



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

Minutes
Roseville Community Engagement Commission (CEC)
Thursday, November 12, 2015 - 6:30 p.m.

1. Roll Call

Chair Scot Becker called the meeting to order at approximately 6:30 p.m. and Communications Manager Garry Bowman called the roll.

Members Present: Chair Scot Becker; and Members Sherry Sanders, Jonathan Miller, Theresa Gardella, and Michelle Manke; with Member Gary Grefenberg arriving shortly after the meeting started.

Members Absent: Member Ebony Adedayo

Staff Present: Staff Liaison/Communications Manager Garry Bowman

2. Approve Agenda

Member Sanders asked for an additional agenda item for the Community Engagement Commission (CEC) to review and consider recent letters sent to their attention.

By consensus of the body, Chair Becker added this item as New Business Item 7.b entitled, "CEC Correspondence.

Gardella moved, Manke seconded, approval of the agenda as amended.

Ayes: 5

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

3. Public Comment – Non Agenda Items

None.

4. Approval of October 8, 2015 Meeting Minutes

Comments and corrections to draft minutes had been submitted by various CEC Members prior to tonight's meeting and those revisions were incorporated into the draft presented in the tonight's agenda packet.

Manke moved, Gardella seconded, approval of the October 8, 2015 meeting minutes as amended.

Corrections:

- **Page 6, Line 251-253 (Sanders)**

44 Correct sentence to read: “Ms. Sanders shared the association’s objectives,
45 and as the oldest and first association registered as a *[non-profit organization]*
46 counted itself 200 members and friends strong.”
47

48 **Ayes: 5**

49 **Nays: 0**

50 **Motion carried.**

51
52 **5. Old Business**

53
54 **a. Continue Discussion on Neighborhood Associations**

55
56 **i. Additional Background Materials**

57 Prior to reviewing the next excerpt of recommendations provided by
58 the Task Force, Chair Becker recognized Member Grefenberg to
59 provide his “TIMELINE for Integrating Neighborhoods into City
60 Decision-Making,” *presented as a bench handout, attached hereto*
61 *and made a part hereof.*
62

63 Member Grefenberg reviewed his written report and highlighted areas
64 of possible CEC interest based upon his nine year involvement in the
65 development of Roseville policy and procedures regarding community
66 and civic engagement.. Member Grefenberg advised that he had
67 served on one of the six subcommittees which composed the 2007-
68 2008 Imagine Roseville 2025 community visioning process; his
69 subcommittee was called “Community Life and Civic Engagement
70 Subcommittee”. This subcommittee addressed community and civic
71 engagement, including neighborhood organizations.
72

73 The next year through 2008 Roseville began updating its
74 Comprehensive Plan. As part of this 2030 Comprehensive Plan
75 update, Member Grefenberg referenced his participation on the on the
76 Comp Plan’s Steering Committee, having been appointed by the City
77 Council as a resident at-large member to the Steering Committee. He
78 noted that at that time eight years ago he had requested a chapter be
79 added to the Plan addressing “Community Engagement”.

80 Member Grefenberg introduced his report by stating that many of the
81 statements and considerations in the Imagine Roseville visioning
82 process and the Comp Plan update should now resonate with the
83 current efforts of the CEC and provide some direction to the
84 Community Engagement Commission and the community.
85

86 Based on his personal involvement in these efforts over the last nine
87 years, Member Grefenberg opined that City planning has been
88 gradually changing from top-down to bottom up.
89

90 Member Grefenberg noted that one of the proposal coming out of the
91 community engagement process Imagine Roseville had been the
92 recommendation to start up the Roseville Community Forum; now the
93 SpeakUp! Roseville module could be considered an update of that
94 earlier communication tool..
95

96 Regarding the last update of the City’s Comprehensive Plan in 2007-
97 2008Grefenberg commented that a fatal flaw of the final 70-page
98 document was that its recommendations and conclusions hadn’t been
99 taken down to the neighborhood level in addressing the issues most
100 impacting several neighborhoods.
101

102 As an example, Member Grefenberg noted one of those issues
103 concerned the northwest corner of Roseville where the Comprehensive
104 Plan recommended a high density residential (HDR) zoning
105 designation, without providing an opportunity for the residents
106 affected by such a change to grasp the impact of such a land use
107 change. Even now the City Council was dealing with that oversight by
108 considering down-zoning an area in this Northwestern part of the City.
109

110 Member Grefenberg opined that this was just one example that
111 reinforced the need--when next updating the Comprehensive Plan-- to
112 bring the discussions down to the neighborhood level was vital as part
113 of the process.
114

115 Member Grefenberg noted the next step in the evolution of the City’s
116 approach to community and civic engagement was involvement of the
117 Human Rights Commission (HRC), In 2009 at the request of the
118 Human Rights Commission the Council formally transferred some
119 community engagement responsibilities to the HRC. Specifically the
120 Commission was charged *to increase the sense of community by*
121 *reaching out to all members of the community and ensuring that our*
122 *city government and its activities, programs and services are*
123 *accessible, understandable, and responsive to all.* Subsequently the
124 HRC formed a Community Engagement Task Force to study and make
125 recommendations as to how the City could facilitate and improve the
126 processes by which its residents participated in their governance.
127

128 Member Grefenberg indicated that this Task Force met for over
129 seventeen months (2011-2013) and gave its final report to the
130 Commission in the fall of 2013, followed by a presentation to the
131 Council in December of 2013. He and Commissioner Gardella were
132 part of initial Task Force, which had focused on considering changes
133 to city processes that would more clearly and effectively integrate
134 neighborhoods. One of the original Task Force recommendations was

135 for a City Council policy to foster and encourage neighborhood
136 associations.

137
138 In conclusion, Member Grefenberg the first six months of this
139 Commissions existence in 2014 were spent in going over those Task
140 Force recommendations, and making revisions as indicated. Member
141 Grefenberg opined that he was confident this process was nearing
142 resolution of a recommendation which could be presented to the City
143 Council in the near future.

144
145 Referencing Member Grefenberg’s written report (page 4) related to
146 the section entitled “Plan from the Neighborhood Level Up,” Members
147 Sanders and Gardella noted that the sixteen planning districts initially
148 outlined had been used to establish the online NextDoor.com website,
149 even though they had not ended up as large as those original districts.

150
151 Member Grefenberg disagreed, opining the sixteen Next Door districts
152 were initially based on the Park Master Plan 16-park constellations,
153 not the sixteen planning districts. However, Member Grefenberg
154 advised that he would need to further research that, but questioned
155 how much use and importance these sixteen planning districts had ever
156 been given.

157
158 Member Sanders advised that during setting up the NextDoor.com
159 website in 2011, the City of Roseville had contacted her asking if the
160 group would increase the area covered to include those sixteen
161 districts.

162
163 Having worked toward these community engagement efforts over the
164 last nine years, Member Grefenberg stated that he was getting
165 impatient, but looked forward to the CEC soon recommending
166 strategies for the City Council to assess and consider implementing.
167 Chair Becker thanked Member Grefenberg for his report and historical
168 comments.

169
170 **ii. Material Support the City can Provide to Encourage and**
171 **Facilitate the Formation of Neighborhood Associations**

172 Chair Becker reminded CEC Members of previous discussions
173 when first organizing how to approach the Commission’s
174 recommendations to the Council, his proposal to separate material
175 support (e.g. monetary or resource value available from the City to
176 fledgling neighborhood associations) from what the City was
177 expecting of those groups to avoid confusion during those
178 discussions. Chair Becker noted that, by general consensus of the
179 CEC at that time, it was agreed to move accordingly starting with

180 review of relevant sections from the Neighborhood Task Force
181 Report (Attachment A), even though it wasn't an exhaustive list.

182
183 In moving forward with this excerpt of the Task Force report
184 (pages 5 – 6), Chair Becker suggested determining those areas of
185 consensus of the CEC, and discussion of areas needing further
186 consideration and agreement, with any voting on a draft and/or
187 final document to be considered at a later date upon completion of
188 that review.

189
190 As a point of information and in his review of this excerpt prior to
191 tonight's meeting, Member Grefenberg opined he found something
192 missing from the chapter entitled "How the City of Roseville Can
193 Encourage and Facilitate Neighborhood Associations," and asked
194 whether Member Sanders. Member Grefenberg thought the item
195 missing had revolved around the City providing a mailing list of all
196 neighbors within a certain area.

197
198 Member Sanders clarified that this was addressed in Item 2 on
199 page 6. However, Member Sanders noted it had been decided by
200 the Task Force, in an effort to address potential legal and/or private
201 data issues, to compromise by asking the City to provide mailing
202 lists for a mailing produced by an association in lieu of possibly
203 giving out private information, thus the current language of Item 2.

204
205 Member Manke sought clarification as to whether the intent was to
206 ask the City to pay for those mailings.

207
208 Member Sanders responded that this was the intent to get those
209 neighborhood associations (NA) started by the City providing that
210 mailing as another tool to advertise their intent to form an
211 association. Member Sanders advised that this was intended as
212 only one initial mailing (e.g. post card mailing), such as had been
213 done by the McCarron's NA, but not on a regular basis. Member
214 Sanders suggested this could be a tool in addition to the City's
215 website, *Roseville Review* and/or NextDoor.com.

216
217 Member Manke expressed her personal preference to see this
218 recommendation more clearly defined to avoid a NA presuming
219 they were able to send out something that could cost the City
220 (taxpayers) a huge amount of money, or that they were able to send
221 out a number of mailings. Member Manke noted that could simply
222 state that the City would assist with the first or initial mailing, and
223 mailings after that would be the responsibility of the NA.

224

225 Member Sanders stated that was initially spelled out, but due to the
226 vagueness of public/private information, it was determined it
227 would be better to allow the City to handle it.

228
229 Member Manke reiterated her only concern was the potential cost
230 for the City.

231
232 Member Gardella clarified that at this level of a CEC
233 recommendation to the City Council it wouldn't be necessary to be
234 that explicitly detailed, and suggested would be the responsibility
235 of the City to set those parameters, how to fund it, or how public
236 and private data was defined.

237
238 Member Sanders agreed with Member Gardella, noting the
239 additional information from the City based on past precedence as
240 well. Member Manke agreed, opining it would be nice to provide
241 a little tighter definition.

242
243 Member Gardella suggested defining the mailing as a post card,
244 with Member Manke agreeing that would serve to restrain costs, if
245 stated something like, "The City will pay for an initial, one-time
246 post card size mailing," in order to keep costs in line. Member
247 Gardella suggested either the City pay for the "first-time" or "one
248 mailing per year" or "one mailing for a certain period for the
249 association," as options.

250
251 Member Sanders suggested stipulating one mailing per year to get
252 an association on its feet and get it started.

253
254 Chair Becker noted that this (one mailing per year) was the
255 recommendation in the task force report.

256
257 . Member Grefenberg suggested one initial mailing for already
258 existent Neighborhood Associations with its description and
259 seeking people to join, or for new Associations announcing the
260 Association's first organizational meeting.

261 .

262
263 Member Manke noted this would give each neighborhood or
264 existing Association an opportunity, from addresses provided by
265 the City, to reach all neighbors in their area and give them an
266 opportunity to join.

267
268 Member Grefenberg noted that whether a new or existing NA,
269 either could benefit from such a mailing seeking members.

270 Member Gardella clarified that she was only stating a one-time
271 mailing, as an example, as a recommendation adding more detail to
272 the original Task Force recommendation,
273 Member Manke stated she could envision that when an
274 Association was forming and organizing, reaching out with an
275 initial mailing inviting neighbors to attend that meeting to learn
276 more, or directing neighbors to the Neighborhood Association
277 website to learn more. However, Member Manke stated she saw
278 this initial mailing via post card as instructional; and then at that
279 point it was up to the NA to work within their neighborhood to pull
280 things together. Member Manke opined that at the point, the City
281 had met their reasonable expectation of what they were being
282 asked to do.

283
284 Chair Becker agreed with the rationale provided by Member
285 Manke, opining it was not the City's responsibility for long-term
286 sustainability of NA's. If the goal was to make sure everyone
287 within a certain boundary was made aware of the opportunity, the
288 onus was on the City to facilitate that. Chair Becker stated he had
289 no problem with the City assisting with one-time per year annual
290 meeting notices, but not for providing generic information, rather
291 simply where, when, and inviting neighbors to attend, or
292 announcing voting on the NA structure, similar to other public
293 notices sent out by the City.

294
295 Member Manke sought clarification from Chair Becker on whether
296 his intent was for an annual or initial mailing, with Chair Becker
297 stating he was open to either one.

298
299 While stating she could support an organizational mailing, If
300 supporting sixteen potential NA's, Member Manke expressed
301 concern with the City paying for an annual post card for each NA
302 every year, opining that it would prove costly.

303
304 Chair Becker reiterated he was sympathetic to that concern.

305
306 Commissioner Grefenberg interjected that it would be a long time
307 before the City had 16 neighborhood associations, and cautioned
308 against determining neighborhoods based upon the past precedence
309 of sixteen planning districts.

310
311 Member Sanders stated that was the Task Force's rational for
312 asking the City to place that information on the City's website and
313 for space in the *City News* newsletter to get that information out.

314

315 Member Manke opined if an Association was going to be
316 successful it should determine other ways to get the word out.
317 Member Manke reiterated that the City should only be held
318 responsible for a one-time post card notice for neighbors to be
319 initially notified, but nothing beyond that mailing.
320

321 Member Sanders stated the Task Force thought funding would
322 come from the Roseville Communications Fund.
323

324 Member Grefenberg suggested those specific details be left up to
325 the City, and provided potential wording --if there was
326 Commission consensus --for revising Item #2 as follows: *“The*
327 *City can encourage formation or the existence of a NA by paying*
328 *for and coordinating a mailing list to notify residents of the NA.”*
329 Member Grefenberg opined this would provide minimum
330 expectations of the City via reasonable mailing of a post card, ,
331 while providing notice to all residents within a geographic area
332 Member Miller suggested keeping the language slightly vague and
333 only as a broad suggestion versus prescriptive on size, etc. was
334 better, noting that there may be the potential to piggyback the
335 notice with some other mailing, and also allowed some flexibility
336 through the *City News* as another option.
337

338 Member Manke noted the least expensive option would be a post
339 card mailing.
340

341 Member Grefenberg suggested staying with recommending a
342 policy that was not prohibitively expensive or a minor expense
343 only He added he had worked with the City’s Planning Department
344 to gain some idea of how many households might be in a typical
345 NA, with the largest neighborhood being that of Member Sanders,
346 with approximately 3,700 households, and his neighborhood at
347 approximately 3,600, which could provide some idea of the
348 maximum costs.
349

350 Member Gardella stated “vague is good,” noting that the CEC’s
351 charge from the City Council was to make recommendations, and
352 hopefully they would prove cost-effective.
353

354 Member Gardella also suggested the CEC’s recommendation
355 include grandfathering in the three existing NA’s to ensure they
356 could benefit from a city-generated mailing list similar to that
357 benefit for new NA’s.
358

359 On behalf of her NA, Member Sanders expressed appreciation for
360 that suggestion.

361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404

By consensus, the CEC agreed as noted.

Member Grefenberg asked that the CEC review the initial Item #1 under “How can the City encourage formation of NA’s’ on page 5 as well. Item #1 reads that the City will provide space on its web site...offering a list of associations with contact names , e-mail addresses, ...and an interactive map...of each association.

Specific to that item it was stated that the key was the interactive map and as such that was a high cost for for a Neighborhood Association to absorb. Therefore, at this stage of making a recommendation to the City Council, it was suggested having a map on the City’s website highlighting various neighborhoods and a pop-up contact name for that particular area of Roseville.

Member Sanders clarified that she hadn’t intended that it be instantaneous, and even if interactive down the road, it would remain a resident resource as part of the City’s website. Member Gardella agreed, since residents may not even know the boundaries of their NA.

Member Grefenberg suggested revising language to leave it up to the particular Association as to who the “contact” person should be rather than requiring it be the “lead” for each NA.

Chair Becker noted it should be an official contact or spokesperson, potentially even the membership officer of the NA.

Member Sanders noted that, if someone accessed the NA website to look up a list and provide information, they should be able to determine if a NA had already been established in their neighborhood, and if so, how to connect with it through that contact person.

Specific to Item #2, in the section on “encouraging formation of NA’s”, Member Sanders noted the intent of the Task Force was to include space for articles promoting NA events or meetings, not anything major.

Member Grefenberg offered his support for this item, but questioned how Items #2 and #3 were related and whether they should be combined (Item #3, how-to document or tool kits).

405 Member Gardella stated the intent was to provide a prospective
406 NA with options for their formation, or as suggested by Chair
407 Becker a “NA in a Box.”

408
409 Member Miller referenced the recent creation by the City’s Public
410 Works, Environment and Transportation Commission (PWETC) of
411 a Neighborhood Organized Garbage Collection educational tool,
412 which he found a great example.

413
414 Member Grefenberg reported that Edina has an actual tool kit, and
415 offered to make it available for the CEC’s December meeting.
416 Member Grefenberg noted that it provided options for creation of a
417 NA, and boiler plate forms to get a NA going and suggested
418 structures, whether the NA formed as a 501C.3 organization or a
419 less formal structure.

420
421 Member Sanders suggested it also be compiled in a packet that
422 could be displayed and obtained along with other forms available
423 at City Hall. Member Grefenberg suggested it also be made
424 available on the City’s website.

425
426 Member Manke sought clarification as to whether the intent was
427 for the City to provide that tool kit, with the Commission’s
428 consensus Community Engagement Commission being
429 affirmative.

430
431 Member Manke questioned if the Commission’s intent was for the
432 City to create that tool kit as well. Member Gardella suggested, if
433 the City Council accepted the CEC’s recommendations, that could
434 come back to the CEC to work out those details.

435
436 CEC Liaison Bowman suggested it would be smart for the CEC to
437 provide some input as to what was included in the tool kit and
438 make that part of their initial recommendations to the City Council
439 to ensure staff didn’t fall short of the CEC’s expectations or
440 eliminate something that may prove vital for NA’s.

441
442 Member Sanders suggested seeking volunteer assistance from the
443 three established NA’s to provide that input.

444
445 Member Grefenberg suggested postponing further discussion on
446 the specifics until the Commission had an opportunity to view
447 examples of tool kits.

448

449 Member Gardella questioned if the CEC should have a discussion
450 about the actual documents needed for the tool kit before making
451 their recommendation to the City Council.

452
453 Mr. Bowman responded that wouldn't be necessary as long as they
454 provided the City Council with a list of ideas as part of their
455 recommendation. Mr. Bowman clarified that these documents
456 should include a set of core items intended as living or dynamic
457 documents.

458
459 Manke suggested a generic "how to" document to be included in
460 the tool kit that could be expanded upon, including the types of
461 Association structure, and supporting documents for each.
462 Member Manke noted something as simple as that could return to
463 the Commission for its input regarding such a template. Member
464 Gardella agreed with that suggestion.

465
466
467 Chair Becker suggested tips for "how to get the word out", such as
468 the aforementioned mailing, could be included as part of the
469 suggestions in the tool kit.

470
471 Discussion ensued as to distribution options for the tool kit (hard
472 copies and electronic copies); recognizing things that may not be
473 applicable for printing off the website but could be included as
474 samples in a box or tool kit as examples to promote NA's
475 Chair Becker opined that having online work documents available
476 for organizational documents would prove much more useful, and
477 then point them to those other resources.

478
479 Member Gardella agreed, noting it was less important to be
480 concerned with the sophistication of the tool kit and specific
481 materials as it was to make sure contact information and resources
482 were readily available.

483
484 Returning to the Section "facilitating NA's," Item #1 (page 6),
485 Chair Becker asked Mr. Bowman if he was aware of a current City
486 policy on how/who gets access to park and city buildings at no
487 charge.

488
489 Mr. Bowman stated he wasn't sure how formal the process to
490 prioritize users or if there was an actual policy in place.

491
492 Before getting further into that area, Chair Becker asked Mr.
493 Bowman to research that item and report back to the CEC.

494

495 Member Grefenberg stated he had heard varying opinions,
496 expressing concern there may currently be some inconsistencies
497 among user groups and how fees or no fees were addressed.
498 Member Grefenberg asked that Mr. Bowman research not only
499 park buildings, but also any and all city buildings available for use
500 by resident groups.

501
502 Chair Becker noted the need to determine the current policy being
503 used; and agreed that Member Grefenberg brought up a good point
504 about scheduling and prioritization; suggesting that discussion
505 occur once information becomes available to the CEC. Member
506 Manke noted the need to address frequency of free use or uses in
507 general as well.

508
509 Member Grefenberg noted some neighborhoods were blessed with
510 a park building in their neighborhood, with many of them well
511 booked; and enquired if Chair Becker was suggesting priority be
512 given to NA's.

513
514 Chair Becker stated that was something needing further
515 consideration as more information was provided by Mr. Bowman.
516 However, Chair Becker stated he was not suggesting NA's receive
517 priority, but wanted to establish clear policy going forward on how
518 building use was prioritized.

519
520 Member Sanders advised that from the perspective of her NA, they
521 had expectations of paying for that building use, but suggested it
522 could depend on the situation and if the meeting was open to the
523 entire community or specific to the NA.

524
525 Member Manke suggested in considering prioritization, the actual
526 function and specific date for a Association could be somewhat
527 more flexible.

528
529 Member Grefenberg recalled some discussion early on in the Task
530 Force that the City give priority to Associations, but thought that
531 had been dropped. He asked Commissioner Sanders if she could
532 remember that discussion.

533
534 Member Sanders noted that her experience was that park buildings
535 were frequently booked on weekends, but her NA usually met on
536 weekdays, which proved less of a problem.

537
538 Regarding Item #3 under How the City Could Facilitate
539 Associations (page 6) specific to city resources, the consensus of
540 the CEC was that this educational information and documentation

541 should be available for any group and referenced accordingly as
542 part of the tool kit.

543
544 Specific to Item #4 (page 6) related to designating a staff liaison
545 /information source, Chair Becker questioned if a designated staff
546 person was necessary if the information was available online.

547
548 Speaking from her personal perspective, Member Gardella opined
549 the City would still need a staff person designated to address
550 questions or provide additional information beyond that available
551 on the website.

552
553 Member Miller opined it made sense to have that contact, but
554 questioned who should or would serve as that point person.

555
556 Member Manke expressed her concern that someone would have
557 those added duties to their current job duties, or that it may
558 necessitate the City hiring a specific person solely to deal with that,
559 costing taxpayers more money.

560
561 Chair Becker concurred with Member Manke, suggesting the need
562 to build some limits around that contact person, such as providing
563 resource information on specific subjects versus focusing on
564 continued assistance to NA's that may prove very time-consuming.

565
566 Member Sanders suggested the purpose of such a contact person
567 would be to direct NA's to those resources.

568
569 Member Gardella noted that in the past, she and Member Sanders,
570 as well as other residents, had volunteered their services as a point
571 of contact for people interested in forming NAs beyond city staff
572 as well.

573
574 Member Grefenberg suggested the staff liaison could simply direct
575 NA's to those volunteers. However, he stated he preferred
576 language as currently written for recommendation to the City
577 Council,

578
579 Consensus of the CEC was to leave written as is, suggesting that
580 the City Council could push back if they found the current
581 language undesirable.

582
583 Member Grefenberg stated that he personally thought the City
584 should have its own community engagement staff person and that
585 this idea was not new, but buried in their recommendations to the

586 Council. He added he would eventually encourage the City to hire
587 a part-time staff person specific to that area.

588
589 Member Miller opined that was too far into the details at this time
590 for a CEC recommendation to the City Council and much too
591 specific.

592
593 Member Grefenberg clarified that his intent was to include it as a
594 future possibility and as part of the recommendation, but offered
595 his support for the language as currently written.

596
597 At the suggestion of Member Manke to add language to set some
598 “parameters,” Member Gardella opined the City Council could tell
599 the CEC if they preferred that; with Chair Becker concurring.

600
601 Member Grefenberg questioned if the intent was to include
602 existing NA’s. Member Manke suggested caution, as that
603 addressed continued support.

604
605 Member Sanders suggested leaving existing NA’s in the language
606 as written.

607
608 Member Gardella asked Members Sanders and Grefenberg, based
609 on their involvement in existing NA’s, whether they thought a staff
610 liaison was still needed by their NA.

611
612 Member Sanders responded their NA would not need a liaison;
613 with Member Grefenberg stated his NA typically went to each
614 department or City source as needed, whether addressing zoning,
615 sidewalks, public hearings, or other topics. However, Member
616 Grefenberg spoke in support of clarifying the existing language of
617 Item #4 to read:

618
619 *“The City will designate a staff liaison to serve as a source of*
620 *information available for residents interested in forming a*
621 *neighborhood association **or joining an existing NA.**”*

622
623 **By consensus, the CEC agreed** to that revised language.

624
625 Related to Item #5, Member Grefenberg spoke in support of the
626 language for this item as written. Member Grefenberg noted some
627 city departments (e.g. Planning and Police) that aggressively
628 sought out grant for city functions.

629
630 Member Sanders noted other communities who sought grants for
631 NA’s.

632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677

With his personal limited experience with grant coordination, Chair Becker opined to him it seemed to go beyond simply knowing of the existence of grant funds, but also facilitating the governance around grants (e.g. reporting and other requirements) throughout the process. Chair Becker questioned if the city provided grant information to NA's, were they also taking on the liability for proper execution of grants in successfully awarded to NA's.

Member Miller opined this would be more of a list than the entire process.

Member Gardella agreed with Member Miller, suggesting Item #6 got to Chair Becker's concern.

Discussion ensued regarding responsibilities of the city and NA's to further research grant opportunities; including that information as part of the NA tool kit.

Member Grefenberg stated his concern with the word "maintain" in Item #5 (*The City would develop, maintain, and provide information about existing funding and grants for neighborhood associations*), suggesting it be deleted.

Member Sanders opined she found "maintain" to refer to keeping the grant information up-to-date on the website.

Based on his personal experience, Member Grefenberg stated he did not believe anyone in his neighborhood would step forward to maintain that grant information; therefore he would like to put that responsibility on City, but stated his willingness to drop his initial suggestion to delete "maintain."

Further discussion ensued as to the number and type of grants and how exhaustive the list of opportunities may actually prove; people tasked in various departments to seek out grants and what to look for and where that may be specific to each NA depending on their activities; and challenges in keeping the list of opportunities or available grants up-to-date and complete over time.

Member Manke opined it was in some degree the responsibility of an Association to look for those opportunities on their own, and while there may be a pool within which that information could be consolidated, she didn't find it to be the sole responsibility of the City.

678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723

Chair Becker suggested moving this item to the tool kit as part of the bullet list to provide basic information about grants and in doing so putting the onus on the NA.

Members Manke and Gardella agreed with that suggestion.

Member Grefenberg stated his reluctance with that suggestion was that in order to be good at getting grants, you had to be aware of what was available, and questioned if a typical resident had those skills.

Member Manke noted that may not be a skill of the staff contact either.

Additional discussion included information available to city staff that may be geared to specific departments or functions based on periodicals or journals in their field; no current designated grant coordinator on city staff to search out possible grants; and whether each NA could designate one person to research those opportunities if and when they were found.

Member Gardella suggested by NA's working cooperatively to pursue grant opportunities, it could provide a way for them to commit to each other or build the community, at which time they could post that as a source of NA information, and depending on their specific legal structure and/or financial sponsors. Member Gardella noted this could simply be provided in the tool box as sources that the city encouraged NA's to search out further.

Since there are currently only three existing NA's, Member Sanders stated she didn't see them moving fast on this opportunity; and recalled discussion of the Task Force of having a representative or leader from each NA meet periodically or annually with the City Manager to discuss such opportunities based on their specific needs.

Member Grefenberg suggested more frequent meetings of those parties, and calling it a "discussion" to address various issues. Member Sanders suggested the discussion could address city business as it pertained to neighborhoods.

Member Manke suggested part of that discussion's agenda could be to coordinate talk about grants, and if something was found by one NA to bring it forward at that point, also making the City Manager aware of it as well.

724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769

Member Sanders noted the possibility of creating a closed Face Book page for those leaders to share that information.

By consensus, the CEC accepted those suggestions as noted.

Chair Becker clarified that his intent was for crowd-sourcing this item, not necessarily making it the sole responsibility of the city.

Member Manke suggested still including Item #5 as a bullet point and part of the tool kit for the time being.

Member Gardella wondered with both Items #5 and #6 if it didn't mean they couldn't happen at some point, but not sure whether it was necessary to include either as a specific item. Chair Becker noted this was his rationale in including them as a tool kit item, and council/staff could then put them at whatever level was most beneficial.

Members further discussed how to address these items individually or as part of the tool kit bullet list; with consensus developing and Chair Becker confirming to wait for formal action until after additional tweaking was completed and a formal draft list of recommendations was identified; with the items remaining as is to allow a reaction from the City Council when presented with the CEC's recommendations.

Member Gardella stated that, in general, she was in agreement, especially given the amount of hard work done by the Task Force in developing these items.

Member Sanders advised that when Task Force Member Lisa McCormick had been doing research, she had reviewed outer-ring information, and could provide additional detail on that research, and those cities sharing resources and reallocating those resources to NA's.

Member Grefenberg stated he didn't feel there had been closure on that discussion in the Task Force, and based on his experience in the City of St., Paul, he noted both St. Paul and Minneapolis had district councils that received funding from those cities, some through Community Development Block Grants (CDBG).

Member Manke questioned if the city had that much money sitting around without purpose, which she would find personally scary. If the city was to establish funds, Member Manke asked where that

770 money would come from, or if money was really needed for a NA,
771 asked if that would serve to jack up taxes more. As an example, if
772 the intent is for those funds to provide for neighborhood
773 beautification, Member Manke noted that was kind of what a NA
774 would do and suggested it would be their responsibility to raise
775 money for those efforts from within their area versus expecting the
776 city as a whole to come up with funds to accomplish it.
777

778 Member Sanders clarified that the Task Force wasn't thinking that
779 grand, but due to her own NA's participation with park clean-up –
780 whether a city or county park, city boulevard, or a park name sign
781 in front of each flower bed, their intent was for smaller
782 expenditures (e.g. \$50 for flowers, seeds or a related item).
783

784 In response to a question from Grefenberg g, Member Sanders
785 confirmed that their NA charged an annual \$20 association fee.
786

787 Member Manke questioned at what point suggestions stopped
788 saying the city has to buy this or that, opining it would eventually
789 reflect on city taxes. Member Manke opined that either a
790 neighborhood is fine with what the city can do or provide, or it
791 comes up with a NA and money to accomplish what they thought
792 was needed.
793

794 Member Gardella advised that whether it was a tax or budget issue,
795 it was also prudent to consider not just what the NA could benefit
796 from the city, but also recognize that the city would get a benefit
797 from vibrant neighborhoods and community. Working from that
798 assumption, Member Gardella suggested it may be beneficial for
799 the city to invest in flowers, trees or different items which a
800 neighborhood may not be able to afford on its own or through a
801 robust NA that can afford such amenities.
802

803 Member Gardella admitted she got nervous about the city
804 managing a grant for a NA, but finding money in its budget to help
805 out a NA was not as menacing. If the Commission determined by
806 consensus, to leave the language of Item #6 "as is," Member
807 Gardella suggested letting the City Council tell the Commission
808 whether there was a clear consensus for one or the other.
809

810 Member Miller agreed with the comments of Member Gardella,
811 but also agreed with Member Grefenberg's concerns that this is
812 premature; he worried it may create a controversy or raise a red
813 flag that could potentially sink the whole thing; as such it may be
814 better left out.
815

816 Chair Becker noted that may not be an unrealistic scenario; and
817 suggested the scope for the commission’s recommendation on
818 NA’s wasn’t whether or not the three existing NA’s get flower
819 beds or are able to address beautification projects in blighted areas
820 (e.g. city boulevards).

821
822 Member Manke noted that already occurred. Chair Becker clarified
823 that was his point.

824
825 As another example, Member Grefenberg noted in his
826 neighborhood residents with the assistance of its Neighborhood
827 Association brought the need for a County Road B pathway to City
828 Council attention, with the City subsequently finding money to pay
829 for the pathway.

830
831 Chair Becker reiterated that his point was that it was the
832 responsibility of the neighborhood to bring such things to the city’s
833 attention.

834
835 As another example, Member Manke clarified that she didn’t feel
836 it was responsible for the city to pay for a horticulturist to speak to
837 just one special area or NA when it should be made available and
838 of benefit to the entire community of Roseville.

839
840 Member Grefenberg opined that the Task Force’s report language
841 sounded to him that the city would have a line item in its annual
842 budget for NA’s; and therefore he found it premature to consider
843 such a recommendation until those Neighborhood Associations
844 demonstrated their value to the City Council.

845
846 Member Grefenberg suggested it would be best to table such a
847 recommendation; or at a minimum to delete current language
848 suggesting an “established fund.” For the 2016 budget, Member
849 Grefenberg noted it was now well on its way toward approval at
850 this stage, and didn’t want to provide any excuse for this NA effort
851 to be deferred to the next budget cycle based on this part of
852 recommendations.

853
854
855 Member Grefenberg stated he still found this language too strong,
856 and suggested either tabling or rejecting this item for reasons as
857 stated so far, with his personal suggestion to delete Item #6 at this
858 time.

859
860
861

862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907

Motion

Grefenberg moved, Manke seconded, deleting Item #6 from the report to the City Council as unnecessary at this time.

Member Sanders opined this was important to the community and needed now.

Substitute Motion

Gardella suggested a substitute motion, that where appropriate the city will consider or can make funds available to support NA activities (as currently listed and including education). Member Gardella noted this would address there being no mandate or set-aside funds, but provided availability that the City had on its radar that it would prove beneficial to support NA activities.

Member Grefenberg noted this was not the way this item came from the Task Force.

Member Gardella expressed her hope that this one item would not sink the ship; and expressed her hope that the City Council would be open to the recommendation.

Chair Becker stated his support for the motion to delete, but was also in favor of the alternate language provided by Member Gardella. In response to a question from Member Gardella, Chair Becker noted the alternate language could be added as a new recommendation.

Chair Becker called the vote for the original motion.

Ayes: 5

Nays: 1 (Sanders)

Motion carried.

Specific to Item #7(*The City will provide a website or similar function to which the neighborhood association could provide content*), Chair Becker sought consensus that this item could be incorporated into Item #1 with NA's tasked with providing content about their activities.

Member Grefenberg asked if the language was in considering a project or asking others in the neighborhood to joins, with Item #1 specifically addressing the contact person. Member Manke noted there was a significant difference in the two and costs and time commitments of the city would depend on the technical abilities and desires of a NA.

908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953

Member Manke sought clarification whether the intent was asking the City to create a secondary website or simply to provide a page; with Member Grefenberg correcting his intention to state web “page” not “site.”

Mr. Bowman noted this would be similar to that offered other associations or organizations on the city’s website. Mr. Bowman advised that those groups currently send him information for his review and/or update, similar to that input received from the City Council’s advisory commissions.

Discussion ensued regarding frequency of requested updates; current city staffing to process those updates and whether or not it proved problematic once incorporating NA’s; use by Associations depending on their activities and organizational structure; city staff editing Association submissions that hopefully would not prove substantive; or part of an Association’s advocacy efforts versus informational/educational input.

Member Manke noted the current availability on the city’s website for resident resources that could address NA’s and include an interactive map, contact information for each NA, and a place to link to get more information. Member Manke opined this would allow NA’s to respond rather than having so many additional pages added noting at some point would the website reach a point where it couldn’t handle more without hiring additional staff. Based on her personal job experience, Member Manke noted it was time-consuming to update websites in a timely manner depending on the formatting of information received.

Further discussion ensued regarding staff changing content of NA submissions; appropriate material for submission; and highlighting particular projects in which NA’s are currently working on versus advocacy on the city’s website by one or more NA’s for their specific interests.

Member Manke noted it had already been determined that NA’s could post information on the city’s website under “city news” about upcoming events or by adding another section under Item #7 as listed (page 6).

Member Grefenberg suggested some guidelines could be provided for NA’s or more explicit prohibitions against advocacy as Chair Becker had raised this as a potential problem.

954 Member Miller opined it didn't make sense to have the city
955 provide the website and/or maintain it for NA's, but then having
956 the Association control their own content when potential issues
957 arise, as talked about tonight. If the interest of NA's ramped up
958 and more organizations began asking for these types of changes,
959 Member Miller stated he would support not including #7, but
960 simply provide a contact information for and a link on a static page
961 to Association websites. Member Grefenberg further opined that
962 was putting too many burdens on the Neighborhood Association.

963
964 Member Manke questioned the opposite view of putting that
965 burden on the City.

966
967 Member Sanders opined the report language was not specific
968 enough to the task force's original thinking.

969
970 Member Gardella questioned if most NA's would have the
971 capacity or skills to have a website or the task force's rationale.

972
973 Member Sanders opined she thought NA's would have that
974 capacity and skill, and suggested this may be a way for the city to
975 provide assistance to NA's even if by a link; further opining that
976 was worth it and should be pursued.

977
978 If the City's website had that NA information and link available
979 for the NA website as they'd established and maintained, Member
980 Gardella asked if that was the intent of the task force.

981
982 Member Sanders agreed with Chair Becker's suggestion that the
983 page be static and not requiring a lot of city staff work, and simply
984 serve as another way the city could help get the word out for and
985 about NA's.

986
987 Further discussion included the differences in a static page and/or
988 blog posts; information to be provided (coming events, activities,
989 or next NA meeting dates); timing of various publication tools and
990 lead time required (e.g. *City News*) and advantages of providing a
991 Neighborhood Association tab on the City's website to provide
992 event/calendar information with the Association feeding that
993 information on their next month's activities to Mr. Bowman for
994 processing and including on the calendar. This would compare
995 favorably to having another entire page and layer to the City's
996 website, with everything including a contact person for each NA
997 all in one place.

998

999 Member Sanders suggested including more detailed information
1000 (e.g. blog) providing a taste or flavor for life in each area of the
1001 community.

1002
1003 After further discussion, Chair Becker cautioned that the CEC was
1004 getting hung up on specific content and implementation methods
1005 rather than the more generic recommendations intended. Chair
1006 Becker suggested language for Item #7 revised as follows:

1007 *“The City should provide contact information for each NA,*
1008 *including upcoming events, and potentially provide a landing page*
1009 *for each NA that included several paragraphs about the NA and*
1010 *how many households it represented and other pertinent*
1011 *information.”*

1012
1013 **By consensus, this language was agreed upon by the**
1014 **Commission.**

1015
1016 Chair Becker noted that there was apparently not yet consensus on
1017 how frequent those updates should be beyond association meeting
1018 dates/times; and what constituted a reasonable burden on staff.
1019 Chair Becker opined there was also some difference in boundary
1020 issues about advocacy issues and lobbying efforts by specific
1021 NA’s. Chair Becker noted, in general, the CEC was okay with
1022 Item #7 with some constraints about content, but that those issues
1023 be addressed elsewhere.

1024
1025 Member Grefenberg suggested those boundaries could be
1026 addressed to make them clear; and further suggested incorporating
1027 some of the language of Item #7 with Item #1.

1028
1029 Member Miller suggested that the tool kit list of items include a
1030 brief guide on how to build a website easily or a link to a resource.

1031
1032 Member Gardella suggested a list of things Associations may find
1033 useful, and different than ideas on content. Member Gardella
1034 spoke in support of Chair Becker’s idea of describing boundaries,
1035 including the number of residents in a NA, and rather than having
1036 multiple places on the City’s website, have one basic area to
1037 include NA information.

1038
1039 Chair Becker suggested rewriting Items #1 and #7 providing a list
1040 of what type of information was included.

1041
1042 Member Gardella agreed, but suggested incorporating Items #1, #2
1043 and #7, including upcoming events listed, and combining things
1044 pertinent to the media sources the city could provide.

1045
1046
1047
1048
1049
1050
1051
1052
1053
1054
1055
1056
1057
1058
1059
1060
1061
1062
1063
1064
1065
1066
1067
1068
1069
1070
1071
1072
1073
1074
1075
1076
1077
1078
1079
1080
1081
1082
1083
1084
1085
1086
1087
1088
1089

Chair Becker spoke in support of combining Items #1 and #7 and striking the website language completely from Item #2.

Member Grefenberg questioned if the intent was for updates or as Item #1 was currently written; which wouldn't allow a NA to post any pressing issues. He noted the recently organized Alzheimer's group now had this opportunity to update its page on the City's website.

Member Gardella questioned why a NA would want to include burning issues on a static website page.

Member Manke concurred, asking why a NA would not use another option for those burning issues.

Chair Becker offered to reword Items #1 AND #2 outside the meeting, under the "encourage" section and relocate Item #7 to the "facilitate" section.

Based on the initial list provided by the task force, Chair Becker asked if there were any additional items the CEC wanted to add.

Motion

Gardella moved, Sanders seconded, that where appropriate the city will consider making funds available to support NA activities (as currently listed in the former Item #6 list of activities and including education, improvements, beautification, community events, etc.).

Member Miller stated this made sense and kept things more open; and offered his full support.

Member Grefenberg noted this left it up to the City Council every time, if the language remained, "The City WILL consider..." versus saying, "The City MUST provide..."

Member Miller recalled previous discussion that it would be scary to have language as previously stated in Item #6, and spoke in support of getting the parameters out there so as to avoid any future surprises.

Member Grefenberg suggested that the City Council could react to the language, but suggested committing to considering different language, such as "The City shall..."

1090 Chair Becker stated he supported this motion as it addressed his
1091 concerns, opining that the issues may prove broader than a
1092 Association and they are likely related to ongoing advocacy and
1093 lobbying by the NA anyway.

1094
1095 **Ayes: 6**
1096 **Nays: 0**
1097 **Motion carried.**
1098

1099 Specific to the paragraph after items and entitled, “City
1100 Expectations of Communications from Neighborhood
1101 Associations,” Chair Becker sought any additional input from the
1102 CEC.
1103

1104 Discussion included whether this was for tonight’s discussion or
1105 future study since not included in the numbered lists; notification
1106 preferences for residents to avoid duplicated efforts; how the city
1107 communicates with established NA’s; and the current revision of
1108 how the city communicates related to notice areas and zoning or
1109 land use issues; how best to ensure residents are aware of what is
1110 going on in their community; and the overall benefit to the
1111 community beyond simply NA’s and benefits in the city notifying
1112 NA’s to spread those communication efforts.
1113

1114 Member Gardella opined she found this paragraph to be a great
1115 intention statement for all of the community; and how to cultivate
1116 a change in culture and engage the community beyond NA and
1117 serving as an umbrella statement for the entire document.
1118

1119 Member Miller stated he didn’t disagree with the sentiment of the
1120 paragraph.
1121

1122 Specific to the comments of Members Miller and Gardella,
1123 Member Grefenberg asked if they felt this paragraph related to all
1124 sorts of city issues and efforts beyond the NA and therefore was
1125 not relevant for this report to the City Council.
1126

1127 Member Miller clarified that he didn’t think it was relevant to this
1128 section of the report; with Member Gardella agreeing it didn’t fall
1129 under the purview of formation of a Neighborhood Association.
1130

1131 Chair Becker suggested it applied to NA’s after their formation,
1132 and expectations after their establishment.
1133

1134 Member Grefenberg suggested retaining the first sentence of the
1135 paragraph as it related to this report; and deleting the remainder of
1136 the paragraph from this section for further study.

1137
1138 As suggested by Member Miller, Member Gardella agreed that it
1139 was an umbrella paragraph and at a minimum should not be
1140 included in this section.

1141
1142 Member Miller suggested tabling this discussion at this point, as
1143 the remainder of the document was not available to provide the
1144 context, even though he thought another portion of the paragraph
1145 may fit in nicely.

1146
1147 Chair Becker stated that he felt Members Miller and Gardella were
1148 on point, with the focus on how the city intended to alert residents
1149 and communications channels to do so. If a Association can
1150 accomplish that focus and reach out to residents in their
1151 neighborhood to disseminate information, Chair Becker suggested
1152 it meant the NA became a communication means, but agreed it was
1153 not related to formation of NA's, but in how they could be
1154 engaged.

1155
1156 Member Grefenberg expressed his comfort in deleting the
1157 paragraph for possible consideration elsewhere upon further study,
1158 but retaining the first sentence in this report.

1159
1160 Member Miller questioned that sentence's relevancy to this
1161 section, and suggested it be relocated at the end of the report or in
1162 recognition of the whole thing.

1163
1164 Chair Becker noted the discussion is about bullet points at this
1165 stage, not paragraph formatting; and therefore stated he was not
1166 going to concern himself with this paragraph until it came up later.

1167
1168 Member Grefenberg sought some clarification of where the
1169 consensus of the CEC was currently at.

1170
1171 Chair Becker clarified that would assume the CEC was starting
1172 with the existing document that was currently being edited by this
1173 body. Again, Chair Becker noted attempts were not being made to
1174 wordsmith a past report but using it to get to a new report.

1175
1176 **Motion**
1177 Gardella moved, Manke seconded, removal of this paragraph from
1178 this list of recommendations.

1179

1180 Member Grefenberg asked that he could be assured that this
1181 motion wouldn't preclude what eventually went before the City
1182 Council.

1183

1184 **Ayes: 6**

1185 **Nays: 0**

1186 **Motion carried.**

1187

1188 By consensus, the CEC determined that as far as association
1189 responsibilities, when a more formalized draft document was
1190 available to recommend to the City Council additional items could
1191 be considered at that point.

1192

1193 **b. Update on Community Listening and Learning Events**

1194 Member Gardella reported that she, Member Sanders and Chair Becker
1195 had met with Mayor Roe and Councilmember Laliberte and noted
1196 everyone was generally on board with this most recent proposal for a
1197 listening sessions in the community and the conversation centered on
1198 details, such as how many listening sessions and who would be involved.
1199 Member Gardella advised that she would take results of that discussion
1200 back to the Madeline Lohman from the Advocates for Human Rights to
1201 provide more detail and articulating that to staff for presentation to the full
1202 City Council when it was more fully-fleshed out after that next November
1203 19, 2105 meeting, and with an update for the CEC in December.

1204

1205 **c. Update on Joint Task Force on Zoning Notification**

1206 Member Manke advised that the joint task force met after the last CEC
1207 meeting, but they had still been short of commissioners representing the
1208 Planning Commission and that being Commissioner Daire, the keeper of
1209 the meeting minutes. Member Manke apologized for not having more
1210 useful information to give the CEC, but will continue to arrange another
1211 meeting to provide their final report, as well as to approve those meeting
1212 minutes

1213 Member Manke advised that Community Development Director Paul
1214 Bilotta was going to put together an overview of this Task Force's
1215 discussions to-date and the direction being taken by the task force and
1216 when finalized by this Commission it would go to the Planning
1217 Commission for their information, then to the City Council.

1218

1219 Member Grefenberg stated it was his understanding that the Planning
1220 Commission would be asked to approve recommendations.

1221

1222 Member Manke advised that she was not aware they were going to be
1223 asked to do so. Member Grefenberg stated he had a different
1224 understanding of the process as described by Manke. He believed both
1225 Commissions would need to approve the report.

1226
1227
1228
1229
1230
1231
1232
1233
1234
1235
1236
1237
1238
1239
1240
1241
1242
1243
1244
1245
1246
1247
1248
1249
1250
1251
1252
1253
1254
1255
1256
1257
1258
1259
1260
1261
1262
1263
1264
1265
1266
1267
1268
1269
1270
1271

Member Manke advised that the presentation would definitely go to the CEC first, then if well-received, it would proceed to the Planning Commission as an informational item but not for formal action.

d. Update on Civic Engagement Website Module

Mr. Bowman reported that the official Speak Up! Roseville site had officially been launched on November 7, 2015. Mr. Bowman reviewed the format and content of the new site as launched and plans as it evolves and citizens become more aware of it through a variety of other media sources to alert them to the site.

Of note, Mr. Bowman noted there is one discussion site on city communications and looking forward to the 2040 Comprehensive Plan Update. While feedback and use is still growing, Mr. Bowman anticipated more comfortable posting their ideas, with approximately 65-70 registered to-date. Mr. Bowman presented a flyer advertising the site, and Chair Becker asked that he provide copies for distribution by CEC members; with Mr. Bowman advising hard copies were also available at City Hall.

Member Grefenberg reported his difficulties in getting a question posted in the Ideas section; with Mr. Bowman not able to find it electronically either and suggesting it may have been a technical error and Member Grefenberg should try the process again, and offering to assist him if the problem continued.

Chair Becker suggested that there could be other ways in Speak Up to emphasize that residents could pose questions. Discussion ensued regarding the two-step submission process in posting an idea; how the instructions are formatted on the website; and whether or not some redesign of the issues page was prudent; and clarification by Mr. Bowman for Member Grefenberg that Speak Up! Roseville is not equipped to translate languages, but the City's website has that ability.

e. CEC Social Gathering

Member Manke apologized that she had still been unable to devote time to this effort given time and scheduling constraints. Member Manke also noted the issues involved in meeting Open Meeting Law requirements in such a get-together.

Members Gardella and Sanders suggested postponing this social gathering until 2016.

Chair Becker questioned if it was still necessary to plan and hold this social event, as it had originally been intended as a social opportunity for commissioners to get to know each other when first coming onto the CEC

1272 approximately one year ago. With the holidays approaching, Chair Becker
1273 suggested waiting until next summer and perhaps incorporating into a
1274 public involvement opportunity.

1275
1276 **There being Commission consensus**, Chair Becker advised he would put
1277 this item back on the CEC agenda in January or February of 2016 for
1278 further discussion and consideration.

1279

1280 **6. Chair, Committee and Staff Reports**

1281

1282 **a. Staff Report**

1283

1284 **i. Upcoming Items on Future Council Agendas**

1285 Mr. Bowman briefly reported on some upcoming City Council
1286 agenda items that may be of interest to the CEC, noting that only a
1287 few meetings remained in 2015.

1288

1289 **ii. Other Items**

1290 None.

1291

1292 **7. New Business**

1293

1294 **a. Initial Discussion on 2016 Priority Planning**

1295 Chair Becker provided a copy of the original CEC report presented to the
1296 City Council in December of 2014 (Attachment 7a), copied from the
1297 City's community engagement website; noting it represented a different
1298 summary of recommendations than those made by the initial task force.
1299 Chair Becker noted the document had been reorganized somewhere with
1300 policies supporting those recommendations; and noted this had been used
1301 as a seed document for forming priority projects in 2015 and could now be
1302 used as a source for 2016 projects.

1303

1304 Chair Becker noted some projects would carry over from 2015 (e.g.
1305 listening/learning sessions and NA's) but there would be room for new
1306 initiatives from individual CEC commissioners and could serve as the
1307 beginning point for discussions at upcoming meetings. Chair Becker
1308 noted that last year, themes emerged based on this seed document; and
1309 questioned if there were other items (e.g. similar to zoning in 2015) that
1310 could be removed going forward based on the collective wisdom of
1311 commissioners in defining priorities for 2016 and the joint session to be
1312 held with the City Council for their input and direction.

1313

1314 Discussion ensued from Members Manke and Grefenberg regarding the
1315 status of the zoning notification policy and recommendation; Chair
1316 Becker's recommendation for 4-5 themes for 2016 from the ideas coming
1317 forward and as they were combined for similarity and like themes for

1318 priority consideration; how to define the focus of civic engagement versus
1319 community engagement and efforts going forward not that both had been
1320 more clearly defined.

1321
1322 Member Grefenberg suggested the CEC should begin raising the profile as
1323 a CEC recommendation to hire a community engagement coordinator
1324 part-time, or at least to start those discussions.

1325
1326 Chair Becker asked individual commissioners, as their “homework”
1327 assignment, to come up with five specific recommendations or broader
1328 themes and submit them to Chair Becker prior to the packet deadline.
1329 Chair Becker stated he wasn’t anticipating a lot of detail from these initial
1330 submissions, but anticipated some overlap of ideas and themes.

1331
1332 Vice-Chair Gardella asked that Chair Becker provide a reminder to
1333 individual commissioners through Mr. Bowman of that assignment.

1334
1335 **b. CEC Correspondence**

1336 While not publically available at the meeting, several items of
1337 correspondence were discussed among commissioners as requested by
1338 Member Sanders at the beginning of tonight’s meeting.

1339
1340 One of the items was from a resident regarding lack of availability of the
1341 *Roseville Review*, the city’s official newspaper of record. Apparently
1342 several residents were not receiving the newspaper by home delivery, or
1343 there was a lack of consistency in its available.

1344
1345 Member Miller offered to follow up and report back to the CEC.

1346
1347 A second item of correspondence was sent to the full commission via the
1348 CEC website, but was marked “no need to contact me,” with Chair Becker
1349 reporting he had not responded to the individual with an “official
1350 response” nor did he direct it to the CEC’s attention for follow-up based
1351 on that direction.

1352
1353 Member Sanders referenced this item of correspondence from Ms. Kathy
1354 Ramundt specific to her perception of offensive behavior of the CEC
1355 regarding Lisa McCormick, and encouraged better community and civic
1356 engagement. While no copy of the letter was provided for public
1357 discussion at this meeting, Member Sanders stated that, for the record, she
1358 agreed with Ms. Ramundt, and opined that the CEC owed Lisa
1359 McCormick an apology for rude treatment in past meetings when speaking
1360 during public and/or when invited to join in a specific CEC conversation.

1361
1362 Member Manke questioned how Lisa McCormick felt she had been treated
1363 rudely when invited to join the conversation, and subsequently provided

1364 no explanation for her request to change the order of the three
1365 presentations on the three current Roseville Neighborhood Associations.
1366 Member Manke opined that she found that request and the requester's lack
1367 of flexibility to be similarly rude.

1368
1369 Member Grefenberg noted McCormick, after she refused to offer
1370 testimony unless she could go last, had offered to provide written
1371 comments specific to her Neighborhood Association to the CEC, and
1372 asked if those comments had been received. Chair Becker and Mr.
1373 Bowman confirmed that nothing had been submitted by the resident to-
1374 date.

1375
1376 Member Grefenberg said he didn't feel the CEC had been rude to
1377 McCormick either, but was unsure if resident McCormick felt that way or
1378 whether this was Ms Ramundt impression only Member Sanders stated
1379 that McCormick felt the CEC had been rude and she was offended.

1380
1381 Member Grefenberg opined that the CEC attempted to treat everyone
1382 equitably, and didn't personally feel any guilt about the CEC's treatment
1383 of McCormick at that meeting and NA discussion.

1384
1385 Member Sanders stated she was glad Member Grefenberg brought equity
1386 into the discussion, reiterating that she didn't feel the resident had been
1387 treated as such.

1388
1389 Member Miller noted this discussion had already taken place at an earlier
1390 meeting as noted in past minutes, and suggested McCormick's feeling of
1391 being offended may be a carryover from those past conversations.

1392
1393 Chair Becker noted that since the commission approved its agenda at the
1394 beginning of the meeting, as chair he was obliged to follow that set
1395 agenda.

1396
1397 Member Gardella noted that for some residents the experience of coming
1398 forward at a meeting may be more intimidating than for others, even
1399 coming into the meeting room. Member Gardella suggested the term
1400 "equality" may be more appropriate than the term "equity," and it
1401 behooved the CEC to make any resident or speaker comfortable in this
1402 space and room, whether around the table or at the dais. Member Gardella
1403 opined that, regardless of personalities or past conflicts, the CEC's
1404 deference should be to those coming into a meeting, and to listen to them
1405 and not discourage other residents from coming to speak. Member
1406 Gardella stated that, from her perspective, the bigger picture was how the
1407 CEC welcomed residents and their interest in hearing those comments.
1408 Member Gardella stated that she wasn't finding fault with any of the
1409 parties or the CEC, but just stating a general comment that coming

1410 forward may be a tough thing for some to do. However, Member Gardella
1411 agreed that the intent of everyone on the CEC at the meeting in question
1412 was in following the rules and agenda as adopted by the majority of its
1413 members as previously noted.

1414
1415 In response to Member Gardella's comments regarding the comfort level
1416 of residents, Member Grefenberg noted many residents were very
1417 experienced at speaking before City Commissions and the Council, and
1418 were frequent attendees at CEC and/or City Council meetings, such as the
1419 individual now in question, and not intimidated by the situation.

1420

1421 **8. Commission Communications, Reports, and Announcements**

1422 Member Grefenberg announced several upcoming meetings, including a Roseville
1423 University session; and a meeting of the Gavel Club.

1424

1425 Member Gardella offered her willingness to share responsibility with other
1426 members at the Gavel Club in the future if her schedule and that of other CEC
1427 members were open.

1428

1429 **9. Commissioner-Initiated Items for Future Meetings**

1430 Chair Becker briefly highlighted some items for future CEC agendas, including an
1431 update from Member Miller on the *Roseville Review circulation issue*; potential
1432 attendance of NA representatives from other communities to provide their
1433 experiences; next step in the NA discussion the flip side of tonight's discussion
1434 and revolving around the City's expectations of NA's in exchange for material
1435 support (e.g. exchange versus recognition); and the City Council's priority
1436 planning and how that impacted the CEC.

1437

1438 Chair Becker suggested a break from NA discussions in December to focus on
1439 2016 planning for the CEC, but opening the meeting up if NA representatives
1440 from St. Louis Park are available to attend that meeting if the presentation of their
1441 written materials as researched by Member Grefenberg was not sufficient to the
1442 discussion. However, whether the representatives attended the December meeting
1443 in person or if the information was presented by Member Grefenberg, Chair
1444 Becker stated he anticipated this agenda item should not exceed twenty-minutes
1445 of time at the meeting in order to focus on other issues.

1446

1447 If St. Louis Park representatives are unable to attend the December meeting,
1448 Member Grefenberg suggested deferring that NA discussion until the January
1449 meeting.

1450

1451 **By consensus, commissioners agreed.**

1452

1453 Member Gardella stated her preference for devoting the December meeting to
1454 focus on priority planning; and by consensus, commissioners agreed unless St.
1455 Louis Park representatives were already committed to attending in December.

1456
1457
1458
1459
1460
1461
1462
1463
1464
1465
1466
1467
1468
1469
1470
1471
1472
1473
1474
1475
1476
1477
1478
1479
1480
1481

Chair Becker advised that the December meeting would include approval of the CEC’s 2016 meeting schedule in accordance with the City’s Uniform Commission Code, currently scheduled for the second Thursday of each month.

10. Recap of Commission Actions This Meeting

Member Gardella reviewed actions of the CEC at tonight’s meeting, including Chair Becker compiling content for NA websites; homework for individual CEC members to come up with five 2016 priorities; encouragement for individual CEC members to post a discussion item on Speak Up! Roseville in the “idea” section; Member Miller’s offer to contact the *Roseville Review* to find out about problematic and inconsistent deliveries in the community before responding to a citizen concern brought forward; a task force work meeting with Madeline Lohman; and scheduling an additional meeting of the zoning notification task force.

11. Adjournment

Grefenberg moved, Manke seconded, adjournment of the meeting at approximately 9:41 p.m.

Ayes: 6

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

Next Meeting – Thursday, December 10, 2015 at 6:30 p.m.