal is finding ways to get  
359 information from the community in a way that they might not normally get.

360

361 The chair called the motion to a vote. **Motion passed unanimously.**

362  
363

364 **c. Update on Joint Task Force on Zoning Notification**

365

366 Commissioner Manke updated the Commission on the Joint Task Force on Zoning Notification.  
367 She noted the minutes in the packet have a June date but they did meet in July.

368

369 Commissioner Manke stated a lot of what held them back from zoning notification was not  
370 having renters' addresses and having a database for residents who are renters and by the July  
371 meeting that was well underway and they have done a lot of work on getting the database up and  
372 going. She stated there is fantastic forward movement on this.

373

374 Commissioner Grefenberg added as a member of the task force, at the July meeting they received  
375 a report on what the City has done and significant progress has already been made. He stated he  
376 would like to send that out to all of the Commissioners if there is no objection because some of  
377 their ideas have already been put into place. Chair Becker directed Commissioner Grefenberg to  
378 send the information to Staff Liaison Bowman for distribution and he would send out the email  
379 from Community Development Director Paul Bilotta as well.

380

381 **d. Update on Civic Engagement Module for City Website**

382

383 Staff Liaison Bowman stated he received an update and the nuts and bolts of the module was  
384 finished up a couple weeks ago and they received the designated URL  
385 [www.speakuproseville.org](http://www.speakuproseville.org). Staff had also received an email from Councilmember Laliberte that  
386 she wanted more information about the module and the policies and procedure for inserting  
387 topics on the module. He noted she has a lot of questions and is not in a place of comfort with  
388 that and she asked the City not to launch it until they go before the Council. City Manager  
389 Trudgeon thought they should go ahead and put together a policy. He stated he is working on  
390 that and hoped to finish it up. This will not be a part of the Commission's joint meeting but on  
391 the same Council meeting agenda. He stated City Manager Trudgeon is also trying to set up a  
392 meeting with Councilmember Laliberte so staff can answer her questions.

393

394 Commissioner Grefenberg stated the only thing he would want to add for the record is what Staff  
395 Liaison Bowman indicated a very recent email that he would be reviewing draft policies with the  
396 Commission's sub-committee and he thought it was important to let Councilmember Laliberte  
397 and others know that they are playing a part. Staff Liaison Bowman indicated when he finished  
398 the policy he would send them a copy of it for review.

399

400 The Commission recessed at 8:00 p.m.

401

402 The Commission reconvened at 8:06 p.m.

403

404 **e. Implementation of Other Strategic Recommendations**

405

406 **Report on July Council Meeting:** At the request of the chair, Commissioner Grefenberg  
407 reported on the July 13 Council meeting which he and Commissioner Gardella attended on behalf  
408 of the Commission, when there were two issues before the Council that relate to the  
409 Commission's work. The first one was Councilmember Laliberte and Mayor Roe's presentation  
410 on a League of Minnesota Cities conference on Community Engagement last January. The  
411 second Council agenda item was the issue of the Human Rights Commission and the CEC about  
412 the possibility of restructuring both of those, or merging them into one Commission

413  
414 Chair Becker stated also in the packet are City Council minutes related to this Council discussion  
415 on page 26 of the meeting packet, under Uniform Commission Code. The Council actually took  
416 action on this at a subsequent meeting and those meeting minutes have not been approved so  
417 could not be included in the packet but will be available once approved. He stated also at the  
418 meeting they discussed the structure of the Human Rights Commission.

419  
420 Commissioner Gardella stated they did not need to present or offer any comment because the  
421 staff presented their position and their recommendations and invited the HRC Commissioners to  
422 present their views. The Council took up a very robust conversation that seemed to settle on the  
423 fact that there will be no combining of the two Commissions at this point and they see the value  
424 in both Commissions. There were further communications, mostly about the HRC, so there was  
425 no call for her or Commissioner Grefenberg to present or offer anything because it was clear that  
426 the CEC was going to remain a stand-alone Commission.

427  
428 Commissioner Grefenberg commented that he read the Council's position as being satisfied with  
429 the Commission's work and wanted to give them more time to either fumble or achieve some of  
430 their objectives.

431  
432 **Current Status Report on Implementation of Other Strategic Recommendations:** The first  
433 item in the Current Status Report on CEC Objectives, as found in the meeting packets, was the  
434 community involvement of under-represented groups. He noted this already had begun by the  
435 Advocates Proposal on Promoting Civic Engagement in Diverse Populations, which  
436 Commissioners Gardella and Sanders have been working on and the earlier action of the  
437 Commission took at tonight's meeting.

438  
439 Commissioner Grefenberg noted page two of his Current Status Report stated the welcome  
440 packet for new residents was dormant. On the next item he indicated that the Next Door Leads  
441 have met three times over the last twelve months. The Next Door Leads at their last meeting  
442 approved a list of tips and suggestions. They did connect Roseville Neighborhood Leads but  
443 have not made much progress but thought they should leave that up to the separate groups of  
444 leads which has met a couple of different times.

445  
446 Commissioner Grefenberg stated on the item Commission Governance and Practice, also known  
447 as the Uniform Commission Code; the Council did adopt a code to govern all Roseville  
448 Commissions, which incorporated three or four of the Commission's recommendations from last  
449 December. The Commission thus made significant progress on their recommendations.

450

451 Commissioner Grefenberg continued by noting that one of the Commission’s recommendations  
452 was to develop and enforce an absence policy for all Commissions. They recommended that  
453 staff report to the City Council when any Commissioner misses more than four meetings in a  
454 rolling three month period. That was adopted but they tightened it to three meetings in any  
455 rolling twelve month period.

456  
457 Commissioner Grefenberg stated they have been working on these over the past three years and  
458 he felt they have made some progress.

459

460 **f. Definitions of Civic and Community Engagement**

461

462 Commissioner Gardella reviewed with the Commission the definitions of Civic and Community  
463 Engagement information.

464

465 Commissioner Miller thought it was very interesting reading through the last meeting minutes  
466 and the documents attached and thought there was a lot of helpful language, which helps to  
467 clarify it for him. Some of the concepts he saw and really liked were the notion of co-creation of  
468 ideas and solutions rather than just consulting and coming in after the fact.

469

470 Commissioner Grefenberg commented he really liked and appreciated that on page 2 under  
471 Principles of Practices of Authentic Community Engagement it was noted that practitioners need  
472 to expect tension. Authentic engagement is not necessarily easy or peaceful. He also added that  
473 the definition of Civic Participation in the Gardella report is identical to the definition in the  
474 Neighborhood Association Task Force Report they received tonight.

475

476 Commissioner Grefenberg also reminded the Commission that the precursor 2011-2012 Civic  
477 Engagement Task Force there was some discussion of a core value statement for civic  
478 engagement. In their 2012 Task Force report the earlier Task Force had adopted the International  
479 Association for Public Participation Core Values statement, and he wondered if the Principles of  
480 Civic Engagement were similar to the Core Values of the IAP2. Commissioner Gardella stated it  
481 was. Commissioner Grefenberg wondered if they should add the words “or Core Values”  
482 because some people are talking about that and it might be easier for the definition as they go  
483 forward to say they have taken a position, once this is passed, on Core Values.

484

485 Commissioner Gardella asked if the suggestion would be to change the heading to  
486 “Principles/Core Values of Civic Engagement.” Commissioner Adedayo preferred the word  
487 “and” rather than a slash.

488

489 Chair Becker thought this could be a living document that they could choose to tweak over time  
490 but right now use it as a 'stake in the ground' and continue to tweak it. He still struggled with  
491 volunteering as a civic engagement rather than a community engagement but was willing to let  
492 that go because he felt they needed to have definitions that they are going to use as a framework  
493 for all of their discussions and felt it was an opportunity for them to lead in this effort and  
494 potentially help how City Staff and City Council frames these issues as well. He was biased on

495 wanting to take action on it and adopting it and then knowing that they may choose to tweak it  
496 and continue to refine this.

497  
498 **Commissioner Grefenberg moved and Commissioner Becker seconded a motion** to adopt  
499 the Roseville Community Engagement Commission Definition of Terms dated August 13, 2015  
500 with the addition of *Core Values* in the last paragraph after the word *Principles* and with the  
501 understanding that this is a living document which can be modified in the future.

502  
503 Commissioner Gardella asked if this would be posted on their website. Chair Becker thought  
504 that was a great idea.

505  
506 Commissioner Grefenberg though they should adopt this because the Council saw this as  
507 something useful. Commissioner Gardella stated the assessment tool might be helpful in making  
508 distinctions on some of the work.

509  
510 Commissioner Adedayo wondered if they could recommend that the City uses that in its outreach  
511 as a metric because she thought it was really effective in measuring how they do the work.

512 Commissioner Gardella stated it is helpful in helping people think about where they are, if they  
513 are doing more outreach work versus engagement work and if organizations or cities want to  
514 shift to doing more of the transformative engagement work they could ask themselves these kind  
515 of questions. She thought the City would have to think about how they would want to use this to  
516 think about their own work and what they are doing and the Commission could use it for their  
517 own work.

518  
519 Commissioner Grefenberg stated he was not comfortable at this time adopting this line by line  
520 because he has not had the opportunity to review this in its entirety in detail. Commissioner  
521 Gardella stated this is not something they would adopt as a process but something to be used for  
522 education and help them to understand their own terms and not intended to be anything beyond  
523 that.

524  
525 **Motion passed unanimously.**

526  
527 **g. CEC Social Gathering**

528  
529 Commissioner Manke updated the Commission on the CEC Social Gathering.

530  
531 **Other Old Business**

532  
533 None.

534  
535 **Chair, Committee, and Staff Reports**

536  
537 **a. Chair's Report**

538  
539 No discussion



540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584

**b. Staff Report**

**1. Upcoming Items on Future Council Agendas**

Staff Liaison Bowman stated on August 24<sup>th</sup> is the Joint meeting with the City Council and also discussion about the module that they previously discussed. September 14<sup>th</sup> is the Not to Exceed Levy on the Budget so that will be the next big budget item that comes up that the Commission might be interested in.

**New Business**

**a. Planning for August 24<sup>th</sup> Joint Meeting with the City Council.**

Chair Becker thought they should present a status report on the items that were presented to the Council at the beginning of the year. He would like to report on the current status of the Task Force Commission indicating they have received the report and need to review it. The second item he thought they should report about is the Educational Opportunities and thought the Advocates Partnership proposal serves as part of that as well as part of another. They had a priority for the Joint Task Force and Zoning Notification and he thought they could give an update on that. The fourth item was the Resumption of Roseville U, which he thought Staff Liaison Bowman can update the Council on that. Item five was Civic Engagement Module and he thought the miscellaneous other strategic recommendations bucket can be provided.

Chair Becker proposed after the status update that the Commission ask for feedback from the Council on what they want the Commission to focus on in 2016.

Commissioner Grefenberg stated there was a suggestion from Councilmember Laliberte to take a look at recognizing residents of Roseville who have done significant volunteer work. He did not think there should be any action but wanted to follow through and suggest this be an item to look at in the future. Chair Becker thought that was certainly something to look at for review in 2016.

Commissioner Gardella stated she would like to have a better understanding of the distinction of the role of the Volunteer Coordinator and the Commission because she thought that item would be something that the Volunteer Coordinator would take charge of. Commissioner Manke thought it would be a good idea to have the Volunteer Coordinator come to the meetings or give an update via a report to the Commission. Chair Becker agreed and thought this should be added to their next agenda.

Commissioner Adedayo asked what a Volunteer Coordinator does. Chair Becker reviewed the role of the Volunteer Coordinator.

Commissioner Miller stated he liked the framework but he thought the Advocates could be a large discussion because that is addressing a couple of the updates and he did not know how they would frame it. Chair Becker thought they might indicate to the Council that they have an idea but would like to come back to the Council at another meeting and discuss only that. The

585 Commission concurred. Commissioner Grefenberg stated they need to make clear that this item  
586 has evolved into further discussion and that they have not added anything. Commissioner  
587 Gardella thought they needed to mention the buy-in needed. Commissioner Grefenberg thought  
588 they should do the same with the neighborhood association proposal as well.

589  
590 Commissioner Grefenberg requested Staff Liaison Bowman to send the draft RCA to the Chair  
591 and Vice Chair so they make sure the items are in. Staff Liaison Bowman wondered if anyone  
592 would be interested in working on a draft RCA otherwise he would take a stab at it. He indicated  
593 the deadline is Wednesday, August 19, 2015.

594  
595 Staff Liaison Bowman thought the Commission should make a list of what items should be  
596 reviewed with the Council.

597  
598 Chair Becker reviewed the agenda for the Joint Council meeting and who would present the  
599 different items.

600  
601 Commissioner Grefenberg thought they should put the Neighborhood Association Task Force  
602 draft report on the website indicating it is a preliminary report, which would be discussed more  
603 at future Commission meetings because he would like to get more community involvement.  
604 Commissioner Miller stated he did not see a reason for it. It is already in the packet that could be  
605 shared if the public wants to read it.

606  
607 Staff Liaison Bowman stated they have an itemized list of items they are working on and he did  
608 not think it would hurt to have them be more easily accessible than to go back through packets to  
609 find the information. Commissioner Sanders thought it was premature at this time.  
610 Commissioner Adedayo thought when things are posted people seem to assume they have been  
611 adopted or are official and even though they want to be transparent she did not want people to  
612 think that was something the Commission has accepted. Commissioner Grefenberg stated there  
613 could be a statement indicating the Commission has not adopted the report and is a work in  
614 progress. Commissioner Manke agreed that when something is posted some people will still  
615 believe it is final and they have not really spent a great deal of time reviewing it and she thought  
616 they were a little premature on the association. Commissioner Sanders felt they could add it to  
617 the website further down the road once they have had time to review it.

618  
619 Chair Becker stated he would not want to have the entire report clickable through a link as the  
620 main commission-level topic item but he could see an indented bullet indicating the Task Force  
621 has provided this report for the Commission but did not represent the final action of the  
622 commission. He felt if properly framed he would not have an objection to it being on the  
623 website because it is public record and accessible but he would not want a reference to it being a  
624 draft as it was the final work product of the task force to be followed by additional artifacts that  
625 are the work product of the commission. Commissioner Grefenberg was agreeable to that and  
626 made some sense to him. He suggested this get scoped out when it will be discussed because he  
627 felt it needs more public input.

628

629 Chair Becker thought they could highlight areas in the report that needed significant discussion.  
630 He indicated he will come up with a rough plan but did not think that this report should be posted  
631 at this time. The Commission concurred.  
632

633 **Commission Communications, Reports, and Announcements**

634

635 Chair Becker stated the Roseville Human Rights Commission in co-sponsorship with the  
636 Roseville Library is hosting the event Civility of Better Choice on Saturday, September 19th  
637 from 9:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. at the Roseville Library Community Room. The event is free and  
638 open to everyone. To register or for more information go to RCLreads.org.

639

640 Commissioner Grefenberg wanted to clarify that the Joint Task Force on Zoning Notification  
641 will be on August 25<sup>th</sup> at 6:00 p.m. at City Hall in the Aspen Room. This is an open meeting and  
642 the public is invited to come.

643

644 **Commissioner-Initiated Items for Future Meetings**

645

646 There was no discussion.

647

648 **Recap of Commission Actions This Meeting**

649

650 The Commission recapitulated the Commission actions taken at the meeting.

651

652 **Adjournment**

653

654 Commissioner Gardella moved and Commissioner Miller seconded a motion to adjourn. **Motion**  
655 **passed unanimously.** Meeting adjourned at 9:15 p.m.

656

1                                            **Community Engagement Commission**  
2                                            **Meeting Minutes**  
3                                            **DRAFT – September 10, 2015 - DRAFT**

4  
5  
6 **Commissioners:**        Scot Becker, Gary Grefenberg, Sherry Sanders, Jonathan Miller, Michelle  
7                                            Manke and Ebony Adedayo.  
8

9  
10 **Commissioners Absent:**        Theresa Gardella  
11

12 **Staff Present:**                Garry Bowman  
13

14 **Others Present:**                Lisa McCormick (part of meeting)~~None.~~  
15  
16

17 **Call to Order**  
18

19 A quorum of Commissioners being present, the Community Engagement Commission meeting  
20 was called to order at 6:30 p.m. by Chair Scot Becker.  
21

22 **Approve Agenda**  
23

24 Chair Becker asked if there were any changes or amendments to the Agenda as mailed to the  
25 Commission; no one wished to amend the agenda.  
26

27 Commissioner Gary Grefenberg asked to add Discussion regarding a presentation by the Gavel  
28 Club.  
29

30 Commissioner Sherry Sanders indicated the letter sent by Roger Hess should be discussed.  
31

32 Commissioner Michelle Manke stated she would like to discuss a Welcome Packet.  
33

34 Commissioner Becker moved and Commissioner Grefenberg seconded a motion to approve the  
35 agenda as amended. **Motion passed unanimously.**  
36

37 **Approve Minutes**  
38

39 Commissioner Sanders asked if these minutes that were tabled the same as before or were there  
40 changes. Chair Becker stated there were a couple sections of public comment where he removed  
41 the edits. Commissioner Sanders stated she was confused because if someone comes to the  
42 table, how is their comment removed. Chair Becker indicated there are a number of quality  
43 concerns with minutes and in the course of doing that, there are times that corrections or  
44 clarifications are added based on ~~the rest of~~ the context of the conversation. He stated they  
45 received a little bit of feedback on that particular section so he removed the edits and left them as  
46 transcribed. Chair Becker reviewed how the minutes are reviewed and edited.

47  
48 Commissioner Sanders stated on line 248, sometimes the edits get really crowded because the  
49 type is in black and then they have blue, green and red, which is kind of confusing. She stated  
50 she knew Diane said things but then they are crossed out in blue and she wondered who was  
51 responsible for blue. Chair ~~Sanders~~ Becker did not see any changes to the minutes in the packet  
52 and he wondered if she had the correct packet. Commissioner Sanders indicated she had the old  
53 packet and her comments should be disregarded.

54  
55 Commissioner Grefenberg stated on line 252 there is a grammatical error and on line 251 the  
56 word “and” should be deleted.

57  
58 Commissioner Manke moved and Commissioner Adedayo seconded a motion to approve the  
59 July 9, 2015 meeting minutes as amended. **Motion passed unanimously.**

60  
61 Commissioner Sanders stated there were things brought up at the table that are not in these  
62 minutes so she wondered what the protocol was. Chair Becker stated the minutes are reviewed  
63 by a third party and they create the minutes and then the Commission will review them and make  
64 changes. It is likely in the course of transcribing, they summarize and don’t always include  
65 verbatim minutes. He stated sometimes the items being summarized are items of substance and  
66 sometimes they are subjective.

67  
68 Commissioner Sanders stated there were comments from Lisa McCormick that were not in the  
69 minutes. Chair Becker stated no changes were made and what is in the minutes was submitted  
70 by the transcriber. He reviewed a few grammatical and name corrections.

71  
72 Commissioner Sanders indicated the minutes did not match the video. Chair Becker indicated  
73 the minutes will not be an exact match to the video tape of the last meeting; ~~and~~ if there are items  
74 of content she would like submitted then she should do that at this time or the minutes could be  
75 tabled to be reviewed further.

76  
77 Commissioner Grefenberg passed out some changes to the minutes he would like reviewed and  
78 included in the minutes.

79  
80 Commissioner Sanders thought if a resident spoke to the Commission then their words should be  
81 recorded. Chair Becker agreed. Commissioner Manke stated it is rare to find minutes verbatim  
82 from what is said, it is just to capture generally the essence of what transpired which is why they  
83 also videotape the meeting. Commissioner Grefenberg stated the minutes are not a direct  
84 transcription and never have been.

85  
86 Commissioner Sanders moved and Commissioner Grefenberg seconded a motion to table the  
87 August 13, 2015 meeting minutes for additional information and review. **Motion passed**  
88 **unanimously.**

89  
90 Commissioner Grefenberg stated he had two concerns with the minutes as transcribed by  
91 TimeSaver. They do not adhere to the recently enacted Universal Commission Code. He stated

92 for example, there is a ~~reference heading under on~~ line 652 to “~~R~~recap of Commission ~~A~~actions  
93 ~~This Meeting~~”; ~~which only it~~ states, “The Commission Recapitulated the Commission Actions”.  
94 ~~There were some specific things in and for the record, he found t~~This part ~~of the minutes was~~  
95 very important to him so he would ask that TimeSaver ~~to~~ not take the easy way out ~~and but to~~  
96 ~~actually~~ state what the ~~items recapitulations recapitulated~~ were. He also noted that TimeSaver  
97 did not ~~do~~ adequately ~~ly cover to~~ Jerry Stoner’s report and that is why in the packet there are some  
98 additions.

99  
100 –The recently enacted Commission Code says Commissions ~~minutes shall follow the manner~~  
101 ~~regarding minutes.~~ “~~Commissions are required to keep a record of its meeting and actions~~  
102 ~~available through the City as well as other recommendation reports, studies and other documents~~  
103 ~~created or performed by or for a Commission. Minutes of the meeting~~ “shall be detailed in the  
104 same way as the City Council minutes are written”. ~~He felt there were certain sections that did~~  
105 ~~not get enough detail, which he mentioned.~~

106  
107 Chair Becker stated he would like to discuss at a future date how they do the meeting minutes  
108 corrections. The process they have been following to date has been to have the Operations  
109 Committee look at them as a group and submit revisions to save time. Otherwise, they found  
110 there were enough changes where it took a long time to go through it ~~at Commission meetings.~~  
111 Based on some feedback they have gotten with maybe too many edits, he tried to pare it back a  
112 little ~~and but~~ now there are sections ~~that are not as revised~~ that Commission ~~M~~members ~~felt feel~~  
113 should be ~~detailed~~ more in-depth. He felt the delegation was working fairly well until they got  
114 into stylistic changes. He also thought it was worth revisiting how they go about the minutes.  
115 He stated he personally did not want to re-watch the meeting or read sentence for sentence to  
116 find out what is missing. He indicated he did not know what the happy medium was but will see  
117 where things could go.

118  
119 Commissioner Grefenberg indicated the ~~yellow highlighting in the~~ minute changes he handed  
120 out, ~~the yellow markings,~~ are not stylistic. They are substantive. ~~He added that and he thought~~ it  
121 was important that ~~any every~~ Commissioner review the minutes especially when ~~you are a~~  
122 ~~Commissioner’s comments were recorded-quoted,~~ which is what he has done.

### 123 124 **Public Comment**

125  
126 Ms. Lisa McCormick, Wheeler Street, stated she had several items and indicated she would  
127 appreciate knowing who was on the Operations Committee regarding correcting the minutes.  
128 She stated she did not appreciate Commissioner Grefenberg smiling, laughing at her when she  
129 came forward. She appreciated the acknowledgement from the Commission that there are  
130 quality issues with the current transcription service and she would assert that there are quality  
131 issues especially given the change with the Universal Commission Code. She suggested another  
132 vendor be chosen. She thought it was burdensome to watch the video, likewise for the residents  
133 who haven’t formally signed up for a Commission, for them to come, make comments, and then  
134 not have them be accurately reported because the minutes control the record.

136 Ms. McCormick stated she has been thinking about this Community Engagement Commission  
137 | and she would appreciate knowing what this is about, what for. You hear you want outreach,  
138 you want to get other people involved but for what. She would like some fly on the wall, the  
139 what for, and why explanations as they talk about some projects because if people feel welcome,  
140 respected, and honored, she thought they will show up. When they take time to come up and  
141 | make public comment on issues, if that is not respected ~~or~~ and considered, that sends a message.

142  
143 Ms. McCormick stated as far as the draft minutes, she will make corrections. She noticed that in  
144 July, she came in and made a correction and that was not included in these minutes. August  
145 minutes on lines 153 and 154, Sherry made a point to clarify that she was speaking about staff  
146 liaison, not volunteers, yet the minutes say volunteers. Line 158 to 171, she also noted a  
147 discrepancy in Mr. Stoner’s presentation. She felt it did not accurately reflect the conversation.  
148 During her public comments, starting on line 203, there was over one minute of conversation that  
149 was left out and to that point, she thought it was very substantive and she admits that it can be  
150 subjective but she was talking about why she started the neighborhood association because she  
151 heard story after story of neighbors, and these were not necessarily neighbors who were  
152 comprised of under-represented, marginalized group but average neighbors that felt discounted  
153 and they did not have a voice that was listened to or honored. Her commitment when she started  
154 the neighborhood association was to bring forward a structure for reengagement and out of that,  
155 she formed the neighborhood association. She brought neighborhood leadership together,  
156 contacted the City and brought next door leads together for their first ever meeting so they could  
157 get to know each other and form a network of leads. She thought many people might remember  
158 that she talked about initially being a big proponent of the task force, however, that she no longer  
159 agreed with the direction it was taking. She thought that was a significant statement that was, it  
160 is not that it was edited, it was just left out. She used an analogy about you can paint a house and  
161 do a really good job and it could be the wrong house, and that was totally not there. She finds  
162 that very disturbing, that so much was ignored and not even included. Going on, she just wanted  
163 to give a shout out on line 427, there was discussion about next door tips being prepared and  
164 | shared among the leads and she would like to give credit to Kathy ~~Remund~~ Ramundt who  
165 actually took on that project and wrote the vast majority of the document. There were some edits  
166 and contributions of one or two tips by other leads but she actually did a great majority of that  
167 work.

168  
169 Ms. McCormick stated on line 41, she took issue with the fact that Commission Grefenberg  
170 stated there was currently discussion raised by herself and others that the Council should develop  
171 a Core Value Statement, which in their Task Force report they adopted the IAP2, which she  
172 believed was an inaccurate statement and at least a misrepresentation. She did not believe that  
173 she ever recommended the Council adopt the Core Value Statement. She stated at that meeting,  
174 the Task Force was asked to consider adopting the Core Value Statements and Diane Hilden and  
175 she objected and volunteered to review the documents, possibly modify it, they did so and  
176 prepared a memo and presented it to the Task Force. What she did ask the Council was to  
177 consider developing a Code of Conduct or Professionalism. She provided them with the IAP2  
178 Code of Ethics for Public Participation Practitioners as an example to demonstrate that there is  
179 likely some type of guideline available that could be tailored to their needs.

180

181 Ms. McCormick stated she will include some documents that can be attached to the bench  
182 handouts and the other thing she wanted to just comment on briefly is that she is somewhat upset  
183 about what she considers to be a normalization of an experience on the Task Force. There were  
184 issues on the Task Force, a lot of them were not, and some of that was left out of the minutes as  
185 well. There were also comments as well about “Forming, Storming and Norming”. She has  
186 served on many Task Forces and has never had an experience like she has had on this one.  
187 Depending on the leadership, you set ground rules, there are ways that there can be respectful  
188 disagreement and she did not experience that here and thought it did a disservice to youth,  
189 phrases such as “Forming, Storming and Norming”. She was troubled by the fact that there were  
190 comments made, you heard public comment from several of the Task Force members that  
191 resigned, they heard comments from herself, and yet there has been very little outreach to find  
192 out what is going on and what the problem is and what can they do to fix it or solve it or make it  
193 better. If they are not going to do that then why are we trying to have outreach to try to bring  
194 more people in. It is like, fix what is going on now, if they do that and people feel welcome they  
195 will come but she was troubled that there is not more conversation about what is going on.  
196

197 Commissioner Grefenberg asked Ms. McCormick to recap the lines she found in the August  
198 minutes that were missed. Ms. McCormick stated on lines 153-154, lines 158-171, line 203, that  
199 was the start of it, she did not know where it ended and then lines 213-217, and those were the  
200 lines as far as omissions. She did not spend a lot of time, just basically what she said.  
201

202 Chair Becker asked Ms. McCormick to go back through the revisions to the minutes that are on  
203 the website because he believed the handout she provided at the July meeting was then added to  
204 the June meeting minutes. So if that was something she was referring to, he believed they did  
205 add that and if it is not, he will make sure the attachment does get added. Ms. McCormick  
206 thought it was back at the July meeting, she saw it once but when reviewing the minutes again, it  
207 was not there this time. Chair Becker thought it might have been retroactively added to the July  
208 packet.  
209

210 | ~~Chair~~ Grefenberg advised Ms. McCormick to review ~~the his~~ handout, which covered the draft  
211 | minutes found on ~~rom~~ pages 9-15.  
212

## 213 Old Business

### 215 a. **Plan Next Steps on Neighborhood Association Priority Project**

217 | Chair Becker stated he would kick this off and then ask Commissioner Grefenberg to set ~~the a~~  
218 | ~~little bit of~~ the context for why this is even being talked about. This is something they have been  
219 | discussing at various levels of the City since before this Commission was formed and he thought  
220 | some historical data might be of interest, especially for some of the newer Commissioners or  
221 | those who were not serving on a Commission then or the Task Force at the time. He would then  
222 | like to go into how they plan to dissect that report and go about making their recommendation to  
223 | the Council. He stated there is a proposed Neighborhood Association work plan in the packet,  
224 | which is essentially his outline on how they can go about the discussion in order to get things  
225 | going. He would like ~~to refer to~~ the Commission to review that work plan and respond with ~~get~~



226 | ~~thought on that and~~ any changes, but ~~his idea was that~~ at some point ~~they~~the Commission is are  
227 | going to take the report and ~~do something with it.~~ Make some sort of recommendation to the  
228 | Council. ~~and~~ ~~†~~Theoretically, the recommendation could be to do nothing. He assumed this group  
229 | would come up with something rather than do nothing. He proposed, the outline as a  
230 | framework on how they can go about discussing that recommendation, ~~which can be discussed in~~  
231 | ~~detail as they go.~~

232 |  
233 | Commissioner Grefenberg stated ~~in their discussions he thought it was clear but apparently, it~~  
234 | ~~was not.~~ ~~H~~he would like to proceed in this manner beginning with~~do this at~~ their October  
235 | meeting. ~~because he has not pulled everything together and he wants to make sure everything is~~  
236 | ~~accurate.~~ Chair Becker stated that was ok but he would now. ~~He would~~ like to ~~take a~~ look at the  
237 | proposal that is in the packet. He indicated he has sketched it out over months and has put in  
238 | more detail in the following three months than he did in 2016. He did that on purpose in case  
239 | things go a little bit longer than they anticipated. He would like to work on their approach and  
240 | getting consensus across the table on how it is they are going to talk about this, neighborhood  
241 | association, because he thought they could, will spend many hours discussing this and will not be  
242 | achievable in a single meeting. This is a proposal for the framework of that discussion. He  
243 | divided it up into a couple of different categories for October and November. When he read the  
244 | report and got feedback about the report, he thought there was terminology that once in a while a  
245 | flashpoint for discussion and his attempt for October and November is to reframe the discussion  
246 | in terms of what things that the City could provide to neighborhood associations that are  
247 | “material support”, things of actual monetary value or otherwise imply endorsement of the  
248 | organization by the City. In November, he would like to talk about if the City is going to give  
249 | something of monetary value or some endorsement of this organization, what the City should  
250 | expect in return. The reason he wanted to frame it this way is because he thought there was a lot  
251 | of contention around the terms “recognized” or “affiliated” or something like that. He thought  
252 | that even if they define those terms they have connotations inside people’s heads that mean  
253 | something else. He thought they could look through the report because there are tangible things  
254 | in the report that say the City can provide this, this thing, a mailing list, web space on the  
255 | website, using their free use of public buildings is in there, these are tangible things the City can  
256 | do and there was a section in there about minimal requirements for the neighborhood  
257 | associations to be recognized. That is where he wants to go back and say maybe this is in  
258 | exchange for something of material support so it is not stopping any other association from  
259 | forming, it is just if they do not do what the things that they define then they can still form a  
260 | neighborhood association but they do not get the free use of the park building, etc. If they frame  
261 | it that way then it might be a more productive conversation because they would be talking about  
262 | things of value that the City is providing and what they are expecting in return.

263 |  
264 | Chair Becker stated it is also peppered with information that has been gathered from other cities  
265 | that have formed neighborhood associations and have policies and procedures and programs  
266 | around forming them. He thought they could have speakers come in from the other cities and  
267 | discuss how their policy works, how it differs from other cities and so on so then they can do a  
268 | little information gathering while they are hashing out these other items. Assuming that all goes  
269 | well, in December he was proposing that the Commission talk about the rest of the stuff.  
270 | ~~Non-material support items.~~ At one point, he reminded the Commission it had talked about

271 | having a “neighborhood association in a box.” ~~Some boilerplate templates on meeting minutes,~~  
272 | incorporation, tips and tricks for organizing the first meeting, and other items. ~~Not really things~~  
273 | ~~of value, more informational.~~

274

275 | Chair Becker stated time permitting they could talk about any other materials they want to  
276 | incorporate in the Council’s proposal. When he read through the report, he thought there was a  
277 | lot of really good material about why they would want to form a neighborhood association and  
278 | he thought they should carry that forward into a proposal to the Council. After that, they could  
279 | start to draft the proposal.

280

281 | Commissioner Manke asked if there ~~was had been~~ a conversation ~~they had briefly~~ about going  
282 | through this on a night aside from their regular meeting. Chair Becker thought this was  
283 | something they could discuss. Commissioner Manke thought that ~~in light that since~~ this is a  
284 | really huge piece, instead of it becoming so much of their regular meeting, taking it off line, so to  
285 | speak, where that is their only focus of the evening, is to talk about these items because some of  
286 | the Commission has not been as subjected to everything that has gone on and being able to ask  
287 | those questions and taking that time would be beneficial.

288

289 | ~~Chair Becker stated his personal opinion on that is it may be more difficult to coordinate than~~  
290 | ~~the regular scheduled meeting. He stated at some point they are going to be priority planning for~~  
291 | ~~2016 and having a handful of projects due and he thought they will need to figure out how to~~  
292 | ~~chunk out work and how to talk about these things because they will have potentially more of~~  
293 | ~~them next year. This is a big issue, he thought they had the Task Force and a lot of work was~~  
294 | ~~done and time was spent during the Task Force time, which seems like a large, all-encompassing~~  
295 | ~~project. H and he would like the Commission to get better about how they managed their~~  
296 | ~~time and be able to do a lot of this in the meeting but additional research could be done in~~  
297 | ~~between the meetings. He was not opposed to the idea but thought it might be hard to do.~~

298

299 | Commissioner Sanders thought it would be good to have a separate meeting, just for clarity, and  
300 | then when they do come back to the regular meeting they would have that much more  
301 | information. Commissioner Grefenberg stated they would need to notice other members,  
302 | televise this and also have someone take minutes. He did not disagree with what Commissioner  
303 | Manke is saying but a special meeting could not be offline, it would have to be online in the  
304 | sense of having it be televised and noticed. Mr. Garry Bowman indicated he was not sure it  
305 | would have to be televised but it would need to be noticed and has to be open to the public.

306

307 | Commissioner Manke stated if they were to do a brainstorming meeting, they would have to  
308 | capture the scenes of what was done but again it is not a word for word minutes, it is clarification  
309 | so to her it is a little clarification and brainstorming. Commissioner Grefenberg stated looking at  
310 | what was in the packet, he assumed the meeting would need to be early on but where would  
311 | Commissioner Manke suggest placing the meeting in the schedule. Commissioner Manke  
312 | thought it would have to be early on because some of the Commissioners would need  
313 | clarification before discussion could ensue about what is listed on the schedule.

314

315 Chair Becker asked what they would be doing at that meeting if they were going to be doing  
316 similar to what is on the outline and would they really like someone to go through the report and  
317 have a session on that. What are they brainstorming. He wanted this to be collaborative and  
318 come with their ideas for each section. Commissioner Manke stated she was not exactly sure but  
319 did not feel like she had a good handle on it because she was not at all involved in this other than  
320 for what has been brought to the meetings.

321  
322 Commissioner Ebony Adedayo stated as she thought about the last couple of meetings she has  
323 been a part of, she remembers a number of significant problems being raised with the report and  
324 she wonder if starting with the report and moving forward without reviewing what the areas of  
325 tension were and where the areas of disagreement that they might be pushing forward something  
326 that might not be widely excepted. In addition to going to the report as Commissioner Manke  
327 stated, she is not as familiarly with the report itself so she felt ~~like in addition to that~~ she would  
328 like to know what are the areas of tension and what are the areas of disagreement because she  
329 has heard several members of the Task Force that they wanted to have this archived. She wanted  
330 to know why and if there are things that they need to revisit, it there are things that need to be  
331 changed, if there are things that need to be scrapped altogether. She would love for them to  
332 discuss that and how they handle that before they move with the suggestions that are in the  
333 report.

334  
335 ~~Commissioner Adedayo~~ She also thought starting off with what are the monetary things the City  
336 could provide neighborhood associations is starting off with the wrong frame of reference. She  
337 thought by asking the question, what are neighborhood associations, what are their purpose, how  
338 they should function in the City or Roseville, what do they want neighborhood associations who  
339 decide to whether they are incorporated or loosely formed, what do they want them to do, what  
340 do they want to do, starting off with that frame first will help them get to an idea what are the  
341 monetary support that they need or the non-monetary support. She thought starting broad and  
342 narrowing is a more effective way than trying to figure out what is the monetary support. Chair  
343 Becker thought he could agree with that. He stated in his mind the report is an input to this  
344 Commission and there it stops. He thought they can form a recommendation to the Council that  
345 is comprised from pieces of this report or maybe nothing from this report. He stated in his  
346 opinion there are large chunks that are very good and he could see them lifting entire sections of  
347 the text and using that as part of the recommendation but at the end of the day he thought it could  
348 be valuable to go through the report to get some descriptions on it but in some ways he would  
349 like to move on from some of the arguments that were in there and would like to start talking  
350 about the ideas in the report and framing them in a different way.

351  
352 Commissioner Manke stated in November, would they be looking at what other cities have done.  
353 Chair Becker stated he was proposing that for October and November and try to get a couple of  
354 cities in there. Commissioner Manke agreed because felt that was an important piece and then  
355 they could look at what the Task Force put together as far as their recommendations.

356  
357 Chair Becker stated if they moved some of the bullet points under December 2015 to October  
358 and then slide Material Support down under November and ?? Requirements to December.  
359 Commissioner Adedayo thought that made a lot of sense.

360  
361 | Chair Becker also stated the other goal was to allow time for ample public comments, which is  
362 | why hise plan broke ~~this out~~ the Commission's process into several meetings. He thought there  
363 | was a lot of preconceived notions about what it is they are planning on doing, yet-and they have  
364 | not actually started to talk about what it is they are going to do yet.

365  
366 | Commissioner Grefenberg stated he would encourage members to review the minutes from the  
367 | last meeting ~~that will~~ which could give additional background. He was not against what Chair  
368 | Becker is saying, but he asked for reiteration of the two bullets under December that they would  
369 | move up. Chair Becker stated he was referring to the first two bullets: Define Non-Material  
370 | Support and Define the Preamble Materials.

371  
372 | Commissioner Adedayo stated without having a solid understanding, she thought the  
373 | Commission felt neighborhood association were important without having ~~a sense of~~ agreement  
374 | around what they are doing, how can they talk about what they need and she submits to him that  
375 | he wants to move forward but, to Ms. Lisa McCormick's point, people are coming, involved,  
376 | giving their time and opinions about what they want to see happen in the City. These are  
377 | residents who are volunteering along with the Commission but they should respect that otherwise  
378 | they lose trust and accountability. She understood there is an urge to move forward but she also  
379 | valued process in moving forward; ~~but~~ good community engagement says, however, that they  
380 | carry residents along with them. That is one of the underlying principles and values of the  
381 | community engagement process. She thought this process is going to fast but she may be  
382 | wrong because she has only been on the Commission a couple of months; ~~but~~ Yet she has heard  
383 | there are significant problems and tensions with the report and she thought without finding out  
384 | what they are ~~and proposing~~ and adopting their own way ~~that they~~ would beare unassured they  
385 | were not losing ~~by their tract to lose~~ accountability and trust, and thus shooting themselves in the  
386 | foot as Community Engagement Commissioners. Chair Becker would agree with that but they  
387 | are not propagating the report past the Commission table so he thought there was a chance to  
388 | start anew with this.

389  
390 | Commissioner Adedayo thought if they started anew and did not use the report as the guiding  
391 | framework, she thought that was different. Chair Becker indicated that was what he was moving  
392 | towards and he thought they could use the report for some ideas and a source of input plus  
393 | whatever else comes their way. Commissioner Adedayo indicated she could agree with that.

394  
395 | Commissioner Grefenberg stated the report was adopted by a majority vote without opposition.  
396 | There are some dissidents but they were outvoted during the Task Force so he thought the  
397 | Commission alsoy needed to respect the majority opinion; ~~and~~ he thought the Commissiony  
398 | could go through the report more along the lines Chair Becker stated.

399  
400 | ~~He stated~~ Grefenberg added he would like to add another point for the record, there may be  
401 | some things missing from the draft report. He liked the idea of beginning anew and using the  
402 | Task Force Report as a reference point; ~~and~~ if the Commission wanted, they could invite the co-  
403 | chairs, if they are going to go into the report but he was hearing different things. They might  
404 | want to go anew but a Commissioner ~~but then another Commissioner~~ wants to hear about the

405 | dissention. -Commissioner Adedayo thought if they beingwere starting anew, that it is not as  
406 high of a need to do so. She would still like to hear about it but if they use the report as a  
407 framework and that this is what their guide is to the next step, it necessitates needing to hear  
408 what the areas of disagreement in the content are.

409  
410 Chair Becker thought in his mind, the report is a source to mine ideas from and he suspected that  
411 when they get to an actual proposal they will mine more than ideas. He did not suggest they  
412 throw the entire report away because he thought there was a lot of value to it but in his mind  
413 when they started the Task Force what he wanted was additional input.

414  
415 Commissioner Manke thought it was also really clear that they have a solid understanding of  
416 what their task is and what they are asking. They are not here to create neighborhood  
417 associations and then ask the Council to bless it and go on. What they are here to do and what  
418 involvement goes forward has to be very clear. Commissioner Grefenberg agreed and stated the  
419 charge of the report as discussed twice by this Commission and presented to the City Council in  
420 December 2014 was to discuss and recommend ways the City could facilitate and encourage the  
421 formation of neighborhood associations and he thought that was the primary task.

422  
423 Commissioner Jonathan Miller thought whatever they can do to move beyond some of the  
424 ugliness that seemed to be in the Task Force but he did not know what would be the best way to  
425 do that. If they split it up into all of these meetings will it just be a repeat every meeting with the  
426 tensions and the same people coming and being upset. He wondered if the well is tainted on this  
427 because he did not want to keep coming back to these meetings because he does not look  
428 forward to having these discussions on the neighborhood task force work plan. He did not want  
429 it to be like that but did not know what the answer was. Chair Becker thought they could move a  
430 little faster on this and stated it was a balancing act between trying to get it done with but also  
431 allowing for ample input but he would also like that input to be substantive. He felt like some of  
432 the input they received at the last meeting was predicated on the assumption that they were going  
433 to take the report and hand it right to the City Council and he made that clear in the meeting that  
434 it was not going to happen. He would like to get them to the point where they can have things in  
435 the packet that can be responded to in the meeting and have a more specific feedback going  
436 forward and in the end he thought they would have some sort of draft where they will also get  
437 public comment on as well. He was trying to balance how do they move forward, how do they  
438 | take the solid bits of work that are in the report and how do they move past the rank-rancor that  
439 happened in the formation of it. How do they get something done in the relative near period  
440 since this is a 2015 priority and he would like to button this up and move onto other priorities in  
441 2016. He stated he did not want to rush this through with a steamrolled agenda either.

442  
443 | Commissioner Grefenberg stated as Jerry Stone~~r~~ said the Task Force came to a unanimous  
444 conclusion and Diane Hilden missed that meeting along with the last four meetings and so to  
445 recap and find who was at fault and who was not, he was not sure that he agreed and would like  
446 to move forward with a blank sketch in some ways. Commissioner Miller thought that was what  
447 they needed to say, some people were upset about some items but moving forward everyone will  
448 be invited to come and give feedback about the things the Commission is talking about but  
449 please do not keep bringing up how things were dysfunctional on the Task Force. He stated he

450 did not want to discount that for people because it does sound like it was a bad experience for  
451 people.

452  
453 Commissioner Grefenberg proposed they move forward using the Task Force report as a  
454 | consensus but begin ~~the~~ anew. Commissioner Manke stated she did not want to hear about  
455 | disagreements on the Task Force, she wanted to hear about what other cities have done because  
456 | she did not want it to be about the Task Force, she wanted it to be about the Commission and  
457 | what they are looking at. She would like the Commission to look at everything together and then  
458 | comparing what the Task Force looked at and not having why those other things were in there.  
459 | She wanted to take a fresher look on this because she believed that when the Task Force went  
460 | forward there was a misunderstanding as to what the intention was and she felt like the  
461 | Commission was tasked to do this and put some plans, options out there for foundations and it  
462 | got off far beyond what the Commission wanted.

463  
464 | Chair Becker stated if they used the October meeting ~~in October~~ for the more core definitional  
465 | information and getting the motivations and intentions on why they are doing this, then they  
466 | could break into more specific items in meetings going forward after October. Commissioner  
467 | Manke thought it was worth a try and if that did not work then they could look towards having a  
468 | separate meeting on the issue. Commissioner Sanders agreed with that idea.

469  
470 | **Public Comment:** Ms. McCormick stated she was ~~in~~ heartened to hear they were willing to start  
471 | anew with this concept and thought it would go a long way for the citizens that they do, even  
472 | make a blanket statement that they will be starting fresh. She thought as far as asking, did the  
473 | Council say they want neighborhood associations, why do they want neighborhood associations.  
474 | She apologized to Commissioner Miller for being upset and indicated she is not generally upset.  
475 | She thought this is really representative of what she was trying to get across before. When  
476 | people get upset it really helps to be heard and she thought that is why she is continuing to be  
477 | upset because of comments. If they have a group of people and you push most of them away,  
478 | those that are left will have agreement but she did not know if that is really the intent if they want  
479 | community engagement. She did not think what they are looking for is consensus to their point,  
480 | they want to bring people along, especially when a number of those that are descending are ones  
481 | that actually have the neighborhood associations and she would like to be invited if they have a  
482 | brainstorming session. She thought the Commission should invite those people who are doing it  
483 | in the City of Roseville. Edina is an entirely different demographic than Roseville and she  
484 | suggested they ask peer communities to come to the meetings and find out what works for them  
485 | and what do the citizens of Roseville want in their formation of associations and where to take it  
486 | from there. She stated it was not her intent and she asked that if there are any special meetings  
487 | that they be televised because as they have been talking, you cannot rely on minutes and she has  
488 | talked to several Councilmembers about that and they feel that things need to be on record.  
489 | Chair Becker agreed and indicated that is why he was cool to the idea of a separate meeting.

490  
491 | Chair Becker stated in regards to why they are doing this and what has the Council asked for,  
492 | there were a number of recommendations in the original Community Engagement Task Force  
493 | report related to neighborhood associations and when that culminated in the form of this  
494 | Commission and they adopted that body of work as a beginning of a work plan that they would

495 prioritize over the coming years, that was in there and they took a look at that and added that to  
496 the proposed list they brought before the Council at the end of 2014 and said those were the five  
497 projects for 2015. He stated the Council has not asked them to form neighborhood associations  
498 but they have put out the priority project that the Council agreed to which related to looking at  
499 ways the City can encourage and facilitate it which is why they are doing this.

500  
501 Ms. McCormick stated that raises the question why and for what purpose did the Council want to  
502 encourage this, was it from the residents, and was there some value to it. She thought it would  
503 be helpful to know their perspective and why they were asking for it going forward.

504  
505 Chair Becker proposed they more or less keep the plan as outlined except shift everything down  
506 a month and put in October's agenda items talking about motivations behind this, using as a  
507 potential reference using certain sections of this report and find out why they want to do this and  
508 why this is important and they do not get into specific items until future meetings.

509  
510 ~~Commissioner Grefenberg raised the point of providing~~ There was discussion regarding mileage  
511 ~~reimbursement~~ disbursement for speakers coming to the meetings.

512  
513 Commissioner Grefenberg stated there are three neighborhood associations in the City that  
514 should be involved. Chair Becker thought was not to resuscitate the Task Force ~~D~~ discussions  
515 and how the associations formed and anyone is invited to the meeting to give their input. He  
516 stated the value of bringing in the associations to talk will be more about them, not what  
517 happened on the Task Force. Commissioner Sanders stated all three associations were started  
518 with a common enemy. She stated she was trying to change her association, which is 24 years  
519 old. It was formed with a rallying sense and as the current chair she was trying to change that so  
520 they do not come together to find something negative but to celebrate the positive in their  
521 community. Commissioner Adedayo thought it would also be interesting to find out from the  
522 associations what they felt they needed from the City and how they City can support them.

523  
524 Commissioner Manke asked what if they were to have a meeting at one of their new community  
525 buildings and invite more than one to come at the same time to talk and as a group they can focus  
526 on the positive and other cities may learn something as well. Commission Miller stated he liked  
527 the sentiment of the idea but it sounded like a lot of work. Commissioner Grefenberg stated he  
528 was in agreement with what was said and go with what the Chair has summarized with the  
529 knowledge that they can always revise the timeline.

530  
531 Chair Becker thought for the October meeting they could have the neighborhood associations  
532 give them some information and then for the November and December meetings have other  
533 cities come in to talk to them. Commissioner Manke stated she wants this to be a positive  
534 experience and no more sniping, no more jumping up to defend someone only focus on things  
535 they can move forward on.

536  
537 Commissioner Adedayo thought they could have some focus questions that could be sent out to  
538 the associations. She indicated she would form the questions for the Commission. Chair Becker  
539 indicated he looked forward to that.

540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583

**b. Review Plan for Community Listening and Learning Events**

Chair Becker stated based on the feedback they received they are rebranding this. One of the ideas resonating with the City Council is that they can use this as a template for a listening and learning session with the residents. They wanted to balance between coming up with a framework product and pull it off one or two times to demonstrate how it can be done, especially since they had a willing partner with funds and availability and desire to help them facilitate this. That is what the current draft consists of in the packet. He thought the next steps will be to open up conversations with the City Council and get their feedback on the proposal and incorporate that as well and then this will culminate into some sort of dedicated session with the Council on this topic. Key to pulling this off is if they are engaging residents and asking things of them and they have certain expectations that the City is going to do something with that feedback so how do they ensure that and what the Council appetite is for that.

Commissioner Grefenberg asked if Chair Becker wanted approval of this listening and learning enclosure. He was ready to move approval. Chair Becker indicated that was approved at the last meeting and has not changed.

**c. Update on Joint Task Force on Zoning Notification**

Chair Becker stated he included in the packet attachment 7C, an email memo from Community Development Director Paul ~~Belato~~Bilotta and some meeting minutes from the July 16<sup>th</sup> meeting.

Commissioner Manke stated they met again in August and that meeting was almost solely focused on extraordinary notifications and they went through the notification. Commissioner Grefenberg stated the attached Land Use Tables was primarily only for their review but he was pleased with the decision to move forward with the extraordinary notification, which was one of the items in their Civic Engagement Task Force, predecessor to this and it was also approved by the Council as a priority for them in December 2014. He thought they are beginning to get the data in. Commissioner Manke stated they basically went through all of the possible situations they could think of so they have people like herself who have no background in it to the staff who comes across this stuff all of the time. They looked at if this met the criteria that they would have to look at extraordinary notification process and she thought for the most part they have got themselves covered for most of the situations. She thought the biggest hang up they saw was the part about renters and places where they did not have the information to notify and they already worked on that from the last session by putting these databases together. That was the biggest piece. There was not much new as far as extraordinary notification. She stated they know what they are doing and have everything they could come up with so with them moving forward on the databases, that is a huge leap forward.

Commissioner Grefenberg stated he agreed regarding the tenant notification but more importantly is that they have now created a database of all the apartments and condo units, which they did not have before and now they do. Now they can reach renters and condo users since



584 they have that database. There is a now a means for communication with renters, which is one of  
585 their high priorities.

586

587 Commissioner Manke stated in the report they gave to the Council there are basically three  
588 databases. One is apartments, one is rental housing and the third is geared toward the  
589 commercial side. There is another one that they will move forward with once they know this  
590 database is working and that would be for more of the industrial type of areas. She thought they  
591 were doing a great job.

592

593 Commissioner Miller stated he had a question on the super impact line, which is where he got a  
594 little lost. He asked if they were saying that normally it would be something out of the norm for  
595 Roseville such as a stockyard or rendering plant and would they have concern in doing a  
596 notification for something like a Walmart. He could see the question of how do you decide  
597 where that line is. He asked for clarification on that. Commissioner Grefenberg thought they are  
598 learning from the past. This was in response to the asphalt plant and relates to more  
599 environmental threats or issues. The extraordinary notification would be to notify the residents  
600 who might be beyond the standard 500 feet of the property line of the place, if there were issues  
601 of wind and smell, which can go further than 500 feet. He thought this was a way to address that  
602 issue. At their last meeting there was more discussion on this.

603

604 Commissioner Manke stated when they do a project it has to meet certain things and so many of  
605 the projects, if something is happening within a project that requires extraordinary notification  
606 then chances are it will go through another process anyways where the City does not have to  
607 look at it or these other little flags will take it into a certain direction in which case there is a  
608 whole process by the State that is followed anyways so the City is not focused on having to look  
609 at that notification.

610

611 Commissioner Adedayo stated a lot of development projects have to go through what is called an  
612 Environmental Impact Statement to talk about what are the potential environmental effects the  
613 project would have on a given area so it is not an organization as much as it is a process.  
614 Commissioner Grefenberg thought when that process began, it would alert the City to decide if  
615 there needed to be extraordinary notification given.

616

617 **d. Discuss Policies and Procedures for Civic Engagement Website Module**

618

619 Chair Becker stated this is the latest draft written by Mr. Bowman and presented to the City  
620 Council shortly after their joint meeting with the Council. The Council asked Mr. Bowman to  
621 get feedback from the Commission and bring it back to the Council.

622

623 Mr. Bowman thought there were a lot of things in the document that they would see in a standard  
624 social media or electronic policy dealing with purpose, scope, general conditions and restrictions.  
625 He was not sure they would need to go over that stuff in too much detail. He was looking for  
626 feedback on if there was any thoughts on processes as far as posting of topics, discussion items  
627 that relate to those kinds of things.

628

629 | Commissioner Grefenberg stated the Website Committee ~~discussed~~reviewed Mr. Bowman’s  
630 draft policies and prepared suggested changes and additions to the policy. Some may not be  
631 critically necessary but some are: ~~He thought working with Scott and Jonathan, said~~ the  
632 Website Committee ~~came~~ had come up with suggested changes. On line 8, there was some  
633 concern that the City has an overriding interest in deciding what is asked and seems a little  
634 excessive. ~~The~~ City cannot decide what residents ask; ~~and the intent to speak up of Speak Up is~~  
635 to encourage two-way communication with residents. They suggested this be clarified or delete  
636 what is meant by “ask”. Another thing on line 15, they suggest “I understand the policy  
637 established guidelines for employees and residents”, he thought this was policies for residents.  
638 He would point out in the definition section on line 22, allows for resident generation of  
639 questions and topics along with other things mentioned and he thought it was their expectations  
640 that this setup would also generate topics and issues from the residents and would not just be  
641 from department heads. He thought that was an important clarification they would ask the  
642 Council to consider. Mr. Bowman stated the whole idea of the idea section of that is kind of  
643 where the residents will have an opportunity to provide questions and suggest ideas. He thought  
644 the discussion areas were a little more formalized and that is where he saw those areas being  
645 staff driven or as being driven by this Commission if they had a topic that should be suggested  
646 but he thought most of those areas will be staff looking for feedback on those certain things. He  
647 wondered how else they would be used.

648  
649 Chair Becker stated they talked about the ideation section, they talked about the discussion  
650 section where there are City promoted topics, and then there is a forum area that other cities use  
651 for loose discussion and questions from residents. He thought that area would be used for  
652 questions. Mr. Bowman stated the forum section is more a way for the City to put out a topic  
653 and then rank the responses, whereas discussions are a little bit freer flowing. He stated the use  
654 by forums allows the City to look at what the feedback is with a “thumbs up or down.” Part of  
655 the handicap is that they have not gotten to use it yet so once they get into it and use it, then they  
656 will see where they can put different topics.

657  
658 Commissioner Grefenberg stated when they got into this years ago, there was a way that  
659 | residents could raise topics or ask questions. He stated looking at the website mockup, it was not  
660 clear in the language. Mr. Bowman stated all of the words have been set by Graticus and he is  
661 working on this with them. Commissioner Grefenberg thought it would be useful on line 24 to  
662 say the City website allows for resident generation of questions and topics and the committee  
663 thought it would be a great addition to put that into the policies to clarify that.

664  
665 | Mr. Bowman reviewed the ~~Graticus-Granicus~~ wording with the Commission. Commissioner  
666 Grefenberg stated he agreed with what was said but needed it to be clarified. He stated on line  
667 35, “to seek feedback from residents about current and potential projects” and then add “as well  
668 as issues of community and neighborhood concern” because since the City decides what is a  
669 project they need to allow room for community or neighborhood to initiate an issue that City  
670 Hall is not even aware of. The other change, he beings now to insert the Community  
671 Engagement Commission and was not included in the previous policy. Line 41, “staff will be  
672 responsible for day to day maintenance. Staff may rely from time to time on additional City  
673 staff, City Manager, Department Heads, and City Councilmembers”. He would suggest also

674 including the Community Engagement Commission. He thought it needed to be reflected in the  
675 policy.

676  
677 Commissioner Grefenberg reviewed grammar changes with the Commission and he did not think  
678 it was clear in the ~~mockup-draft policies that where the~~ residents can ask questions. Chair  
679 Becker asked Commissioner Grefenberg thought questions from residents should be answered by  
680 a particular staff member associated with that type of inquiry, such as how long their grass  
681 should be. Commissioner Grefenberg stated his neighborhood received some confusing letters  
682 from the Public Works Department about water being shut off he thought this would be a  
683 question that could be asked and answered on the Civic Engagement module.

684  
685 –Chair Becker asked where that type of question would be asked on the website. Mr. Bowman  
686 stated he was not sure because it was very specific to that one neighborhood or resident and from  
687 looking at other cities websites he did not see that type of interaction and thought the resident  
688 would just call the Public Works Department if they had a question and would not use the  
689 Community Engagement Module that way. Commissioner Miller did not think that was the type  
690 of discussion they necessarily want to push towards that module.

691  
692 Commissioner Grefenberg asked if questions from the public are allowed. Mr. Bowman  
693 indicated they were. Commissioner Grefenberg thought it would be useful to put into the policy  
694 that questions can be asked by the community and responses received from the City.

695  
696 Commissioner Grefenberg reviewed more changes with the Commission. He submitted ~~his-the~~  
697 Committee's draft changes to Mr. Bowman to be added to the minutes.

698  
699 Commissioner Grefenberg stated there seemed to be an added burden ~~placed~~ on  
700 Commissions with the language they are recommending be crossed out. Mr. Bowman asked if  
701 Commission be given carte blanche. Commissioner Grefenberg state by no means, Commissions  
702 are only advisory and they all understand that. It says “Commissions may suggest topics for  
703 staff to include but that they not have to go through the City Manager approval.” They  
704 understand how the department works and the City Manager will have the right to change  
705 anything but it seemed to them that they were picking on Commissions and he thought this was  
706 something they vigorously thought seemed unnecessary. Commissioner Miller thought it might  
707 be that they are explicating saying what the process already is and understood to be for  
708 everything and the City Manager has the ultimate authority on things like this but it seemed  
709 unnecessary to add that in specifically spelling that out. Mr. Bowman stated he will not be the  
710 final determining factor about what goes up. He will take it to the City Manager and he will  
711 decide whether or not it goes up or not and that is why that wording is in there.

712  
713 Commissioner Miller thought there was an additional burden being placed on topics coming  
714 from them. Mr. Bowman indicated that was just the process. There was discussion regarding  
715 why the Commissions were addressed in that section because it seemed to single them out. Mr.  
716 Bowman stated he would take that under advisement and discuss it with the City Manager.

717

718 Commissioner Grefenberg stated the only other thing was to add the Commission in on line 65.  
719 The only other change is on line 107. He wondered if there was consensus or agreement on this.  
720

721 Commissioner Adedayo stated one thing she noticed under Moderating Public Comments, it  
722 states “prohibiting of obscene or racist comments”, which is great but she also wondered if they  
723 could include other ~~comments marginalizing other groups identifies~~ such as “homophobic  
724 ~~and~~, sexist”. Mr. Bowman was not sure if those would fall under personalized attacks because  
725 that is already stated in there. Commissioner Adedayo stated because there is talk about  
726 discrimination in the policy there should be discussion about other ways people are being  
727 discriminated. Chair Becker thought under the second bullet point the wording could be  
728 “Prohibiting of obscene or racist comments or other discriminatory comments towards other  
729 marginalized groups.”  
730

731 | ~~The Website Committee implicitly Commissioner \_\_\_ moved and Commissioner \_\_\_ seconded a~~  
732 | ~~motion to approve the draft policy as amended by both the blue items in the handout as well as~~  
733 | ~~the language given by Commissioner Adedayo. Motion passed unanimously. (No~~  
734 | ~~Commissioner made or seconded the motion but they voted on it)~~  
735

#### 736 e. CEC Social Gathering

737  
738 Commissioner Manke stated she has not gotten any feedback yet. Commissioner Adedayo stated  
739 she did not receive the original survey. Commissioner Manke indicated she would send it out  
740 again.  
741

#### 742 Chair, Committee, and Staff Reports

743

#### 744 a. Staff Report

745

746 Staff Liaison Bowman stated the 14<sup>th</sup> City Council meeting will be for their budget discussions  
747 and the preliminary budget vote for the not to exceed levy as well as some HRA discussions. He  
748 is planning to bring the Community Engagement module back to the Council on the 28<sup>th</sup>.  
749

#### 750 New Business

751

#### 752 a. Gavel Club

753

754 Commissioner Grefenberg stated this Commission in early spring joined the Gavel Club and  
755 while he was still Chair of the Gavel Club he suggested a topic might be the Community  
756 Engagement Commissions efforts from the website to neighborhood associations but primarily to  
757 raise their profile on who they are and what they do. That Committee meets the third  
758 Wednesday of every month.  
759

760 | Commissioner Grefenberg stated ~~he has chaired the club because he is retired.~~ The Gavel Club  
761 | is a collection of social service agencies and private groups, like the Lions, Quanta’s, League of  
762 | Women Voters; ~~and~~ the Park Department also belongs. They are the only Commission that

763 belongs and basically they just share what their groups are doing. Every meeting has a focus on  
764 one of the organizations or members and since they are a member he thought it would be good to  
765 raise their profile and for the outreach committee to do. He stated the next Gavel Club meeting  
766 is October 21<sup>st</sup>. He would like to have someone else on the Commission help present their  
767 Commission to the club. He noted the meeting at is 12:00. Commissioner Sanders stated she  
768 would be willing to help out.

769

770 **b. Memo from Roger Hess**

771

772 | Chair Becker stated they received through the website a message from a resident residents  
773 related to some recent statements the Mayor had made regarding a settlement of a lawsuit against  
774 the Police Department. He reviewed the background and indicated he did forward the feedback  
775 to the Council and they indicated the City Council has seen the message also.

776

777 | Commissioner Sanders stated Roger Hess Jr. is a resident ~~in their community~~ and ~~he~~ is really  
778 concerned about transparency with the City and wanting to know more; ~~and~~ she was sure there  
779 were other residents that wanted to know more. He mentioned that the settlement was \$60,000  
780 and also the lawyers' fees so it actually cost \$100,000 and the statement that Mayor Dan Row~~e~~  
781 gave at the Council meeting was very short and there wasn't any time for people to ask questions  
782 and there are residents out there that want to know more about this. She thought it was important  
783 to bring this up because if they truly are trying to engage the City they should help them find out  
784 more or offer more information so it is transparent.

785

786 Mr. Bowman stated if residents had questions, there are all sorts of ways on the website to ask  
787 for feedback from the Council and they can always call the City Manager and Councilmembers  
788 as well. Commissioner Sanders encouraged Mr. Hess to come to a Council meeting and ask  
789 during public comment for more information because she believed the Mayor said that was all  
790 that was going to be said and there would be no more. Mr. Bowman thought the Mayor was  
791 referencing some personnel issues that are confidential.

792

793 Chair Becker stated he was glad Commissioner Sanders reached out to Mr. Hess and reminded  
794 him that he can come to the meetings.

795

796 Commissioner Grefenberg stated since they are discussing the letter he thought it should be  
797 added to the minutes as an attachment. It was his understanding that this item will be brought  
798 back to the Council after internal review and then more information may become public but he  
799 was not sure.

800

801 Commissioner Grefenberg moved and Commissioner Sanders seconded a motion to add the  
802 letter, as received from Mr. Roger Hess be attached to the minutes and referred to in the text, see  
803 attachment.

804

805 Chair Becker wondered if this should be attached as a bench item to the packet rather than the  
806 minutes. Mr. Bowman thought it would be cleaner to put it directly in the minutes. Chair

807 | Becker asked Mr. Bowman to check to see ~~how~~where the letter should be ~~put into the~~  
808 | ~~minutes~~placed.

809

810 | **Motion passed unanimously.**

811

812 | **c. Welcome Packet**

813

814 | Commissioner Manke stated in their report to the City Council she thought Commissioner  
815 | Grefenberg said it was inactive. Commissioner Grefenberg indicated it was dormant.

816 | Commissioner Manke stated the wording lead her to think they were not interested in doing  
817 | anything about it whereas it had been an earlier item they had been working on. Mr. Bowman  
818 | stated they did some research together on this and Commissioner Mueller ended up resigning  
819 | from the Commission. That is kind of where it stopped.

820

821 | Commissioner Manke stated she started working on this with Commissioner Mueller and sent  
822 | her some information after doing some extensive research out there as to other States that have  
823 | cities that have done this so she felt this was a little unfair and knew that the Council is looking  
824 | at whether it belongs with the Commission or if it belongs with another Commission and at this  
825 | point, because she thought it does belong in the HRA and they have done it before but something  
826 | that has not been actively worked on for a while and they are a community engagement and she  
827 | felt was a huge piece of this welcome packet that she would offer it up that they look at this as a  
828 | task force, a joint task force with HRA. She stated HRA has the funding but she wanted to make  
829 | sure as the Community Engagement Committee that they have that connection and she thought  
830 | they could work very well together on it.

831

832 | Chair Becker asked if she had concerns about timing. Over the next few months they should be  
833 | forming their recommendations for 2016 and is this something that could wait until sometime in  
834 | 2016 or would she like to get working on it now. Commissioner Manke stated it all depends on  
835 | what the City Council plan is.

836

837 | Chair Becker stated the feedback he recalled was ~~one~~a Councilmember stating they liked the idea  
838 | of the welcome packet and they should ~~start~~consider working with the HRA on it but he was not  
839 | aware of any other Council thought to resuscitate it. Commissioner Manke got the feeling that  
840 | the Council was not sure if the Committee or the HRA should be tackling it but she thought it  
841 | should be a joint task force. Chair Becker stated he would ~~re-watch the~~ bring this forward to the  
842 | ~~next~~ Council meeting to ~~find out what they were thinking~~verify.

843

844 | Commissioner Grefenberg thought some preliminary research needed to be done to see if the  
845 | HRA was even interested in ~~it~~such a proposal before they go the route of another task force.  
846 | Commissioner Manke asked if it was the Commissions responsibility to contact the HRA to find  
847 | out what their plans are to do with it. She thought a lot has to do with what the City Council  
848 | wants. Her recommendation is to go to the City Council and ask them.

849

850 | Mr. Bowman thought it would be interesting to do some market research and see how people are  
851 | accessing this type of information and would they even use a welcome packet. Commissioner

852 Manke stated the information that she started to put together is basically an online welcome  
853 packet. They could also consider some of the business community and thought it was an  
854 excellent place for them to advertise.

855  
856 Chair Becker stated when Commissioner Mueller left this item was on her plate and at the time  
857 Commissioner Manke was interested in helping out so he would propose that they put this on the  
858 agenda of their next meeting to discuss further.

859

### 860 **Commission Communications, Reports, and Announcements**

861

862 Chair Becker stated the Roseville Human Right Commission is in co-sponsorship with the  
863 Roseville Library and hosting an event, Civility a Better Choice, on Saturday, September 19<sup>th</sup>  
864 from 9-11 at the Roseville Library Community Room. If you want more information go to  
865 RCLreads.org and click on events and classes and select the calendar to find the event.

866

867 Commissioner Adedayo stated there is a learning event coming up around Community  
868 Engagement. An event that Theresa Gardella's organization sponsors. This could be an  
869 opportunity to increase their learning and understanding around community engagement. It is on  
870 September 30<sup>th</sup> from 9-11 a.m. at URock in North Minneapolis. The name of the event is  
871 "Advancing our practice sharing strategies and expertise." She has been going to several of the  
872 events over the last year and she has really enjoyed them.

873

### 874 **Commissioner-Initiated Items for Future Meetings**

875

876 Chair Becker stated he noted a few items as a course of this meeting. They will kick off the  
877 Neighborhood Association Work **P**lan beginning with talking about some of the motivations  
878 and they will see if they can ask some of the chairs of the associations to come to the meeting to  
879 talk to them briefly.

880

881 Commissioner Grefenberg thought it would be a good opportunity to understand the Uniform  
882 Commission Code as it relates to them, which may include some discussion on minutes and what  
883 is considered handouts.

884

### 885 **Recap of Commission Actions This Meeting**

886

887 Chair Becker stated there are some bench handouts that will be added to either their meeting  
888 minutes or packet. Commissioner Sanders and Grefenberg will be doing the Gavel Club talk on  
889 October 21<sup>st</sup>. They have a couple of take aways related to the Welcome Packet. They will be  
890 reaching out to cities that have done Neighborhood Associations and engage their interest and  
891 availability to come and talk to the Commission over the **next** few months. He will re-watch the  
892 Council meeting and figure out direction on the HRA and Councilmembers please reach out to  
893 him as well, and framing questions for neighborhood organizations.

894

895 Commissioner Grefenberg stated he would like some discussion on outreach planning for **the**  
896 Speak Up Roseville. He thought it would be important to hear from Mr. Bowman and give him

897 some thoughts on outreach and conceivably, his suggestion is to have a committee meeting to  
898 discuss this with Mr. Bowman first before the meeting. There is significant discussion about  
899 outreach. He thought they could help by going to the Commissions and telling them what they  
900 are doing. He would like the possibility of a committee meeting with the possibility of a full  
901 report back to the full Commission at their next meeting.

902

903

904 **Adjournment**

905

906 Commissioner Adedayo moved and Commissioner Manke seconded a motion to adjourn.

907 | **Motion passed unanimously.** Meeting adjourned at 9:03 p.m.

908



## **Framing questions for receiving information from existing neighborhood associations**

1. Tell us about your experience with your neighborhood organization. When was it started? What was the particular cause or issue that brought your organization together?
2. Tell us about some of the activities your organization has been involved in over the years. What have been some successes? What challenges have you faced?
3. What is your organization's vision for the future? How can the city most support that vision?

of neighborhood associations, city recognition of neighborhood associations, ways in which the city can encourage and facilitate neighborhood associations, and two-way communication between the city and neighborhood associations. Task Force members did not necessarily agree on all topics and, for this reason, this report indicates areas where further consideration by the CEC is recommended. Also, it is important to note that this report does not go beyond neighborhood associations and address other ways that the City of Roseville could facilitate neighborhood participation in civic decision-making.

## General Definitions Informing Task Force Deliberations

**What is Civic Engagement:** Three years ago, the Civic Engagement Task Force (precursor of the CEC) defined Civic Engagement as follows:

*"Individual and collective actions designed to identify and address issues of public concern. Civic engagement can take many forms—volunteering on city commissions and committees, involvement with neighborhood groups or other non-profit civic organizations, and/or organizational involvement for electoral participation. It can include efforts to directly address an issue, work with others in a community to solve a problem or interact with the institutions of representative democracy."*<sup>1</sup>

**What is a Neighborhood Association?** A voluntary neighborhood-based group of residents within a specific geographic area who come together to protect, preserve, and enhance the livability of their neighborhood.<sup>2</sup>

**Who is a Neighbor?** Residents who either own or rent within a neighborhood. Some neighborhood associations may choose to include local business owners who operate businesses within the designated neighborhood area.<sup>3</sup>

## Purposes of Neighborhood Associations

The purposes of a particular neighborhood association are determined by an association. Generally speaking, the following are purposes commonly identified by many neighborhood associations. The listing herein is not meant to be prescriptive or exhaustive but to serve as guidelines for existing or future Roseville neighborhood associations.

Neighborhood associations:

1. Build a sense of community and a culture of neighborliness;
2. Involve residents in their democratic forms of government;
3. Promote social activities of varied interest to residents;
4. Maintain and enhance the quality of neighborhood life and safety;

<sup>1</sup> American Psychological Association: <http://www.apa.org/education/undergrad/civic-engagement.aspx>

<sup>2</sup> NOTE: A neighborhood association should not be confused with a homeowner's association (often referred to as a HOA). A neighborhood association is a voluntary association formed around a particular community issue or interest. In contrast, a homeowner's association requires mandatory membership and arises out of ownership in a common-interest community, e.g., condominium, townhome, or other planned development. Such homeowner's associations deal primarily with financial obligations relating to the common property interest, e.g. maintenance and repairs, provided services, etc.

<sup>3</sup> There was a public comment in disagreement with whether business owners should be included in neighborhood associations.

5. Provide the means by which issues and concerns of a neighborhood can be more effectively expressed and communicated, thus serving as a vital link between local government (City Council, Departments, and City Commissions, as well as School District and County government) and the neighborhood;
6. Promote community and civic engagement by presenting opportunities for resident involvement;
7. Assist staff in disseminating timely and understandable information to provide for informed resident participation in government decision-making and planning, thus gaining better acceptance and understanding of government decisions; and
8. Function as a liaison enabling two-way communication between neighborhoods and government entities on matter of interest such as zoning changes, redevelopment projects and their neighborhood impact, park projects and Comprehensive Plan amendments as well as other planning efforts.

### **Benefits of Neighborhood Associations**

Neighborhood associations are one of many ways in which the City connects with its residents in the development and implementation of policies, programs, and services. Associations also encompass the process of communicating and working collaboratively with citizens and other stakeholders in balancing various interests and issues affecting their lives and neighborhood.

We recommend that the City recognize that neighbors can sometimes better understand and communicate their neighborhood's issues and concerns to City Hall, especially in a suburb that does not have ward representation.

Neighbors are often in a better position for raising the right issues and asking the relevant questions concerning a neighborhood. Their involvement and collaboration in civic decision-making provide City staff and officials an opportunity to answer their concerns and address their issues. Community members can also provide a valuable source of expertise to influence government decisions that improve neighborhood quality of life and delivery of public services. Neighborhood associations are an important means to facilitate and encourage neighbors to become involved in their community and engaged in local government and to improve communications between residents and their government.

Potential benefits of neighborhood associations and their involvement in a collaborative decision-making process include:

1. Provides residents a means to express a unified and collective voice;
2. Increases residents' overall awareness of issues, decisions, and other issues that affect the neighborhood and the City;
3. Offers opportunities for local government officials, developers, and residents to prioritize important projects, development, and planning and for the City and developers to solicit input from residents before development plans are finalized and before City approval is secured;
4. Allows the development of better and more creative ideas and solutions and encourages thinking 'outside the box';
5. Instills a climate of respect and acknowledgement of the interests of various participants, staff, and decision-makers;

6. Facilitates the resolution of neighborhood issues within the neighborhood: provides City officials and staff a better understanding of what are the issues neighborhood residents are concerned about;
7. Improves buy-in and acceptance of outcomes and improves confidence in the process leading to an increase in sustainable decisions and greater resident satisfaction with the City's decision-making process;
8. Engenders trust between citizens and local government;
9. Improves the City's access to the expertise of its citizens and expands the capabilities of existing city staff;
10. Nurtures the potential pool of informed and engaged candidates for Commissions and other volunteer efforts in the city; and
11. Assists seniors and elderly desiring to age in place an additional sense of connectedness and support.

## City Recognition of Neighborhood Associations

The Task Force recommends that Neighborhood associations *have the opportunity to register with and be recognized by* the City. Further, the Task Force recommends that standards for Neighborhood association recognition be limited to a set of minimal requirements to allow for variation in associations across the City. It is important to note that the Task Force believes that not all Neighborhood groups should be required to be recognized. Instead recognition is suggested for groups that want to participate in the communication expectations and/or receive support from the City as described below.

While each recognized Neighborhood association will determine its own purpose, priorities, structure, level of formality, and level of activity, this Task Force recommends the following minimal standards for associations recognized by the City:

- Association name and contact information: The association will provide the City with the name of the association and the contact information (name, phone number, email address) for the primary association contact(s) to facilitate efficient two-way communication between the City and the neighborhood association.
- Association geographic boundaries: Each association will work with the city to recommend and determine its own geographic boundaries. The association will provide the City with an adequate description of the neighborhood. This description will identify the specific streets that form the boundaries of the neighborhood. The Task Force recommends that further consideration be given to the appropriate size of neighborhood associations when determining boundaries.
- Communication to members: The association must identify at least one pre-determined approach for communicating to its members (e.g., email, postal mail, phone) and will commit to communicating with its members when the City sends notices to the neighborhood association.
- Inclusiveness: The association will commit to being inclusive of residents within the neighborhood, with voluntary membership open to both home owners and renters in the area. The association will determine whether it would like to include businesses as part of its association.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> Supported by all five members present at the July 22<sup>nd</sup> meeting.

  
**REQUEST FOR COUNCIL ACTION**

Date: October 5, 2015  
Item No.:

---

Department Approval

City Manager Approval

---

Item Description: Discussion of Civic Engagement Module Policy & Procedures

---

1 **BACKGROUND**

2 In March of 2015 the City Council approved a recommendation of the Community Engagement  
3 Commission to contract with Granicus to develop an electronic civic engagement module for  
4 integration with the City of Roseville website. A contract was executed with Granicus, which  
5 developed the Speak Up, Roseville module [www.speakuproseville.org](http://www.speakuproseville.org).

6 At the August 24 meeting staff brought forward policies and procedures for administering the  
7 civic engagement module and reviewed the layout of the Speak Up, Roseville site. After  
8 discussion it was determined that the module required further refinement. The City Council also  
9 requested that staff seek feedback from the Community Engagement Commission about the  
10 module and the policies and procedures developed to administer its use and return at a future  
11 City Council for further discussions.

12 During the September 10 Community Engagement Commission meeting, the Commission  
13 presented staff with its feedback and recommendations. The Commission's recommendations  
14 have been incorporated into the policy document, with the exception of section VII. Posting of  
15 Topics, about which staff is requesting City Council guidance. Specifically, the City Council  
16 should discuss the role of commissions in the posting of topics.

17 Staff has also been in contact with Granicus and will discuss design elements raised by the City  
18 Council during the August 24 meeting.

19 **POLICIES AND PROCEDURES**

20 Staff developed a Speak Up, Roseville Policies and Procedures manual to assist with the oversight  
21 and management of the module. The manual discusses responsibilities for day-to-day  
22 maintenance, interaction responsibilities, use requirements and restrictions, and topic selection,  
23 as well as other logistical items.

24 **STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS**

25 Staff recommends that the City Council accept the revised Speak Up, Roseville Policies and  
26 Procedures Manual after providing guidance on section VII. Posting of Topics and grant final  
27 approval for launch and integration of civic engagement module into City website.

28 **REQUESTED COUNCIL ACTION**

29 A motion to accept the revised Speak Up, Roseville! Policies and Procedures Manual and authorize  
30 staff to begin integration of civic engagement module into City website.

**Prepared by:** **Garry Bowman, Staff Liaison**

Attachments: A: Speak Up, Roseville Policies and Procedures Manual (revised 10/09/15)

B: Community Engagement Commission Speak Up, Roseville Policy – draft recommendations

CITY OF ROSEVILLE

**SPEAKUP, ROSEVILLE!**

---

**POLICIES AND PROCEDURES**



2660 CIVIC CENTER DRIVE  
ROSEVILLE, MN 55113

Revised: 8/19/15

**Speak Up, Roseville Policy - draft**

August 2015

**I. Policy**

The City of Roseville will determine how its web-based civic engagement module, Speak Up, Roseville, will be designed, implemented and managed as part of its overall communication strategy.

**II. Purpose**

This policy establishes guidelines for the use of Speak Up, Roseville. The policy ensures the proper use of the civic engagement module by its employees and residents and establishes procedures for operating the module in a positive and informative fashion. Staff tasked with using the module shall have the responsibility to use these resources in an efficient, effective, ethical and lawful manner.

**III. Scope**

This policy applies specifically to the Speak Up, Roseville civic engagement module. The City's official website, [www.cityofroseville.com](http://www.cityofroseville.com) shall remain the City's primary online medium for communicating information to the public.

**IV. Definition**

Speak Up, Roseville is a civic engagement module integrated into the City's website that allows for resident generation of questions and topic, feedback through discussions on selected topics, and direct feedback via surveys. The module allows residents to find out about ongoing Projects, create/share/vote on citizen-generated Ideas, and connect with other residents that share their interests.

**V. General Conditions & Restrictions****Goals**

The goals of integrating a civic engagement module is:

- To promote the value and importance of civic participation among residents
- To sustain the productive involvement of its residents
- To engage a broader audience and generate fresh ideas
- To better inform residents of new and ongoing projects
- To seek feedback from residents about current and potential projects as well as issues of community or neighborhood concern
- To foster 2-way communications channels between the City and its residents, and to maintain an open, professional and responsive dialog with residents

**VI. Management of Civic Engagement Module**

Communications staff will be responsible for day-to-day maintenance of Speak Up, Roseville. Communications staff may at times rely on the expertise of additional city staff, the city manager, department heads, city councilmembers, and commissions to assist with interactions as necessary.



When using Speak Up, Roseville a representative of the City of Roseville will:

- Adhere to personnel policies
- Use appropriate language
- Not provide private or confidential information
- Not negatively comment on community partners or their services
- Not provide information related to pending decisions that would compromise negotiations
- Be aware that all content added to a site is subject to open records/right to know laws and discovery in legal cases

#### **VII. Use**

The primary use of Speak Up, Roseville will be for the City to better inform residents of new and ongoing projects and to receive feedback from residents about those projects and other issues of community concern. Speak Up, Roseville will also be a place where residents can share their own ideas, ask questions, and receive responses from the City.

#### **VIII. Posting of Topics**

City staff will be primarily tasked with generating and moderating topics for inclusion on Speak Up, Roseville City Councilmembers will also produce guidance for topics. Commission members may suggest topics for staff to include in discussion or forum section of the module. Inclusion of suggested topics made by commission members shall be determined by the City Manager. Resident's ideas and discussion items shall be posted in the Ideas section of the module; however should staff determine that an idea should be escalated to a discussion or forum item it may choose to do so after consultation with the City Manager. Staff interested in employing the survey function of Speak Up, Roseville shall do so only after receiving approval from the City Council. Staff will also make it known that the surveys are for informational purposes and are not meant to serve as scientific measurements of public opinion.

#### **VIII. Posting of Topics (from CEC recommendations)**

City staff will be primarily tasked with generating and moderating topics for inclusion on Speak Up, Roseville City Councilmembers [and the Community Engagement Commission](#) will also produce guidance for topics. ~~Commission members~~ [Commissions](#) may suggest topic for staff to include in discussion or forum section of the module. ~~Inclusion of suggested topics made by commission members shall be determined by the City Manager.~~ Resident's ideas and discussion items shall be posted in the Ideas section of the module; however should staff determine that an idea should be escalated to a discussion or forum item it may choose to do so after consultation with the City Manager. Staff [or Commissions](#) interested in employing the survey function of Speak Up, Roseville shall do so only after receiving approval from the City Council. Staff will also make it known that the surveys are for informational purposes and are not meant to serve as scientific measurements of public opinion.

#### **IX. Hosting, Training, and Support**

City of Roseville Communications staff will provide basic training to the primary staff members responsible for maintaining Speak Up, Roseville.

#### **X. Data Retention**

The City will comply with the Minnesota General Record Retention Schedule. Routine social media posts and comments by residents are considered "transitory correspondence," as defined by the Minnesota General Records Retention Schedule. These messages are not required to be retained.

**XI. Disclaimer**

*The following disclaimer will be posted as a part of Speak Up, Roseville:*

Speak Up, Roseville is operated by the City of Roseville. The City reserve the right, at our sole discretion, to change, modify, add or delete comments or posts, photos and video at any time.

Comments associated with unlawful activity or that contain offensive or vulgar language or photos, personal attacks on staff or members of the public, political endorsements of any kind, commercial advertisements or any other form of commercial solicitation will be removed.

The City of Roseville has the right to reproduce any pictures or videos to this site in any of its publications or websites or any other media outlets.

The views, postings or opinions expressed on this site do not necessarily reflect those of the City of Roseville.

**XII. Advertising**

The City of Roseville does not endorse any product, service, company or organization advertising through its civic engagement module.

**XIII. Privacy Policy**

The City of Roseville does not share information gathered through its social media sites with third parties for promotional purposes. However, any information you provide to the city is subject to the Minnesota Data Practices Act. This law classifies certain information as available to the public upon request.

**XIV. Moderating Public Comments**

City of Roseville staff, with administrative rights, will not edit posted comments, but may remove comments that are abusive; obscene; defamatory; in violation of the copyright, trademark right or other intellectual property right of any third party; or otherwise inappropriate or incorrect. The following may be removed by city staff:

- Potentially libelous comments
- Obscene, racist or homophobic comments
- Personal attacks, insults or threatening language
- Plagiarized material
- Private, personal information published without consent
- Comments totally unrelated to the topic of the forum
- Commercial promotions or spam
- Hyperlinks to material that is not directly related to the discussion
- Sexual content or links to sexual content
- Encourage or promote illegal activity
- Promote political campaigns or ballot measures
- Information that may compromise the safety or security of the public
- Posts by individuals using aliases or false names to utilize module

In addition, residents may flag abusive or offensive comments as part of the Speak Up, Roseville terms of use. Once a comment has been flagged it is removed from being displayed and placed into a queue for staff review. Should staff determine the comment to have violated the module's terms of conditions the comment will be deleted and the posting member warned. Repeated offensive posts may result in loss of posting privileges for the offending poster.

DRAFT

1 **Speak Up, Roseville Policy - draft**  
 2 **As revised by the Community Engagement Commission** **September 13, 2015**  
 3 Original revised 08/19/2015; CEC Revisions 09-13-2015

4 **I. Policy**

5 The City of Roseville will determine how its web-based civic engagement module, SpeakUp, Roseville!,  
 6 will be designed, implemented and managed as part of its overall communication strategy.

7 **II. Purpose**

8 The City has an overriding interest in deciding what is “asked” and “answered” on behalf of the City.  
 9 *[Comment: The phrase “The City has an overriding interest in deciding what is asked” seems a little*  
 10 *excessive if not totalitarian. The intent of Speak Up is to encourage two-way communication between*  
 11 *residents and the City. . The City cannot decide what a resident asks as long the poster follows the*  
 12 *requirements of Sections XI and XIV below.]*

13  
 14 This policy establishes guidelines for the use of SpeakUp, Roseville!. The policy ensures the proper use of  
 15 the civic engagement module by its employees and residents, and establishes procedures for operating  
 16 the module in a positive and informative fashion. Staff tasked with using the module shall have the  
 17 responsibility to use these resources in an efficient, effective, ethical and lawful manner.

18 **III. Scope**

19 This policy applies specifically to the SpeakUp, Roseville! civic engagement module. The City’s official  
 20 Website, [www.cityofroseville.com](http://www.cityofroseville.com) shall remain the City’s primary online medium for communicating  
 21 information to the public.

22 **IV. Definition**

23 SpeakUp, Roseville! is a civic engagement module integrated into the City’s website that allows for  
 24 Resident generation of questions and topics, feedback through discussions on selected topics and direct  
 25 feedback via surveys. The module allows residents to find out about ongoing Projects, create/share/vote  
 26 on citizen-generated Ideas, and connect with other residents that share their interests.

27 **V. General Conditions & Restrictions**

28 **Goals**

29 The goals of integrating a civic engagement module is:

- 30 • To promote the value and importance of civic participation among residents
- 31 • To sustain the productive involvement of its residents
- 32 • To engage a broader audience and generate fresh ideas
- 33 • To better inform residents of new and ongoing projects
- 34 • To seek feedback from residents about current and potential projects as well as issues of  
 35 community or neighborhood concern
- 36 • To foster 2-way communications channels between the City and its residents, and to maintain  
 37 an open, professional and responsive dialog with residents

38 **VI. Management of Civic Engagement Module**

39 Communications staff will be responsible for day-to-day maintenance of SpeakUp, Roseville!  
 40 Communications staff may at times rely on the expertise of additional city staff, the city manager,  
 41 department heads, ~~and~~ city councilmembers, and the Community Engagement Commission to assist  
 42 with interactions.

43 When using SpeakUp, Roseville! *[Note: Missing a noun, who is the representative]* as a representative of  
 44 the City of Roseville will:

- 45 • Adhere to personnel policies
- 46 • Use appropriate language
- 47 • Not provide private or confidential information
- 48 • Not negatively comment on community partners or their services
- 49 • Not provide information related to pending decisions that would compromise negotiations
- 50 • Be aware that all content added to a site is subject to open records/right to know laws and
- 51 discovery in legal cases

## 52 VII. Use

53 The primary use of SpeakUp, Roseville! will be for the City to better inform residents of new and ongoing  
 54 projects and to receive feedback from residents about those projects [and other issues of community](#)  
 55 [concern](#). SpeakUp, Roseville! will also be a place where residents can share their own ideas, [ask](#)  
 56 [questions](#), and receive responses from the City.

## 57 VIII. Posting of Topics

58 City staff will be primarily tasked with generating and moderating topics for inclusion on SpeakUp,  
 59 Roseville! City Councilmembers [and the Community Engagement Commission](#) will also produce guidance  
 60 for topics. ~~Commission members~~ [Commissions](#) may suggest topic for staff to include in discussion or  
 61 forum section of the module. ~~Inclusion of suggested topics made by commission members shall be~~  
 62 ~~determined by the City Manager.~~ Resident's ideas and discussion items shall be posted in the Ideas  
 63 section of the module; however should staff determine that an idea should be escalated to a discussion  
 64 or forum item it may choose to do so after consultation with the City Manager. Staff [or Commissions](#)  
 65 interested in employing the survey function of SpeakUp, Roseville! shall do so only after receiving  
 66 approval from the City Council. Staff will also make it known that the surveys are for informational  
 67 purposes and are not meant to serve as scientific measurements of public opinion.

## 68 IX. Hosting, Training, and Support

69 City of Roseville Communications staff will provide basic training to the primary staff members  
 70 Responsible for maintaining SpeakUp, Roseville!

## 71 X. Data Retention

72 The City will comply with the Minnesota General Record Retention Schedule. Routine social media posts  
 73 and comments by residents are considered "transitory correspondence," as defined by the Minnesota  
 74 General Records Retention Schedule. These messages are not required to be retained.

## 75 XI. Disclaimer

76 *The following disclaimer will be posted as a part of SpeakUp, Roseville!:*

77 SpeakUp, Roseville! is operated by the City of Roseville. The City reserve the right, at our sole  
 78 discretion, to change, modify, add or delete comments or posts, photos and video at any time.  
 79 Comments associated with unlawful activity or that contain offensive or vulgar language or  
 80 photos, personal attacks on staff or members of the public, political endorsements of any kind,  
 81 commercial advertisements or any other form of commercial solicitation will be removed.

82 The City of Roseville has the right to reproduce any pictures or videos to this site in any of its  
 83 publications or websites or any other media outlets.

84 The views, postings or opinions expressed on this site do not necessarily reflect those of the City

85 of Roseville.

## 86 **XII. Advertising**

87 The City of Roseville does not endorse any product, service, company or organization advertising  
88 through its civic engagement module.

## 89 **XIII. Privacy Policy**

90 The City of Roseville does not share information gathered through its social media sites with third  
91 parties for promotional purposes. However, any information you provide to the city is subject to the  
92 Minnesota Data Practices Act. This law classifies certain information as available to the public upon  
93 request.

## 94 **XIV. Moderating Public Comments**

95 City of Roseville staff, with administrative rights, will not edit posted comments, but may remove  
96 comments that are abusive; obscene; defamatory; in violation of the copyright, trademark right or other  
97 intellectual property right of any third party; or otherwise inappropriate or incorrect. The following may  
98 be removed by city staff:

- 99 • Potentially libelous comments
- 100 • Obscene or racist comments [or other discriminatory comments towards other marginalized](#)  
101 [groups](#)
- 102 • Personal attacks, insults or threatening language
- 103 • Plagiarized material
- 104 • Private, personal information published without consent
- 105 • Comments totally unrelated to the topic of the forum
- 106 • Commercial promotions or spam
- 107 • Hyperlinks to material that is not directly related to the discussion
- 108 • ~~Sexually~~ [Sexual](#) content or links to sexual content
- 109 • Encourage or promote illegal activity
- 110 • Promote political campaigns or ballot measures
- 111 • Information that may compromise the safety or security of the public
- 112 • Posts by individuals using aliases or false names to utilize module

113  
114 In addition, residents may flag abusive or offensive comments as part of the SpeakUp, Roseville! Terms  
115 of use. Once a comment has been flagged it is removed from being displayed and placed into a queue  
116 for staff review. Should staff determine the comment to have violated the module's terms of conditions  
117 the comment will be deleted and the posting member warned. Repeated offensive posts may result in  
118 loss of posting privileges for the offending poster.

## **CHAPTER 201**

### **ADVISORY COMMISSIONS**

#### **SECTION:**

- 201.1 : Establishment
- 201.2 : Purpose
- 201.3 : Membership
- 201.4 : Terms
- 201.5 : Compensation
- 201.6 : Organization
- 201.7 : Meetings and Reports

#### **201.1 : ESTABLISHMENT:**

- A. All permanent standing advisory commissions to the City shall be established by adoption of an ordinance under this Title, and shall be governed by the provisions of this Chapter.
- B. From time to time, the City Council may elect to establish other advisory groups by adoption of a resolution establishing, among other things, the purpose, membership, organization, duties and term of service for such advisory groups.

#### **201.2 : PURPOSE:**

Advisory Commissions are established to provide a method for citizen input and are advisory to the City Council. No advisory commission shall have decision-making authority for the City, except as expressly established by this Code or State Statutes.

#### **201.3 : MEMBERSHIP:**

- A. All members of advisory commissions shall be residents of the City, and shall be appointed by majority vote of the City Council.
- B. In addition to the regular commission members, the City Council may appoint additional residents of the city who are the age of 18 or under and enrolled in high school to serve one-year terms as ex-officio youth commissioners.

#### **201.4 : TERMS:**

- A. Term Length: Members shall serve terms of three years, except for youth members and the first members appointed following the creation of the commission. First members shall be appointed as follows: At least one third of members shall be appointed for three-year terms, up to one third of the members shall be appointed for two-year terms, and the balance of the members shall serve a one-year term. Term length for any member will be established by the Council at the time of the appointment.
- B. Oath of Office: Every appointed member, before beginning his or her duties shall take an oath stating that he or she will faithfully discharge of the duties of the commission to which he

or she was appointed. Individual commissioners are expected to understand and adhere to the Roseville Ethics Code and attend the annual ethics training.

C. Expiration of Terms: A member's term shall expire on March 31 of the year of the expiration of the term, or at such time as a successor is appointed.

D. Term Limits: Members are eligible to serve two consecutive full terms on a commission in addition to any partial term served to complete an unexpired term resulting from a vacancy or an initial term upon creation of a commission. Upon completion of service on one commission, residents can be eligible for appointment to another commission, or after a period of at least one year, for appointment to the same commission on which they have previously served.

E. Vacancies: Vacancies during a term shall be filled by the City Council for the unexpired portion of a term. A vacancy occurs in any of the following circumstances: resignation, residence outside the city, removal or death. The City Council reserves the right to defer filling commission vacancies for any length of time deemed necessary.

F. Attendance: It is the expectation that Commissioners attend all meetings of the commission. An absence is considered the same whether it is excused or unexcused. If a commissioner is absent three consecutive meetings and/or misses a total of 30% or more of commission meetings in a rolling 12 month period, the staff liaison or commission chair will forward the information to the City Council.

G. Removal: Members may be removed by the City Council without cause. A member's removal shall be by majority vote of the City Council. In addition:

1. If a member fails to comply with the Roseville Ethics Code, the member may be removed by the City Council.

2. If a member has absences from more than three consecutive commission meetings, or is absent from more than 30% of the meetings in any rolling 12 month period, the member may be removed by the City Council.

## **201.5 : COMPENSATION:**

Members of all advisory commissions shall serve without compensation.

## **201.6 : ORGANIZATION:**

A. Election of Officers: At the first meeting following the start of new regular terms of appointment, or at such other time as required by State Statutes, each advisory commission shall elect a chair and vice-chair from among its appointed members for a term of one-year.

B. Governing Documents: City Code and State Statutes will govern commission activities. A commission shall not adopt separate by-laws or rules to govern commission duties or activities.

C. Committees, Subcommittees and Task Forces: Commissions may by majority vote appoint committees or subcommittees of their own members from time to time as required for the conduct of their business. The formation of any other committees, task forces and/or alternate workgroups would be subject to the provisions of this Chapter and shall be created only after approval of the City Council. Subcommittees shall report on work underway and completed on a regular basis to the full commission.



D. Logo and Materials: To reflect the official nature of the commission and to preserve consistency of the City's brand, only the official city logo or a Council-approved derivative of the logo, that contains the words "City of Roseville," shall be used on commission materials.

E. Accessibility: Commission members will be available to residents of the city by providing a preferred phone number or email address that can be used on the city website and/or on print materials.

F. Staff Liaison: Each commission will be served by a staff liaison to assist in meeting planning and commission processes and serve as a conduit to city staff and the City Council.

G. New Commissioner Training: New commission members will receive both general and commission-specific training from the staff liaison and commission chair before beginning their term.

## **201.7 : MEETINGS AND REPORTS:**

A. Meeting Schedule: Prior to the start of each calendar year, each commission shall adopt a regular meeting schedule for the coming year. Commissions may amend their regular meeting schedule, cancel meetings, or call special meetings as needed by majority vote at a regular commission meeting. Commissions shall meet at least quarterly, except as otherwise required by this Code or State Statutes.

B. Joint Meeting with City Council: At least once a year, each commission shall meet with the City Council to report on the previous year's work and to discuss work plans and pending issues for the upcoming year. Commissions may request additional joint meetings with the City Council whenever necessary to share information or seek guidance. A staff liaison is assigned to assist each commission and will work with the City Manager to schedule any joint meetings.

C. Open Meeting Law and Data Practices: All meetings of a quorum of a commission need to be properly noticed and shall be subject to the requirements of State Statutes section 13D, as applicable. Individual commissioners are expected to understand and adhere to applicable state laws and statutes. When a vacancy exists on a commission, a quorum shall consist of a majority of the commission's non-vacant seats.

D. Rules of Order: All commissions shall be subject to the same Rules of Order as are adopted annually by the City Council.

E. Meetings: Commission meetings shall be held in a public place and the time, date, and location of the meeting shall be publicly noticed. Commission must allow time for public comment on each agenda item and at a Public Comment portion of the agenda at the beginning of each meeting. All meetings shall be televised and recorded for future reference. External site tours by a Commission shall be exempt from being televised, but such tours shall be publicly noticed as all other Commission meetings.

F. Minutes and Reports: Commissions are required to keep a record of its meetings and actions available through the City, as well as other recommendations, reports, studies and other documents created or performed by or for a commission. Minutes of the meeting shall be detailed in the same way as the City Council minutes are written.

(Ord. 1481, 07-20-2015)

## **CHAPTER 209**

### **COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT COMMISSION**

**SECTION:**

- 209.01: Establishment and membership  
209.02: Scope, Duties and Functions

**209.1 : ESTABLISHMENT AND MEMBERSHIP:**

There is established a Community Engagement Commission of the City which shall consist of seven members appointed by the City Council and which shall be subject to Chapter 201 of the City Code.

**209.2 : 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.

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.

(Ord. 1462, 2-10-2014) (Ord. 1481, 07-20-2015)