



## Minutes

### Roseville Community Engagement Commission (CEC)

Thursday, January 14, 2016 - 6:30 p.m.

1  
2  
3  
4 **1. Roll Call**

5 Chair Scot Becker called the meeting to order at approximately 6:30 p.m. and  
6 Communications Manager Garry Bowman called the roll.  
7

8 **Commissioners Present:** Chair Scot Becker; and Commissioners Sherry  
9 Sanders, Michelle Manke, Theresa Gardella, with  
10 Commissioners Gary Grefenberg and Jonathan  
11 Miller arriving at approximately 6:44 p.m.  
12

13 **Staff Present:** Staff Liaison/Communications Manager Garry Bowman;  
14 City Manager Patrick Trudgeon

15 **2. Approve Agenda**

16 Chair Becker moved, Commissioner Manke seconded, approval of the agenda as  
17 amended to reverse agenda items 5.a and 5.b to hear from City Manager Patrick  
18 Trudgeon before he left for another commitment.  
19

20 **Ayes: 4**

21 **Nays: 0**

22 **Motion carried.**  
23

24 **3. Public Comment – Non Agenda Items**

25 None.  
26

27 **4. Approval of November 12, 2015 Meeting Minutes**

28 *Comments and corrections to draft minutes had been submitted by various CEC*  
29 *Commissioners prior to tonight's meeting and those revisions were incorporated*  
30 *into the draft presented in the tonight's agenda packet.*  
31

32 Commissioner Manke moved, Commissioner Gardella seconded, approval of the  
33 December 10, 2015 meeting minutes as presented.  
34

35 **Ayes: 4**

36 **Nays: 0**

37 **Motion carried.**  
38

39 **5. Old Business**  
40

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

42 As part of this discussion, Commissioner Gardella distributed four bench  
43 handouts, *attached hereto and made a part hereof*, providing background  
44 information on the development of the partnership between the CEC and

45 Advocates for Human Rights. The attachments were respectively entitled,  
46 “Development of Partnership between the Community Engagement  
47 Commission and the Advocates for Human Rights (Timeline);” “The  
48 Linking Communities (TLC) Project 2016 Funding Cycle Grant  
49 Application;” “TLC Project Budget from January – June 2016;” and  
50 Request for Council Action (RCA) dated December 7, 2015 entitled,  
51 “Discuss 2016 Policy Priority Planning Document,” incorporating SE  
52 Roseville Redevelopment initiatives.

53  
54 Commissioner Gardella reviewed the timeline and recognized that future  
55 grant application processes required more due diligence and  
56 communication with the City Manager and administrative staff to inform  
57 the city as well as receiving authorization from the City Council for  
58 applying for grants. Given the timing for the grant opportunity and how it  
59 fit into initiatives for this area, Commissioner Gardella provided the  
60 rationale as she and Commissioner Sanders pursued the grant in  
61 partnership with the Lake McCarrons Neighborhood Association as the  
62 lead applicant given its 501.C.3 status, the Advocates for Human Rights,  
63 the City of Roseville’s CEC, and the Karen Organization of Minnesota.

64  
65 Commissioner Gardella reported that the grant application had been  
66 successful and designed in the \$4,000 to support three conversations,  
67 including providing translation equipment or translators, food and to  
68 enhance more robust conversations.

69  
70 Commissioner Gardella reviewed grant detail as provided in the bench  
71 handout; and Chair Becker clarified that the grant had been submitted  
72 under the Lake McCarrons Neighborhood Association, not under that of  
73 the CEC, and based on their location serving SE Roseville.

74  
75 Commissioner Sanders clarified that the Lake McCarrons Neighborhood  
76 Association was a 501.C.7 corporation, not under 501.C.3 status.

77  
78 **City Manager Patrick Trudgeon**  
79 City Manager Trudgeon thanked the Chair Becker and the CEC for  
80 rearranging their agenda to accommodate his meeting schedule. With  
81 receipt of the grant and in context of other work and initiatives underway  
82 and next steps. City Manager Trudgeon noted, as reflected in the City  
83 Council’s RCA, had been identified by the City Council as a priority; and  
84 assured the CEC that they were very aware of issues ongoing for many  
85 years in that area of the community.

86  
87 In conjunction with that and in more recent history (2014), City Manager  
88 Trudgeon noted that the City had created the rental inspection and  
89 licensing program for multi-family apartments with some of the  
90 deficiencies found during inspections able to be addressed. City Manager

91 Trudgeon noted some of these corrections affected the Karen population in  
92 those buildings, and communications were instigated to make sure their  
93 rights were upheld and any scare tactics used by landlords that worried  
94 tenants not knowing their rights and responsibilities. Once staff became  
95 aware of the situation, City Manager Trudgeon noted they were able to  
96 correct some of those misperceptions, like concerns with being evicted or  
97 needing more money, and advocacy steps taken to stabilize those  
98 situations to some extent.

99  
100 As a result of those initial efforts, City Manager Trudgeon advised that the  
101 conversation had continued among various city departments, other  
102 agencies, school districts, and municipal jurisdictions as a meeting as a  
103 continuing working group to expand and address other issues, needs,  
104 education, and awareness of rental rights and responsibilities. City  
105 Manager Trudgeon noted this addressed the situation of these newer  
106 immigrants being taken advantage of, while also addressing their  
107 responsibilities and the expectations of their landlords as well as their  
108 community. City Manager Trudgeon noted that the ECHO program and  
109 creation of an informative DVD in five different language was another  
110 result of these efforts, soon to be premiering and broadcast on public  
111 television as well as available via DVD.

112  
113 City Manager Trudgeon noted another opportunity was the school district  
114 utilizing land in Little Canada for urban farming to provide community  
115 gardens, and for funding available through Community Development  
116 Block Grant (CDBG) for connecting pathways (e.g. along Larpenteur  
117 Avenue to Dale Street). While not solving all the problems, City Manager  
118 Trudgeon noted that positive steps were being taken.

119  
120 Commissioners Miller and Grefenberg arrived at this time, approximately 6:44 p.m.

121  
122 City Manager Trudgeon reported the most recent opportunity involved  
123 vacant land in the area of the apartments (1716 Marion Street) allowing  
124 for a long-time and strong desire to serve the recreational needs of youth  
125 in that area, with 200 children currently residing in the immediate area,  
126 many in those apartment complexes. City Manager Trudgeon advised that  
127 the City was made aware of a grant by U. S. Bank to pay for playground  
128 equipment, and given the short application deadline, staff was currently  
129 scrambling to get City Council approval to meet the timeline; as well as  
130 trying to obtain more CDBG funds to acquire the property. While  
131 recognizing additional city cost in the future for maintenance and  
132 replacement of equipment, City Manager Trudgeon noted that interest is  
133 currently being processed through the Parks & Recreation Commission  
134 and subsequent request of the City Council for their approval at the  
135 upcoming January 25, 2016 meeting, with a February grant application  
136 deadline.

137 Specific to this grant application in partnership with those agencies listed  
138 by Commissioner Gardella, City Manager Trudgeon stated that while he  
139 was glad to see the application be successful and congratulated the CEC,  
140 he wanted to make sure groups were not working at cross purposes. City  
141 Manager Trudgeon admitted the City also struggled internally in its  
142 communication efforts across the board, but asked that the CEC make  
143 every effort to keep him aware to disseminate that information to the City  
144 Council on behalf of the CEC and seek City Council approval in moving  
145 efforts forward. However, City Manager Trudgeon recognized the time  
146 constraints for the grant application process, and while admitting it could  
147 have and should have been done differently, he understood that it was  
148 intended toward a good purpose, and anticipated future processes would  
149 be in order. City Manager Trudgeon advised that his main purpose in  
150 attending tonight was to provide that background explanation, and assure  
151 the CEC was aware that SE Roseville was undergoing a more  
152 comprehensive look in alignment with City Council priorities and  
153 strategies.

154  
155 City Manager Trudgeon suggested getting together off line with the grant  
156 authors, advocates and staff to talk about coordinating next steps to ensure  
157 everyone was working in the same direction. City Manager Trudgeon also  
158 suggested that the CEC include this as part of their report to the City  
159 Council at the February 8, 2016 joint meeting and the partnership of these  
160 groups, with Chair Becker and perhaps several representatives of the CEC  
161 appearing before the City Council, clearly noting that there is not a  
162 financial commitment for the City with this grant, only staff time and  
163 resources. However, City Manager Trudgeon noted that the City Council  
164 would want to monitor the grant, steps in the process and its final  
165 outcome.

166  
167 In conclusion, City Manager Trudgeon noted the intent was to facilitate  
168 better lines of communication and ensure efforts were not working at cross  
169 purposes; and offered that as his advice to the CEC as next steps and in  
170 context of tonight's conversation. City Manager Trudgeon noted that the  
171 City Council and staff were excited about the work beginning in SE  
172 Roseville, and personally anticipated having a tremendous impact by  
173 working together, and offered his interest in working with the CEC.

174  
175 Commissioner Gardella advised City Manager Trudgeon that she would  
176 contact his office tomorrow to start the process on next steps.

177  
178 Chair Becker expressed his appreciation that the CEC would be able to  
179 meet jointly with the City Council in the near future, noting that was  
180 always their intention, but recognized the confluence of timing as  
181 addressed by Commissioner Gardella's timeline with the January 25, 2016  
182 deadline. Chair Becker noted his confidence that no one on the CEC

183 intended to march on with efforts without staff and City Council buy-in to  
184 make them successful and hearing the City's commitment and expected  
185 reactions.

186  
187 Specific to the previously referenced December 2015 RCA, Chair Becker  
188 noted other areas where this technique would dovetail nicely and current  
189 projects as applicable.

190  
191 City Manager Trudgeon noted that the initial conversation about SE  
192 Roseville Redevelopment listed in the City Council strategic priorities was  
193 prompted by the St. Paul Area Chamber of Commerce and new urbanism  
194 look and redevelopment. City Manager Trudgeon noted Commissioner  
195 Sanders had attended that meeting about revitalization efforts, and  
196 bringing in Ramsey County as well, creating a great opportunity, and  
197 including lots of stakeholders and important ideas for that corridor and  
198 what needs to be revitalized. City Manager Trudgeon reviewed the vacant  
199 I.C.O. station site and recent developments and changes in plans; interest  
200 of the City in community space and a possible Police Department  
201 Substation or satellite office for city services and gathering site for  
202 residents in that area – all still conceptual at this point.

203  
204 City Manager Trudgeon noted one of the challenges for SE Roseville was  
205 the confluence of various cities involved – Maplewood, Little Canada,  
206 Roseville and St. Paul, and the interest of some in discussing common  
207 interests, prompted by Mayor Roe as well as various city staffs.

208  
209 In his review of the grant application before the CEC, City Manager  
210 Trudgeon noted that it provided a missing link that was obvious but not  
211 yet well thought-out in directly engaging residents to determine what they  
212 thought was important, but grounded in reality, and serving as another  
213 check-in with them and complimenting the other efforts. City Manager  
214 Trudgeon noted that made it even more evident that there were a lot of  
215 ideas out there and the need to check in and work with each other and the  
216 Karen Organization.

217  
218 Based on the comments made by City Manager Trudgeon, Commissioner  
219 Gardella noted her addition of a number of questions to the listening  
220 sessions (e.g. what kind of equipment did those residents want or need in  
221 the park), allowing for that direct input from the community and helping  
222 them feel part of the process through those conversations.

223  
224 Chair Becker referenced the December 2015 RCA and its goals and focus  
225 areas that involved the CEC and other advisory commissions listed in the  
226 responsibility column. Chair Becker asked if City Manager Trudgeon had  
227 any ideas of how the City Council anticipated the CEC working or  
228 interacting with that process.

229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273

City Manager Trudgeon suggested that was a good question for the CEC to ask the City Council at their joint meeting; and noted that Commissioners Sanders and Grefenberg were actively representing the CEC on the SE Roseville Working Group that met during the day and could report back to the full CEC. While that may serve as a minimum involvement at this stage, City Manager Trudgeon stated that he envisioned a broader context for the CEC to bring forward and as the working group evolved over the next few months and things were adjusted accordingly.

Commissioner Sanders provided a bench handout related to an upcoming meeting about community gardens that was underway as part of the efforts of the interagency working group.

Commissioner Grefenberg hoped there would be time at the February 8<sup>th</sup> joint meeting to get exposure for the proposed listening sessions and make sure the CEC was working in cooperation with the City rather than in addition to.

City Manager Trudgeon expressed confidence that as those details were worked out on the staff level and with Commissioner Gardella as previously noted, a better understanding would be in place moving forward, at which time a report back to the City Council could be provided at that point.

Commissioner Grefenberg questioned if the joint meeting would allow sufficient time for the CEC to review its 2016 priorities.

City Manager Trudgeon noted the February 8<sup>th</sup> meeting had been selected versus the January 25<sup>th</sup> City Council agenda to allow for a lengthier discussion, with the grant application discussion and a broader discussion with the CEC, HRC and Ethics Commissions about their future roles. City Manager Trudgeon suggested this would be the opportunity for the Chair and Vice Chair to talk about their specific mission and weave their 2016 priorities into that discussion. City Manager Trudgeon suggested a somewhat truncated joint meeting for this round given the other agenda items and commission discussions for that night, and that the CEC not see this as a full joint meeting, but simply address the grant application and their 2016 priorities as part of the grant award.

Chair Becker concurred to limit the discussion beyond the grant to the 2016 CEC Work Plan, and if warranted ask the City Council for an additional joint meeting as appropriate.

274 Commissioner Grefenberg noted that when consideration of the listening  
275 sessions were originally initiated it was the intent for staff to listen in  
276 sessions for under-represented groups; and without that staff support, and  
277 City Council buy-in, opined that the process wasn't going to go anywhere.  
278 Commissioner Grefenberg asked that the City Council be clear that the  
279 CEC didn't sign off on the grant application either.

280  
281 City Manager Trudgeon duly noted that understanding.

282  
283 **Chair Becker noted that the action step for this agenda item would be**  
284 **to meet with staff before the February 8<sup>th</sup> joint meeting and**  
285 **coordinate learning/listening sessions with staff to a united front**  
286 **would be presented at the City Council meeting and solve any**  
287 **problems before then.**

288  
289 Commissioner Gardella confirmed she would contact City Manager  
290 Trudgeon tomorrow; and City Manager Trudgeon thanked the CEC for  
291 their time.

292  
293 **a. Discuss Potential City Requirements for Neighborhood Associations**  
294 **(in Exchange for Material Support)**

295 Chair Becker referenced Attachment 5.A of agenda materials outlining the  
296 task force's recommendations and differentiations between material  
297 support and recognition of neighborhood associations without support of  
298 the City. Chair Becker suggested not focusing this discussion on the word  
299 "recognition" but to concentrate on the broader concept of the City's  
300 expectations in exchange for materials support.

301  
302 Commissioner Sanders brought a sample of a past city-supported 2003  
303 post card mailing for the Lake McCarrons Neighborhood Association,  
304 basically a meeting notice for the association and study done on how best  
305 to improve life in the area.

306  
307 At the request of Commissioner Grefenberg, Chair Becker confirmed that  
308 this was the initial CEC discussion of task force recommendations and  
309 efforts, and draft of bullet points that the CEC wanted to propose for its  
310 next recommendation to the City Council. However, Chair Becker assured  
311 his colleagues that at some point, as a list is compiled of those  
312 recommendations, it would be open for further discussion once formatted.

313  
314 Commissioner Grefenberg expressed concern that this was premature until  
315 meeting with the St. Louis Park CEC Coordinator about their experience  
316 with neighborhood associations. Commissioner Grefenberg noted there  
317 had been a lot of discussion on the task force about this issue, without  
318 consensus at that time. Commissioner Grefenberg suggested there may be  
319 other criteria considered yet not agreed upon.

320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365

Chair Becker clarified that the Cities of Edina and St. Louis Park had been invited to talk about their experiences in fostering neighborhood associations, and while the City of St. Louis Park was tentatively scheduled for the February 2016 CEC meeting in Roseville, there was no reason task force ideas as well as additional input from this group couldn't be considered at this point and start a list. Chair Becker noted that if other ideas from the City of St. Louis Park were found valuable from their presentation, there was nothing preventing those ideas from being added to this draft list and tonight's initial discussion.

At the further request of Commissioner Grefenberg, Chair Becker assured that this initial list was not intended as a draft proposal but take those items from the task force list and any additional ideas presented tonight, and similar to last month's discussion, when consensus was found, they would be included on this draft list. Chair Becker noted that for those areas of contention, this body would put them to a vote. However, Chair Becker advised that he envisioned the CEC having a compiled list ready for reaction at a future meeting, hopefully by March, for either more discussion at length or vote at a subsequent meeting.

If that was the case, Commissioner Grefenberg noted at least three major issues in this task force document that the task force had not agreed upon, as shown in the footnote on page 5 of the document.

With consensus of the body, Chair Becker noted that those items without agreement would be addressed separately starting with task force consideration and then how they might apply to this revised set of criteria.

**“City Recognition of Neighborhood Associations”**

Association Name and Contact Information (Registration with the City)

This bullet point from the task force was approved by consensus as written.

Association Geographic Boundaries

Commissioner Grefenberg noted that, unlike the Cities of St. Louis Park and Edina where they did a prior study to determine and define a neighborhood, the City of Roseville didn't have that step. Commissioner Grefenberg opined that the City Council as representatives of the whole city, needed to confirm neighborhood boundaries, with any existing neighborhood associations grandfathered in. Based on his existing research, Commissioner Grefenberg opined that existing neighborhood associations were much too large, while the ideal size seemed to be under 1,000 households. While recognizing the sensitivities involved and willing to grandfather those existing associations in, Commissioner Grefenberg opined that it needed to be made clearer that the City Council



366 needed to approve boundaries for neighborhoods or at least play a role in  
367 establishing those boundaries.

368  
369 Without having knowledge of prior neighborhood associations,  
370 Commissioner Miller opined that it made sense to have boundaries pre-  
371 determined; but asked if Commissioner Grefenberg's intent was every  
372 time an association was formed, they decide their own boundaries with  
373 subsequent approval of the City Council.

374  
375 Commissioner Grefenberg responded that it was not his intent, but  
376 anytime a group received material support from the City, their boundaries  
377 needed confirmed by the City Council.

378  
379 Chair Becker stated he had no strong opinion either way, and his only  
380 concern was in avoiding a situation where competing neighborhood  
381 associations with the same geographical footprint, with their own websites  
382 and mailings lists, were causing confusion for residents within those  
383 geographical boundaries. Chair Becker opined that lines on the map  
384 needed to be drawn one way or the other so neighborhood associations  
385 weren't overlapping. Therefore, Chair Becker questioned if lines should  
386 be drawn first of let things form and draw those lines as associations crop  
387 up, with the stipulation that boundaries can't overlap or encompass the  
388 entire city. Chair Becker further questioned if there was any other  
389 situations that he was not aware of or to what extent this boundary concern  
390 was part of a neighborhood establishing itself and what was part of the  
391 preliminary work of the City in establishing a neighborhood.

392  
393 At the request of Commissioner Miller, he sought clarification if  
394 Commissioner Grefenberg alluded that the Cities of St. Louis Park and  
395 Edina predetermined neighborhood boundaries through their respective  
396 cities.

397  
398 Commissioner Grefenberg clarified that a task force had met in Edina  
399 before their neighborhood association policy had been adopted, with the  
400 task force proposing a name and area for each neighborhood association.  
401 Commissioner Grefenberg stated that he wasn't suggesting that but  
402 something much easier, by giving the City Council more responsibility  
403 under this bullet point.

404  
405 Commissioner Gardella noted this was outside the parameters suggested  
406 by Chair Becker, and provided rationale for boundaries not being drawn.

407  
408 Commissioner Sanders noted the Lake McCarrons Association had been  
409 started with its boundaries distinctly outlined from a map of 15 boundaries  
410 that fit on the city's map. While unable to speak to how the neighborhood  
411 association started twenty years ago, Commissioner Sanders opined that

412 was her recollection of their beginnings based on a predetermined basis;  
413 but she was unsure if other existing neighborhood associations followed  
414 that same plot.

415  
416 Commissioner Grefenberg reiterated that, without reflecting on existing  
417 associations, but as a recommendation of this overall body, the City  
418 Council needed to approve boundaries; and expressed concern that this  
419 was not clear enough on this bullet point. Commissioner Grefenberg  
420 noted that the current SWARN association bounded by Roselawn Avenue  
421 on the south, Highway 36 on the north, 1 block east of Snelling and all the  
422 way to Highway 280 consisted of 3,600 households.

423  
424 Commissioner Sanders reported the McCarron’s association had 1,000  
425 households; to which Commissioner Grefenberg reported that according to  
426 city data, their association had 3,700 households within its boundaries  
427 based on the information provided to him by the City’s Police Department.

428  
429 Commissioner Sanders asked that Commissioner Grefenberg bring  
430 forward that information for her review.

431  
432 Chair Becker suggested language for this section specific to the  
433 appropriate size of neighborhood associations when determining  
434 boundaries that they not overlap with another existing association, and  
435 conform to the existing boundaries set by the City Council or boundaries  
436 subsequently approved by the City Council.

437  
438 Commissioner Sanders reported on another group within their association  
439 – a block club – that continued to expand and within the seventeen years  
440 of its operation, continued to work well together.

441  
442 Commissioner Gardella noted that, if one association got material support  
443 and another didn’t, since there were lots of opportunities or reasons for  
444 groups to form, the existence of one association shouldn’t preclude those  
445 additional associations from happening. Commissioner Gardella noted  
446 this provided her rationale for the importance of block groups as a  
447 building block for communities. At a bare minimum, Commissioner  
448 Gardella opined and sought consensus for the need that the city had to  
449 know the boundary locations, and someone needed to say “yes” or “no”  
450 and have a contact for existing neighborhood associations, with that  
451 information readily available.

452  
453 Commissioner Grefenberg opined that it was only relevant to this  
454 discussion and boundaries for new associations needing to be approved.  
455 For example if a block club was drawing its own boundaries, the City  
456 Council should be able to say if it was too big. From his perspective,  
457 Commissioner Grefenberg stated that this city-wide proposal needed to

458 recognize that the City Council had a role in confirming the boundaries,  
459 and had nothing to do with the City Council controlling a neighborhood  
460 association, but just to ensure their size was manageable. Commissioner  
461 Grefenberg noted that at one point, the Parks & Recreation Department  
462 defined neighborhoods by neighborhood park constellations, while the  
463 City’s Planning Department identified fifteen different districts or  
464 neighborhoods. Commissioner Grefenberg opined that this bullet point  
465 still needed some revision in recognizing the role of the City Council in  
466 defining boundaries, but suggested grandfathering in existing associations.  
467 However, Commissioner Grefenberg opined that the City Council didn’t  
468 need to divide areas up, but could wait until neighborhoods come forward  
469 on their own.

470  
471 Chair Becker noted that was one of his suggestions, as neighborhoods  
472 come in, it would be the responsibility of the City Council and staff to  
473 determine if their size was reasonable or not. Chair Becker stated that his  
474 main concern was in avoiding overlapping; and suggested moving forward  
475 without predetermining boundaries. Chair Becker stated his interest in  
476 limiting the size of boundaries was to manage financial and time burdens  
477 on staff support, thus avoiding any overlapping.

478  
479 Commissioner Grefenberg suggested adding that language to address  
480 neighborhood associations not being able to overlap. Commissioner  
481 Grefenberg suggested adding the word “affiliated” versus “recognized.”  
482

483 Discussion ensued regarding city involvement in determining boundaries  
484 and logistics to do so, and examples of pre-determined boundaries to avoid  
485 conflict; and specific language to insert specific to that concern.

486  
487 Commissioners Grefenberg and Gardella offered versions of proposed  
488 language and criteria.

489  
490 After considerable wordsmithing, Chair Becker offered the following  
491 language incorporating input from various commissioners:

492 “In order to ensure neighborhood associations are of reasonable  
493 size and not overlapping, the City of Roseville approves their  
494 boundaries as part of the process of them receiving items of  
495 material support.”

496 Chair Becker noted that may be included as part of the application form  
497 included on the City’s website, with perhaps the City Council delegating  
498 that determination to the City Manager or Community Development  
499 Director, or ending up on the City Council’s Consent Agenda. However,  
500 Chair Becker suggested that level of detail can be addressed by the City  
501 Council as they determined the process if accepting the recommendation  
502 of the CEC from this document. Chair Becker focused the CEC’s

503 responsibility to ensure neighborhoods don't overlap and are not too large  
504 or too small.

505  
506 Commissioner Sanders disagreed, opining that the City should not have  
507 that say, but that it should be up to each individual neighborhood  
508 association.

509  
510 Chair Becker questioned what would happen if the association said they  
511 were going to include the entire boundaries of the City of Roseville.

512  
513 Commissioner Grefenberg moved, Commissioner Miller seconded,  
514 including language as follows: "In order to ensure neighborhood  
515 associations are of reasonable size and not overlapping, the City of  
516 Roseville approves their boundaries as part of the process of them  
517 receiving items of material support."

518  
519 **Ayes: 5**  
520 **Nays: 1 (Sanders)**  
521 **Motion carried.**

522  
523 Commissioner Manke noted that the CEC needed to remain cognizant that  
524 the City Council may not take this recommendation.

525  
526 Communication to Members  
527 This bullet point from the task force was approved by consensus as  
528 written.

529  
530 Commissioner Sanders opined that this was a valid point if you claimed to  
531 be an association, you needed to verify how you were attempting to  
532 communicate that and the tools being used to reach your constituency.

533  
534 Inclusiveness  
535 Commissioner Grefenberg noted this area had been of some controversy to  
536 the task force, and the language as shown was a valid representation of the  
537 compromise reach; and offered his support of this language as written.

538  
539 Commissioner Sanders agreed that she supported as well, and reported  
540 that the controversy had resulted from whether or not to include  
541 businesses in neighborhood associations based on their locale.

542  
543 This bullet point from the task force was approved by consensus as  
544 written.

545  
546 Anti-Discrimination  
547 Commissioner Sanders noted this language doesn't exclude the option that  
548 if someone doesn't feel the association represents them well or if an

549 individual is making it miserable for others to be in the association, it may  
550 be productive to disassociate with them.

551  
552 Commissioner Gardella noted that individual association by-law policy  
553 should provide that option as applicable.  
554

555 During discussion, distinctions were clarified that this was not  
556 discriminating from those wishing to join, but to provide an opportunity to  
557 remove someone if warranted; with each association determining their  
558 respective processes.  
559

560 This bullet point from the task force was approved by consensus as  
561 written.  
562

563 **Remaining Three Criteria Considered by the Task Force**  
564 **Without Agreement**

565 Communication about City

566 While generally supportive of the statement, Commissioner Grefenberg  
567 asked that “activism” be removed from the draft language, and instead  
568 encourage commitment of members to become involved in community  
569 and civic engagement.  
570

571 Commissioner Gardella stated her preference for leaving the entire  
572 paragraph out of the draft recommendation.  
573

574 Chair Becker noted that the fact that the neighborhood association exists  
575 and is talking about their issues is causing that communication, and as  
576 issues come up they could determine their process at the city level,  
577 whether through city staff or at the City Council level.  
578

579 Commissioner Grefenberg pointed out that any neighborhood association  
580 affiliated with the city had to reach out to its members. However,  
581 Commissioner Grefenberg opined that the whole purpose of this statement  
582 seemed to indicate that the neighborhood associations had the  
583 responsibility and expectations to reach their members.  
584

585 Chair Becker opined that this item was sufficiently covered by the section  
586 “Communication to Members,” and didn’t think the city needed to be any  
587 more prescriptive on how the association engaged or the topics they  
588 discussed.  
589

590 Commissioner Gardella concurred with Chair Becker.  
591

592 Further discussion ensued, with the final consensus of the body to remove  
593 this item in its entirety.  
594

595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640

Association Organization

Chair Becker suggested that the application process provide at a minimum contact information and as added here, a copy of their bylaws or statement of purposes to provide some organizational governance model.

At the request of Chair Becker as to why the task force could not agree on this criteria, Commissioners Grefenberg and Sanders each shared their individual and diverse recollection of those discussions.

Commissioner Sanders opined that the rationale was that not every association would have bylaws.

Commissioner Grefenberg opined that the rationale was that not every association was structured or required bylaws, but at a minimum there should be some process for their formation and membership requirements established.

Based on her recollection, Commissioner Sanders further opined that the issue went to defining what an association could be, with some recognized as more organized with bylaws and some more casual.

Commissioner Grefenberg admitted he had heard that, but from his recollection, it had not received the support of the majority; and while the process should be simplified, for those wanting to affiliate with the city, there needed to be procedures in place for at least annual elections rather than just an executive committee or officers.

Chair Becker suggested considering the language in the context of the neighborhood association receiving some type of material support from the city. Chair Becker suggested the City Manager could decide upon receipt of an application and make a decision at that point of what is or is not acceptable.

In that context, this bullet point was approved by consensus as written.

Annual Meeting

Again, in the context of the association receiving material support from the city, Chair Becker supported this bullet point as written and with examples of existing neighborhood associations.

Discussion included those items (e.g. officer terms) that would be addressed in respective association bylaws and not part of criteria recommendations; and lack of city interest in specifying how each association organizes itself.

This bullet point was approved by consensus as written.

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  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686

Commissioner Grefenberg suggested additional language that the annual meeting was open to the public, with only members of the association able to vote.

Commissioner Miller opined that was too prescriptive and would be addressed by each association's bylaws.

Chair Becker agreed that association bylaws would address that. However, Chair Becker questioned if there was a preference to add the requirement that meetings be open to the general public or any resident of Roseville or only residents of that geographical area.

At the request of Commissioner Sanders as to why to require that the annual meeting be open to the public, Commissioner Grefenberg responded that it would ensure transparency.

Discussion ensued regarding what was intended by the general public: non-member households within the association boundaries, other associations, or the public at large; whether the public needed to be notified; or if attending who was able to speak.

Chair Becker noted that speaking and voting rights should remain up to the discretion of individual associations, but agreed for a certain amount of transparency, it made sense that, at a minimum, their annual meetings be open to those represented in the geographical boundaries of the organization.

Commissioner Sanders opined that it would be beneficial of a neighborhood association to open their meetings to increase their membership.

By consensus, and as suggested by Commissioner Gardella, the consensus was to add language to this bullet point indicating that the annual meeting was open to the general public.

Final Paragraph(s) of this Task Force Document

Commissioner Grefenberg opined that the last paragraph was important to include and wanted to specifically emphasize it for the CEC.

Chair Becker clarified that neighborhood associations were not determined by the CEC, nor how they explicitly interact with the city. Chair Becker also noted that, when the CEC produces their final recommendations and this product to the City Council, it was not in any way supporting any ideas that neighborhood associations are the only voice for all residents.

687 Commissioner Grefenberg noted that this last paragraph had been  
688 approved by the task force., but agreed it may need to be simplified.

689  
690 Chair Becker opined that the preamble and individual bullet points  
691 addressed the intent of the CEC recommendations to the City Council, but  
692 stated that he wasn't convinced the closing paragraphs were necessary at  
693 this point, but had served their purpose as a template to drive this new  
694 document.

695  
696 Commissioner Gardella concurred, noting that a sentence could be pulled  
697 from these final paragraphs that could be added near the preamble and  
698 before the bullet points, and serve to address the same intended purpose.

699  
700 Commissioner Grefenberg agreed with that formatting as long as the  
701 information was noted and not excluded.

702  
703 Chair Becker advised that he would put a sentence in the final draft  
704 allowing discussion by the CC in more detail at that time.

705  
706 Commissioner Grefenberg requested further discussion of the second to  
707 last paragraph; with Chair Becker responding that the CEC had already  
708 covered that information earlier tonight, and there was nothing further  
709 actionable on that language. Commissioner Grefenberg asked that in the  
710 next draft of this document he would like see it again or a simplified  
711 version of it.

712  
713 Commissioner Gardella noted it was important that it was an important  
714 paragraph that provided context and clarity; and suggested when arriving  
715 at the final drafting stage there may be room for pieces of it in the  
716 document, but in this format it was too big and unruly. Commissioner  
717 Gardella suggested keeping this document as simple and generic as  
718 possible, and only addresses what is relevant with repetitious language  
719 identified and fine tuned at the final document.

720  
721 Chair Becker agreed, noting that a 2-4 paragraph preamble was sufficient  
722 for this short report, or executive summary, and should remain at a more  
723 general or higher level addressing important issues to serve the City  
724 Council as a set of recommendations from the CEC to address those areas  
725 for their consideration, or suggestions for things the City Council needed  
726 to decide (e.g. boundaries, identity, etc.). Chair Becker noted that at that  
727 point the CEC handed the document off to the City Council for further  
728 vetting at their discretion; but clarified that the entire document should not  
729 exceed 3-4 pages.

730  
731 Commissioner Grefenberg conceded that Chair Becker may be right, but  
732 opined he found it better to begin with a comprehensive report and then



733 refine it; and reiterated his opinion that it was important to include those  
734 last two paragraphs from the task force somewhere in the document.

735  
736 Chair Becker agreed that there were different approaches; however, he  
737 noted that the majority of the CEC was ready to wrap up this particular  
738 charge by the City Council as soon as possible and move on to its other  
739 work plan items, while drafting a long report took time but yet  
740 accomplished the same goal.

741  
742 Commissioner Grefenberg noted that the task force had provided a draft,  
743 and stated that it should be recognized and include their suggestions in  
744 some way by context.

745  
746 Chair Becker noted that it also opened up other issues that may not be  
747 pertinent and therefore, the CEC's draft and composite recommendations  
748 could move the process forward faster.

749  
750 Commissioner Grefenberg noted that the final CEC document could be too  
751 restrictive or may end the recommendation accordingly. Commissioner  
752 Grefenberg clarified that the second to last paragraph was intended by the  
753 CEC to be very short or not included at all, but serve to recommend  
754 further consideration for recognition by the City Council or to charge the  
755 CEC with looking further at that particular recommendation. Based on his  
756 understanding of that intent, Commissioner Grefenberg agreed that  
757 perhaps not all of that paragraph was needed any longer provided the CEC  
758 already accepted and recommended that only one neighborhood  
759 association per area was possible.

760  
761 Chair Becker duly noted Commissioner Grefenberg's comments.

762 **Recess**

763 Chair Becker recessed the meeting at approximately 8:02 p.m. and reconvened at 8:07  
764 p.m.

765 c. **Update on Joint Task Force on Zoning Notification**  
766 Commissioner Manke reported that the task force had yet to meet again as  
767 a group but were scheduled to do so next week. In the meantime,  
768 Commissioner Manke reported that task force members Grefenberg and  
769 Daire were scheduled to meet to review meeting minutes to-date and pull  
770 things together. Commissioner Manke advised that there was nothing  
771 further to report at this time until next week's meeting, which should  
772 hopefully prove to be their last meeting.

773  
774 Chair Becker asked if the task force was close to having a set of  
775 recommendations available for presentation by the CEC to the City  
776 Council.

777  
778 Commissioner Manke advised that the information should be forthcoming.

779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824

Chair Becker suggested that, given the full agenda for this upcoming meeting with the City Council, it may be necessary to schedule an additional joint meeting once that set of recommendations is available and vetted by the CEC.

Commissioner Grefenberg noted that he had not volunteered to draft that set of recommendations, but task force member Boguszewski had delegated that task to him and member Daire.

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

**a. Chair’s Report**

Commissioner Grefenberg alerted the CEC that he had been asked by the St. Louis Park representative for a list of questions to be submitted to her prior to her attendance at the CEC meeting. Commissioner Grefenberg advised that he would send a copy of that draft list of questions to the CEC before sending them to her in case he missed anything.

CEC Vacancies

Chair Becker announced two vacancies on the CEC and reviewed the application, interview and appointment process. Chair Becker encouraged individual CEC commissioners to recruit potential candidates to apply in addition to the heavy promotion the City was using to advertise those vacancies citywide.

Commissioner Grefenberg opined that the reason candidates applied was due to the outreach of sitting commissioners; and also encouraged seeking individual interest of candidates. Commissioner Grefenberg opined that City staff needed to emphasize and make very clear the expectations regarding time commitment in serving on commissions, beyond that of monthly meetings, in order to avoid any misconceptions.

Commissioner Sanders noted that Chair Becker had made an announcement about the vacancies on NextDoor.com that had prompted questions from several residents, specifically about his involvement and time commitment when serving on the HRC and CEC, and expressing his willingness to talk to anyone interested in serving.

Chair Becker noted inclusion in the packet (Attachment A) the most recently-adopted City Council Rules of Procedure, annually reviewed at their first organizational meeting of the year. As it corresponds to the Uniform Commission Code, and more applicable to the CEC, Chair Becker noted Rule 5 related to Public Comment and the section related to Future Agenda Items requested by a Councilmember (or Commissioner). Chair Becker suggested that was a valuable practice for the CEC to follow

825 in introducing new information and providing background information  
826 prior to open discussion and thoughtful action if required. Chair Becker  
827 suggested future discussion and subsequent adoption of similar rules for  
828 the CEC for agenda topics presented and for public comment protocol.  
829 Chair Becker noted that the CEC was basically operating under those rules  
830 informally anyway, but asked for a more detailed discussion at a later  
831 meeting and after individual CEC commissioners had a chance to think  
832 about and review those options.

833  
834 Commissioner Grefenberg suggested that individual CEC commissioners  
835 look at what was released in March of 2015 as CEC rules, even though  
836 incomplete. If new rules area adopted, Commissioner Grefenberg  
837 suggested that be used as a background document and revised accordingly.  
838

839 Commissioner Gardella spoke in support of public comment, but noted the  
840 limited meeting time available. Commissioner Gardella suggested it  
841 would be helpful and more timely if the public wrote down their questions  
842 and the CEC could then respond to those questions more quickly and  
843 recognize their effort to attend. Commissioner Gardella noted that the  
844 CEC didn't have a current process for addressing those items brought  
845 before them.

846  
847 Chair Becker opined that was a reasonable consideration and suggested  
848 more thought before discussing it at a later meeting, including how to  
849 resolve issues brought to the CEC's attention.  
850

851 Commissioner Sanders also noted the need for a process in how to  
852 recognize and respond to correspondence sent to the CEC.  
853

854 Chair Becker duly noted that including general rules on correspondence  
855 could be added to that future discussion as well.  
856

857 **b. Staff Report**

858  
859 **i. Upcoming Items on Future Council Agendas**

860 Mr. Bowman reported on recent City Council meeting topics of  
861 interest to the CEC, and noted the Marion Street Park proposal as  
862 touched upon by City Manager Trudgeon earlier in tonight's  
863 meeting. Mr. Bowman noted that at the February 8<sup>th</sup> meeting that  
864 representatives of the CEC would be attending, the City Council  
865 would also be discussing the community survey.  
866

867 As also mentioned earlier by the City Manager, since the February  
868 8<sup>th</sup> joint meeting would not be a typical format and only have  
869 limited time available, Mr. Bowman noted it wouldn't be  
870 necessary for the entire CEC to attend. Mr. Bowman suggested

871 that the Chair and Vice Chari attend, and limit other  
872 representatives of the CEC at the table, even though he encouraged  
873 all commissioners to attend in the audience, but reiterated that this  
874 joint meeting would be limited in format.

875  
876 Chair Gardella advised that she would extend an invitation to The  
877 Advocates for Human Rights representative to attend the joint  
878 meeting to talk specifically on the grant and partnership proposal.

879  
880 Chair Becker noted that the joint meeting would be of interest to  
881 the CEC as it included a joint meeting with the HRC, CEC and  
882 City Council specific to commission roles; as well as topics on the  
883 Marion Street Park, community survey, and the listening/learning  
884 sessions.

885  
886 **ii. Other Items**

887 None.

888 **7. New Business**

889  
890 **a. Discuss Commission Ordinance Scope/Duties**

891 As part of reviewing the scope, duties and functions of commissions at  
892 that upcoming joint meeting with the City Council, Chair Becker provided  
893 a copy of Chapter 209 (Attachment 7a) to inform tonight's discussion,  
894 seeking any other adjustments identified by his colleagues.

895  
896 Discussion included past City Council discussions and a comment from a  
897 Councilmember related to "reining in" the CEC; how much programming  
898 versus advising was involved in the CEC's scope; and how any  
899 misconceptions can be alleviated.

900  
901 Commissioner Gardella noted it was hard to sometimes differentiate when  
902 to facilitate things and demonstrate process, how to model those processes,  
903 and where they should start and stop. Commissioner Gardella suggested  
904 that be part of the joint meeting discussion, and noted her past comments  
905 based on an understanding that the CEC had no intention of being a  
906 programmatic body from a time or interest basis, while also recognizing  
907 that could come into play with the partnership proposal for the  
908 listening/learning sessions.

909  
910 Commissioner Sanders suggested more clarity was needed in determining  
911 what was the role of the CEC and what information from residents was  
912 produced, if the CEC was to remain advisory in nature.

913  
914 Commissioner Grefenberg commented on Commissioner Gardella's  
915 statement, opining that listening sessions were not programs, and in that  
916 manner he agreed with the thinking of some council members.

917 Commissioner Grefenberg stated that he saw the listening sessions as an  
918 opportunity for staff and the City Council to hear back on those issues, but  
919 not to program them. However, Commissioner Grefenberg clarified that  
920 he didn't fault Commissioner Gardella in pursuing the grant, and noted the  
921 process should provide that desired public input.

922  
923 Specific to Chapter 209, Section 209.02, Item F, Commissioner  
924 Grefenberg sought clarification on what the City Council intended by the  
925 "community visioning process." Similar to the distinctions provided by  
926 Commissioner Gardella on civic and community engagement,  
927 Commissioner Grefenberg suggested that the mayor means more than this  
928 states, and noted his personal interpretation of this is broader than the  
929 *Imagine Roseville 2025* community visioning document and extended to  
930 the comprehensive plan updates. Commissioner Grefenberg asked that  
931 this be clarified when meeting jointly with the City Council as to that  
932 terminology issue, with that request duly noted by Chair Becker.

933  
934 **b. Discuss Outline for Joint Meeting with the City Council**  
935 Chair Becker noted that, since hearing tonight from City Manager  
936 Trudgeon, he needed to change this initial draft of the 2016 Joint Meeting  
937 Outline (attachment 7b dated December 23, 2015).

938  
939 Mr. Bowman concurred, recommending that the City Council would be  
940 interested in seeing the 2016 CEC priority outline for projects. However,  
941 Mr. Bowman noted that with the time constraints, there may not be  
942 sufficient time for a full and detailed hearing of each project. After  
943 meeting with City Manager Trudgeon later this week, Mr. Bowman stated  
944 he would have more clarity on that.

945  
946 Chair Becker noted he would be submitting something to include with the  
947 RCA for the City Council, and suggested limiting that attachment to the  
948 2016 priority projects as outlined and as developed from previous CEC  
949 discussions. However, Chair Becker asked for a final vetting of that draft  
950 at this time and commissioners provided input on each bullet point.

951  
952 Overview of Adopted 2016 Priority Projects  
953 Commissioner Grefenberg expressed concerns with the language of the  
954 first bullet point in the 2015 priority project status report specific to  
955 neighborhood associations and potential misinformation it promoted.

956  
957 Chair Becker assured Commissioner Grefenberg that if it came up he  
958 would clarify it at that time.

959  
960 Commissioner Grefenberg reiterated his concern with the language of  
961 "assisting in alignment with community vision" in the second bullet point  
962 as previously stated. Commissioner Grefenberg suggested broadening it

963 to recommend strategies for re-involvement of Roseville residents in  
964 community vision AND the comprehensive plan.  
965  
966 Chair Becker opined that was a lot of meat under that particular bullet  
967 point; with Commissioner Grefenberg reiterating that it remained unclear  
968 in his mind as to the intent of “community visioning.”  
969  
970 Chair Becker advised that his intent was to be vague, such as in updating  
971 the comprehensive plan, with engagement with the community done  
972 appropriately as indicated. Chair Becker advised that he pulled this  
973 specific language from the City Council’s report and their joint meeting.  
974  
975 Commissioner Gardella suggested this was a good point of conversation  
976 for the joint meeting.  
977  
978 Chair Becker suggested it may also be an ongoing discussion with staff  
979 and further suggested keeping it vague at this point was prudent.  
980  
981 Commissioner Grefenberg opined that no one knew the “vision,” beyond  
982 the *Imagine Roseville 2025* document; and suggested it was not being  
983 intended to rework that process or final document.  
984  
985 Chair Becker concurred, and reiterated that he didn’t anticipate the CEC  
986 doing considerable work on visioning, opining that there would be  
987 adequate opportunities for community input on the comprehensive plan  
988 process and other priority items of the City Council.  
989  
990 Chair Becker asked if this document was representative of past discussions  
991 of the CEC; with Commissioner Gardella agreeing to its content as  
992 presented.  
993  
994 Specific to the 4<sup>th</sup> bullet point (page 2), and plugging into ongoing SE  
995 Roseville work, Commissioner Grefenberg asked for clarification from the  
996 City Council on how they saw that happening in the CEC’s role.  
997  
998 As referenced earlier tonight, Chair Becker noted that the City Council  
999 added the CEC into their strategic priority planning document as indicated  
1000 in the December 7, 2015 RCA and its attachments.  
1001  
1002 Commissioner Grefenberg insisted that he wanted reaffirmation on the  
1003 City Council’s intent, opining that may require another joint meeting of  
1004 the full CEC and City Council.  
1005  
1006 Chair Becker advised that he would submit this 2016 priority project  
1007 overview as part of the RCA for the February 8<sup>th</sup> joint meeting; and if

1008 there was any serious objection voiced by the City Council it may prompt  
1009 another joint meeting in the immediate future.

1010

1011 **c. Preliminary Discussion on City-Wide Survey Questions**

1012 Chair Becker referenced the last community survey (Attachment 7c) and  
1013 sought CEC feedback on any additions or deletions to recommend to the  
1014 City Council as part of their review process.

1015

1016 Commissioner Grefenberg suggested questions be added to the survey as  
1017 follows:

1018 “What do you know about city advisory commission structure?”

1019 “Have you ever considered volunteering for a commission  
1020 position?”

1021 Commissioner Grefenberg opined that the City Council would have  
1022 numerous suggestions; but he thought the issue of community engagement  
1023 and commissions should be raised as part of the survey, since he doubted  
1024 many people knew about that system.

1025

1026 Mr. Bowman noted that the last survey was taken prior to the staff  
1027 addition of Volunteer Coordinator Kelly O’Brien. While the City Council  
1028 may want to explore some of those options as suggested by Commissioner  
1029 Grefenberg, Mr. Bowman reported that part of the discussion would be  
1030 what to retain and what to exclude from the next survey. For instance, Mr.  
1031 Bowman noted that the items specific to the Parks Renewal Program are  
1032 no longer applicable, and other questions needed some massaging from a  
1033 variety of angles.

1034

1035 Commissioner Grefenberg further suggested adding a question to inform  
1036 what media source residents to obtain most of their information; or asking  
1037 them if they were aware of or had used Speak Up! Roseville if that wasn’t  
1038 too premature to ask.

1039

1040 Mr. Bowman noted it may be worth considering even if somewhat  
1041 premature, but suggested it may be more appropriate to seek input on  
1042 Speak Up! Roseville on the community survey two years from now. Mr.  
1043 Bowman noted that the goal of the City Council was to measure where the  
1044 city was at on a biennial basis, and therefore to keep the bulk of the  
1045 questions consistent to establish a base line.

1046

1047 In taking the survey, Commissioner Grefenberg expressed concern in  
1048 representation with many households no longer having land lines, and  
1049 only using cell phones.

1050

1051 Mr. Bowman clarified that this was taken into consideration by the firm  
1052 chosen to perform the survey.

1053

1054 Commissioner Gardella suggested a more generic question such as:  
1055 “How do you participate in community life in Roseville?”  
1056 and a follow-up question such as:  
1057 “What barriers or other issues do you find in pursuing that  
1058 participation?”  
1059 Commissioner Gardella noted her preference for keeping the question  
1060 broader about general participation versus a more specific question, while  
1061 determining participation interest and barriers to that participation.  
1062 Commissioner Gardella suggested this would speak to the process for a  
1063 response versus open-ended questions.

1064  
1065 Commissioner Grefenberg concurred with Commissioner Gardella’s  
1066 suggestion to keep the question more general in nature.  
1067

1068 **8. Commission Communications, Reports, and Announcements**

1069 For the benefit of the viewing public, Chair Becker read the announcement related  
1070 to citizen advisory commission vacancies, the application process, with contact  
1071 information from City Hall.  
1072

1073 Commissioner Sanders provided a copy of the flyer announcing an upcoming  
1074 meeting for community gardening opportunities, and contact information for the  
1075 steering committee and location of meetings.  
1076

1077 Mr. Bowman advised that he would include that flyer along with other bench  
1078 handouts from tonight’s meeting as provided.  
1079

1080 At the request of Commissioner Grefenberg related to past meeting minutes and  
1081 bench handouts, Mr. Bowman advised he would review those past meeting  
1082 minutes, and once those minutes were approved by the CEC, he would include  
1083 attachments on the city’s website as part of the meeting minute records.  
1084

1085 **9. Commissioner-Initiated Items for Future Meetings**

1086 Commissioner Grefenberg noted the anticipated availability of a representative of  
1087 the St. Louis Park CEC at the February Roseville CEC meeting.  
1088

1089 Commissioner Grefenberg reported that, earlier today, he had also asked  
1090 Community Development Director Paul Bilotta to attend the February CEC  
1091 meeting and make a presentation about the upcoming comprehensive plan update  
1092 and rewrite, anticipated to start up in March or April of 2016. Commissioner  
1093 Grefenberg opined it would be important to learn how the CEC will be involved  
1094 in that process, whether through community visioning or in other ways; and  
1095 suggested Chair Becker include that presentation on the March 2016 CEC agenda  
1096 as a discussion on how much CEC input is included in the process so it can be  
1097 decided at the very beginning.  
1098



1099 Chair Becker asked Mr. Bowman to coordinate that information and presentation  
1100 with Mr. Bilotta.

1101  
1102 Commissioner Grefenberg reported that he had also asked Mr. Bilotta, at that  
1103 February CEC meeting, to provide his insights on community engagement.

1104  
1105 Commissioner Gardella asked if this was specific to neighborhood association  
1106 discussions; with Commissioner Grefenberg responding affirmatively.

1107  
1108 Whether at the February CEC meeting or on a later agenda, Commissioner  
1109 Grefenberg suggested a discussion to plan orientation for new CEC members.

1110  
1111 Mr. Bowman reported that there would be training offered by the city staff for all  
1112 newly-appointed commissioners in April of 2016 and suggested that orientation  
1113 could be incorporated with that training.

1114  
1115 Chair Becker also reported that, in the past, he had personally contacted newly-  
1116 appointed commissioners as part of the orientation process.

1117  
1118 Commissioner Grefenberg opined that as the new members come on board in  
1119 April, by holding an orientation session, it would also prove useful to update  
1120 newer members of the CEC already serving.

1121  
1122 Outside the parameters of what is already being done by city staff and by Chair  
1123 Becker, Commissioner Gardella asked Commissioner Grefenberg what the intent  
1124 of additional orientation or training would be.

1125  
1126 Commissioner Grefenberg responded that while the city staff providing general  
1127 training for all newly-appointed commissioners, an orientation would provide  
1128 CEC-specific information. Commissioner Grefenberg mentioned his previous  
1129 concern that new commissioners understand their time commitment beyond just  
1130 2-3 hours per month of meeting time.

1131  
1132 Chair Becker advised that he would add this to his list of suggestion to discuss  
1133 outside meeting time.

1134  
1135 Commissioner Grefenberg asked that at the February CEC meeting, Chair Becker  
1136 and/or Vice Chair Gardella provide a recap of the discussion held at the joint  
1137 meeting with the City Council that was specific to the CEC.

1138  
1139 **10. Recap of Commission Actions This Meeting**  
1140 Vice Chair Gardella provided a recap of action items from tonight's meeting:  
1141 • Schedule a meeting with City Manager Trudgeon, Commissioners Sanders  
1142 and Gardella, city staff, and The Advocates for Human Rights representative  
1143 to align strategies and to present a united front at the joint meeting with the  
1144 City Council to report on application for and award of the grant

- 1145                   • All CEC commissioners are encouraged to solicit candidates interested in  
1146                   serving on advisory commission having vacancies, including the CEC  
1147                   • CEC commissioners are asked to review and come prepared in February to  
1148                   discuss adopting Rules and Procedures for the CEC, specifically including  
1149                   public comment and bringing agenda topics forward prior to discussion by the  
1150                   body

1151  
1152                   Mr. Bowman advised that he would consult with Mr. Bilotta as to his availability  
1153                   to attend the February CEC meeting.

1154  
1155                   Commissioner Grefenberg reiterated that he had already spoken to Mr. Bilotta  
1156                   about attending the meeting.

1157  
1158                   Commissioner Grefenberg reiterated his request to make clear during commission  
1159                   interviews the time commitment for serving, noting when he sat in on interviews  
1160                   as a commission chair he had done so.

1161  
1162                   Mr. Bowman advised that he would bring that to the attention of staff and City  
1163                   Manager Trudgeon to include that information as part of the application process.

1164  
1165                   **11. Adjournment**  
1166                   Commissioner Gardella moved, Commissioner Sanders seconded, adjournment of  
1167                   the meeting at approximately 8:53 p.m.

1168  
1169                   **Ayes: 6**  
1170                   **Nays: 0**  
1171                   **Motion carried.**

1172  
1173                   **Next Meeting – Thursday, February 11, 2016 at 6:30 p.m.**  
1174  
1175