



# Community Engagement Commission Agenda

Thursday, Jan. 14, 2016

6:30 p.m.

City Council Chambers

- 6:30 p.m.     **1. Roll Call**
- 2. Approve Agenda**
- 3. Public Comment on Items Not on Agenda**
- 4. Approval of December 10 meeting minutes**
- 5. Old Business**
- 6:45 p.m.             a. Discuss potential city requirements for neighborhood associations (in exchange for material support)
- 7:30 p.m.             b. Update on community listening and learning events
- 7:40 p.m.             c. Update on Joint Task Force on Zoning Notification
- 7:50 p.m.     **6. Chair, Committee, and Staff Reports**
- a. Chair's Report
- b. Staff Report
- i. Upcoming items on future council agendas
- ii. Other Items
- 8:00 p.m.     **7. New Business**
- a. Discuss Commission Ordinance Scope/Duties
- b. Discuss outline for joint meeting with the City Council
- c. Preliminary discussion on city-wide survey questions
- 8:45 p.m.     **8. Commission Communications, Reports, and Announcements**
- 9. Commissioner-Initiated Items for Future Meetings**
- 10. Recap of Commission Actions This Meeting**
- 8:15 p.m.     **11. Adjournment**

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

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





**-Minutes**

**Roseville Community Engagement Commission (CEC)**

**Thursday, December 10, 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.

**Commissioners Present:** Chair Scot Becker; and Commissioners Sherry Sanders, Theresa Gardella, Michelle Manke and Gary Grefenberg

**Members Commissioners:** Commissioner Jonathan Miller; and Ebony Adedayo who resigned last week as reported by Chair Becker

**Staff Present:** Staff Liaison/Communications Manager Garry Bowman

**2. Approve Agenda**

Grefenberg moved, Manke seconded, approval of the agenda as presented.

**Ayes: 5**

**Nays: 0**

**Motion carried.**

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

None.

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

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

Grefenberg moved, Gardella seconded, approval of the November 12, 2015 meeting minutes as presented.

Commissioner Manke requested that future meeting minutes stipulate "commissioners" rather than "members."

Commissioner Grefenberg asked that staff make sure any referenced reports or bench handouts are included on the website once meeting minutes are approved.

~~Calling his attention to these meeting minutes just approved (lines 60-61),~~  
**Commissioner**

44 As an example, Commissioner Grefenberg called Mr. Bowman’s attention to lines  
45 60-61 of the November 12, 2015 meeting minutes.

46  
47 **Ayes: 5**

48 **Nays: 0**

49 **Motion carried.**

50

51 **5. Old Business**

52

53 **a. Update on Community Listening and Learning Events**

54 Commissioner Gardella reported on her most recent meeting, along with  
55 Commissioner Sanders, with ~~city staff representatives and council member~~  
56 ~~representatives~~ Mayor Roe and Councilmember Laliberte. Commissioner  
57 Gardella noted that Mayor Roe and Councilmember Laliberts requested  
58 further detail and focus on the proposal, and then to set a time to present  
59 the revised proposal to the Council. Commissioner Gardella stated that  
60 Commissioner Sanders and Madeline Lohman from the Advocates for  
61 Human Rights agreed to focus the listening and learning sessions in  
62 Southeast Roseville to align with the city’s focus on the area in 2016. ~~the~~  
63 city requested focus remaining on SE Roseville for 2016 and beyond, with  
64 the first listening session will be sponsored by the Lake McCarron’s  
65 Neighborhood Association followed by another session ~~with~~ the Karen  
66 Organization of Minnesota, and then another session through I.S.D. 623.  
67 Commissioner Gardella reported that the intent was to hold them all  
68 within the first quarter of 2016; with the discussion process continuing to  
69 move forward for next steps.

70

71 Commissioner Gardella noted that ~~representative~~ Madeline Lohman from  
72 the Advocates for Human Rights had found a small grant opportunity  
73 through “The Linking Communities Project: Creating Welcome for  
74 Refugees (TLC Project),” with specificity for the Karen community and  
75 having translation and interpretation options available, as well as potential  
76 child care adding extra benefits to the process. Given the limited time to  
77 submit the grant application and necessity for a 501.c(3) organization for  
78 the application itself, Commissioner Gardella reported that the Lake  
79 McCarron’s Neighborhood Association had graciously offered to provide  
80 the grant application under their organization’s umbrella to facilitate the  
81 application. Commissioner Gardella anticipated finding out in early-  
82 mid-December of 2015 if the grant application was successful.

83

84 Commissioner Gardella clarified that the CEC had previously approved a  
85 partnership with the Advocates for Human Rights, but not this specific  
86 grant application. While apologizing for proceeding with the application,  
87 and having to alert the CEC after-the-fact, Commissioner Gardella stated  
88 that she had felt comfortable in submitting the grant application as a way  
89 to fund the CEC’s efforts in pursuing one of the Commission’s strategic

90 | ~~priorities. SE Roseville initiatives.~~ With the Lake McCarron's  
91 | Neighborhood Association taking the leadership role, Commissioner  
92 | Gardella ~~noted advised~~ that ~~the~~ City was mentioned in the application  
93 | itself, but ~~it~~ didn't obligate the City or City Council in any way. If the  
94 | application proves successful, Commissioner Gardella suggested bringing  
95 | that information to the City Council as part of the CEC's initiatives for SE  
96 | Roseville as a potential funding source for their approval.  
97 |

98 | Discussion among commissioners included estimated timing for the first  
99 | Karen listening session in February; public relations options in defining  
100 | those participating in the sponsorship (e.g. Lake McCarron's  
101 | Neighborhood Association, City of Roseville, and Community  
102 | Engagement ~~Council Commission~~); reporting of initiatives such as this to  
103 | the City Council at their next joint meeting with the CEC to ensure their  
104 | buy-in; and the understanding that this initial effort had been presented to  
105 | as part of the CEC's 2015 work plan and subsequently approved by the  
106 | City Council, ~~even though since~~ it differed to some extent from ~~what the~~  
107 | ~~the Commission's 2015 Work Plan~~ City Council actually approved ~~by the~~  
108 | ~~Council~~ in December of 2014 ~~related to training/educational opportunities~~  
109 | ~~versus this type style of presentation.~~  
110 |

111 | Chair Becker noted that he would be updating the CEC on recent City  
112 | Council discussions related to their advisory commissions (Agenda Item  
113 | 5.d) and the preference of the CEC in focusing on policies and  
114 | recommendations, with a segment of the City Council feeling that the  
115 | CEC was stepping away from their mandate. Toward that effort, Chair  
116 | Becker reported that he was seeking a joint meeting with the City Council  
117 | early in 2016 ~~if their schedule allowed it.~~ Chair Becker opined that this  
118 | was ~~also~~ prudent, especially if the City was listed as a partner in this grant  
119 | application. Chair Becker clarified that he didn't feel that this ~~new~~  
120 | concept gleaned from that initial ~~2015~~ priority was ~~insurmountable~~  
121 | ~~impossible~~, but that the CEC just needed to ensure it was positioned  
122 | accurately going forward.  
123 |

124 | As part of that discussion, Chair Becker noted that the City Council had  
125 | recently adopted their Priority Planning document, and SE Roseville had  
126 | been listed as one of their priorities, ~~This Council decision~~ ~~which~~ further  
127 | supported the CEC's efforts toward that goal and this grant application  
128 | and initiative should dovetail nicely with their priorities.  
129 |

130 | Commissioner Gardella suggested this might serve as a test case for the  
131 | CEC in determining programmatic versus policy-driven ~~citizen advisory~~  
132 | ~~commissions, and how to demonstrate that tool and its value or engage in~~  
133 | ~~a pilot project.~~ Commissioner Gardella stated she would be interested to  
134 | learn where the "advisory" part stopped. ~~She stated she had no desire for~~  
135 | ~~the CEC to become a programmatic body and that the intent this project~~

136 | was to facilitate the relationship with the Advocates and to help develop  
137 | ownership for the process among city staff. ~~and while not desiring the~~  
138 | ~~CEC to become programmatic, it had been intentional that it have~~  
139 | ~~ownership from staff, and develop or facilitate an advocate with the city as~~  
140 | ~~part of its infrastructure; at least based on her perspective of how she~~  
141 | ~~envisioned the role of the CEC.~~

142 |  
143 | While the grant application deadline was problematic and thus  
144 | necessitated moving forward with the application process,  
145 | Commissioner Gardella advised that the grant notification timeline and  
146 | availability of resources and their timing may negate any concerns in not  
147 | having received buy-in from the City Council sooner than later.

148 |  
149 | At the request of In response to a question from Commissioner  
150 | Grefenberg, Commissioner Gardella clarified that the rationale in applying  
151 | for the grant under the Lake McCarron's Neighborhood Association was  
152 | due to the fact it needed to be under a non-profit.

153 |  
154 | Commissioner Grefenberg reported that any city-sponsored projected or  
155 | grant needed approval by the City Manager, advising that the Human  
156 | Rights Commission had experienced problems on this the same issue in  
157 | applying for a grant. While appreciating the sponsorship of Lake  
158 | McCarron's Neighborhood Association, Commissioner Grefenberg  
159 | suggested making it very clear who the recipient of the grant would be,  
160 | and suggested Commissioners Gardella and Sanders touch base with City  
161 | Manager Trudgeon accordingly to clarify that process.

162 |  
163 | As mentioned by Chair Becker, Commissioner Grefenberg distributed a  
164 | bench handout with excerpts of the November 30, 2015 City Council  
165 | meeting in which they addressed the roles of several advisory commission  
166 | roles were discussed, as well as the need for a and general review for all  
167 | Commissions in 2016. Commissioner Grefenberg referred to comments  
168 | specific to the CEC and concerns expressed by the several City Council  
169 | members that Community Engagement Commission was that they were  
170 | falling into a programmatic mode, and as such perhaps getting into  
171 | programming areas already under the jurisdiction of the Human Rights  
172 | Commission. Commissioner Grefenberg encouraged Commissioner  
173 | Gardella to speak directly to Councilmember Laliberte regarding her  
174 | concerns on this issue to make sure everyone was on the same page.  
175 | Commissioner Grefenberg stated he was not in agreement with those  
176 | Council concerns, but simply t thought it important to share these  
177 | concerns of some Council members with the CEC.

178 |  
179 | Commissioner Sanders stated that if there was any issue with the grant  
180 | application or with the CEC's involvement or association with it, or  
181 | should that which could tie up grant funds if awarded, she offered to have

182 Lake McCarron’s Neighborhood Association take full ownership of it,  
183 noting that the Karen community had been and continued to be a clear  
184 mission of their Association, with or without the CEC’s involvement.  
185

186 Commissioner Grefenberg ~~stated~~noted that as Chair of the Human Rights  
187 Commission he ~~thought the CEC~~ had initiated the ~~discussion~~ with the  
188 Karen community, and he continued to supported the effort, ~~While not~~  
189 ~~considering it an insurmountable problem or suggesting setting up a~~  
190 ~~standard program, Commissioner Grefenberg~~ He opined that the city  
191 council majority believed the CEC should provide advice and  
192 recommendations to develop ways for the city council and staff to  
193 understand the Karen community versus pursue their own ~~activities~~  
194 program, thus the listening sessions being considered by Commissioners  
195 Gardella and Sanders were not programs but a procedural change to  
196 provide opportunities for City leaders to hear from them.  
197

198  
199 Commissioner Gardella noted the desire to demonstrate what community  
200 engagement could look like as well. Commissioner Gardella admitting  
201 this was all part of learning the landscape as the CEC moved forward.  
202 Based on her understanding of the CEC’s ~~charge~~ direction from Mayor  
203 Roe and Councilmember Laliberte, Commissioner Gardella stated she had  
204 not heard them express any concern that the CEC be cautious in that  
205 regard and felt confident proceeding accordingly. However,  
206 Commissioner Gardella expressed her interest in doubling back to the City  
207 to clarify that and noted that, if the grant application proved an area of  
208 concern, any mention of the city could be removed and allow the Lake  
209 McCarron’s Neighborhood Association to handle it.  
210

211 Commissioner Sanders readily agreed and offered to provide a full report  
212 of the event to the City Council, no matter who took the lead.  
213

214 Chair Becker opined he thought it would be profitable to get the city  
215 council’s buy in upfront to incorporate it and involve staff right away.  
216 Also, if the CEC was listed on the grant application, Chair Becker noted  
217 that it provided their endorsement, which could prove instrumental in  
218 getting the grant, whether it proved to be only as a third party. Therefore,  
219 Chair Becker reiterated the need to get the city council’s buy-in and  
220 articulate how it may differ from original intents.  
221

222 For the record, Commissioner Grefenberg stated that he recalled various  
223 requests made over the last 6-9 months to the Human Rights Commission  
224 to collaborate with the CEC. Therefore, Commissioner Grefenberg  
225 clarified that there was no intent by the CEC to one up the HRC by getting  
226 into their turf.  
227



228 Chair Becker reiterated the City Council’s strategic priorities and their  
229 desire to engage directly with the Karen community in SE Roseville and  
230 involving a number of advisory commissions, including the CEC. Chair  
231 Becker acknowledged that the HRC was the first to engage with the Karen  
232 community, but recognized the apparent desire of the City Council to  
233 engage and involve all advisory commissions.  
234

235 In again referencing the November 30<sup>th</sup> City Council’s meeting minute  
236 excerpts, Commissioner Grefenberg noted ~~their-its~~ discussion on the  
237 various roles of the HRC and CEC, and reviewed his recollection of the  
238 timeframe for involvement in SE Roseville projects.  
239

240 Chair Becker clarified the actions of the City Council specific to the CEC  
241 and directives from them at the last joint meeting and related to focus on  
242 the upcoming Comprehensive Plan update process and the SE Roseville  
243 project. Chair Becker further clarified that this would become part of the  
244 recommendations for the CEC’s 2016 work plan for City Council  
245 approval.  
246

247 Discussion ensued between Commissioners Grefenberg and Sanders  
248 related to her role representing the Interagency Task Force and subgroup,  
249 Lake McCarron’s Neighborhood Association, and the CEC.  
250

251 Commissioner Manke asked how the listening event would be  
252 communicated to the community; with Commissioner Gardella advising  
253 that Ms. Lohman ~~as-part~~ of the Advocates for Human Rightsey effort  
254 would provide those services as part of the original scope of services they  
255 intended to provide.  
256

257 **b. Update on Joint Task Force on Zoning Notification**

258 At the request of Chair Becker, Commissioner Manke provided an update  
259 on the ~~Task Force~~, noting that Commissioner Grefenberg continued his  
260 efforts in working with a member of the task force to formalize minutes  
261 and develop a plan to present to the CEC for their approval.  
262

263 Commissioner Grefenberg admitted this was one reason he felt swamped,  
264 in his attempts to draft the task force report as well as organizing the  
265 development of the Commission’s report to the Council, including  
266 arranging comment from other municipalities with Neighborhood  
267 Association experience. On this last point he, ~~noted ing that~~ the CEC  
268 would be the first ones to see the draft, ~~and~~ While he would prefer it to  
269 be ready before then, Commissioner Grefenberg advised that it may not  
270 be ready to come ~~before- to~~ the CEC- Commission before ~~their- its~~  
271 February 2016 meeting.  
272



273 Given the CEC’s last joint meeting with the City Council, Chair Becker  
274 suggested sooner rather than later, since their initial projects charged to the  
275 CEC involved the task forces and SE Roseville. Chair Becker suggested  
276 that “perfect not become the enemy of good enough” and encouraged  
277 Commissioner Grefenberg to pursue his best efforts in finalizing the draft  
278 report for presentation to the CEC.

279  
280 Commissioner Manke opined that this zoning ~~notification~~ task force had  
281 ~~proven developed as~~ a great effort between two commissions and staff;  
282 ~~she~~ further ~~opining~~ opined that she had found it flawless ~~by~~ in its mutual  
283 involvement of two separate commissions, and how the process had  
284 proceeded.

285  
286 Commissioner Grefenberg advised that ~~one a~~ report the task force was  
287 waiting on was from Community Development Director Paul Bilotta  
288 involving actions already taken by his department to ensure citizen  
289 involvement in zoning decisions over the last five years. Commissioner  
290 Grefenberg opined that the process had gotten significantly better and this  
291 would serve as another step in further improving it.

292  
293 **c. Follow-up on *Roseville Review* Delivery Issues**

294 In respect to an issue raised at the last meeting by a letter from a Roseville  
295 resident regarding the recent lack of home delivery of the Roseville  
296 Review and in ~~the~~ the absence of Commissioner Miller, Chair Becker  
297 reported on his behalf. Chair Becker advised that Commissioner Miller  
298 had reached out to ownership of the *Roseville Review* several times, but  
299 had yet to hear back from them. Chair Becker referenced a link submitted  
300 by Councilmember Willmus to a recent *Minneapolis Star Tribune* article  
301 about the struggles being realized by community newspapers, and  
302 suggested that this situation was no exception. Chair Becker suggested  
303 there may be limited funds available for carriers in certain areas to deliver  
304 newspapers. Chair Becker advised that Councilmember Willmus ~~he~~ had  
305 provided a link to other members of the CEC via the city’s website, and  
306 asked them to contact him (Chair Becker) if they didn’t receive the  
307 information.

308  
309 At the request of Commissioner Grefenberg, Mr. Bowman advised that he  
310 had heard nothing of any concerns for the future of this local publication  
311 beyond typical print media issues being realized by others.

312  
313 **d. Continue Discussion on 2016 Priority Planning**

314 Chair Becker introduced areas of synergy between possible CEC priorities  
315 and those of the recently-adopted City Council Policy Priority Planning  
316 (PPP) document. Chair Becker advised that he had also incorporated  
317 carryover items from the 2014 CEC recommended policies and strategies  
318 (the Neighborhood Associations effort and the joint Task Force on Zoning

319 | Notification), and those items discussed at the last joint meeting ~~of with~~  
320 | the City Council ~~and CEC and indicating a unanimous position or~~  
321 | ~~directive, which he believed had unanimous Commission support. Even~~  
322 | ~~Though Commissioner Miller was unable to attend tonight's meeting,~~  
323 | Chair Becker noted his submission of proposed priorities for 2016, and  
324 | those of Commissioners Gardella, Miller, Grefenberg, as well as tonight's  
325 | submission by Commission Manke.  
326 |

327 | Chair Becker thanked those individual CEC commissioners who had  
328 | submitted their input for proposed 2016 priorities for the CEC work plan.  
329 | As a starting point for tonight's discussion, Chair Becker suggested those  
330 | individual priorities be reviewed to determine areas of consensus,  
331 | followed by areas needing further consideration. He suggested the  
332 | Commission use his proposed 2016 priorities as the document to work  
333 | from in determining consensus and a reasonable CEC work plan for 2016.  
334 |

335 | ~~Using his proposed 2016 priorities as the document to work from in~~  
336 | ~~determining consensus and a reasonable CEC work plan for 2016.~~  
337 |

338 | Commissioner Grefenberg suggested, before finalizing priorities, the CEC  
339 | allow time to meet jointly with the City Council to invite comments from  
340 | them for their desired priorities for the CEC. Commissioner Grefenberg  
341 | noted that the CEC had added two additional items from such a process  
342 | subsequent to their last meeting with the City Council.  
343 |

344 | Chair Becker clarified that his intent was to present the draft 2016 work  
345 | plan to the City Council at the next joint meeting, and then receive their  
346 | input on that document as well as any additional input.  
347 |

348 | Chair Becker noted that the first three bullet points on his proposed 2016  
349 | priority document were based on City Council feedback at the last joint  
350 | meeting, thereby representing three of the items heard from them at that  
351 | time. Of import, Chair Becker referenced the first bullet point (Assist in  
352 | Community Visioning Alignment) and noted the City Council's directive to  
353 | the CEC to begin community visioning work prior to the 2017  
354 | comprehensive plan update ~~process~~ and aligning community aspirations  
355 | now with that of the initial *Imagine Roseville 2025* document.  
356 |

357 | Moving on to the second bullet point (Expand city learning/engagement  
358 | opportunities), Chair Becker noted that involved expanding city learning  
359 | and engagement opportunities as shown, especially in following through  
360 | on the City's cancellation of the annual "Living Smarter Fair" and  
361 | dissolution of the Housing & Redevelopment Authority (HRA). Chair  
362 | Becker noted the ideas that could come from that discussion and ultimate  
363 | recommendation to the City Council for that function, along with  
364 | evaluating the format and content of the "Roseville University" program.

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  
405  
406  
407  
408

Specific to the formerly ~~used~~ City welcome packet, Chair Becker noted that was also brought up by the City Council, seeking a recommendation from the CEC.

Noting her inclusion of that item in her proposed 2016 priority list, Commissioner Gardella agreed with Chair Becker on the –need to re-energize Roseville University, but also suggested consideration be given to reformatting that City series.

Commissioner Grefenberg noted the inclusion of city buy-in to the CEC community listening and learning events in his list of 2016 priority projects, and expressed his support of how Chair Becker worded that initiative in his document, as his second bullet.

Chair Becker opined that the third bullet point (Form strategies for outreach to underrepresented groups) on his list of priorities covered the City Council’s expectations heard by the CEC earlier this year and implied by projects identified in the City Council’s PPP document.

Commissioner Gardella noted the listening/learning initiatives fit in with those first three bullet points, and were also included on her list and that of Commissioner Miller.

Chair Becker advised that, since it was intended that the CEC discussions on neighborhood associations and the recommendation of the Joint Task Force on Notifications would be finalized shortly, he had not included them as a new item in 2016.

Commissioner Grefenberg ~~asked~~ agreed with Commission Manke’s fourth main bullet (Explore Senior Concerns) ~~that seniors~~ also be incorporated into the list of outreach to under-represented groups, ~~(which now only listed e.g. renters and businesses),~~ as well as including seniors in community visioning work.

Commissioner Manke asked that the concerns and ideas of Roseville youth also be included in those efforts. Commissioner Manke opined that youth needed to be engaged related to their issues at home, educational and park issues, and other directions. Commissioner Manke noted other communities (e.g. Golden Valley, Minneapolis and St. Paul) that had actual youth Commissioners actively engaged youth on advisory commissions, suggesting additional research and exploration of those efforts.

409 | Chair Becker agreed, noting the new Uniform Commission Code already  
410 | allowed the addition of non-voting youth commissioners appointed by the  
411 | City Council to most advisory commissions.

413 | While agreeing with the need to recognize youth concerns in the  
414 | community, Commissioner Grefenberg stated he was less optimistic about  
415 | adding a youth position to ~~the Community Engagement Commission~~,  
416 | based in part on his experience with most HRC youth commissioners ~~on~~  
417 | ~~the HRC~~ who typically were only interested in having community  
418 | involvement that listed on their college admission documents ~~to show~~  
419 | ~~their community involvement~~. ~~Before he would be able to accept such an~~  
420 | ~~addition to the CEC~~, Commissioner Grefenberg suggested connecting with  
421 | the school system to motivate and mobilize youth ~~with into~~ ongoing  
422 | engagement opportunities and projects and to determine their focus.  
423 | Commissioner Grefenberg expressed his willingness to discuss this  
424 | further, but at this time stated his unwillingness for the CEC to spend any  
425 | considerable time on ~~it~~. adding youth commissioners.

427 | Chair Becker suggested not getting into that level of detail at this time,  
428 | with specifics to be identified at a later date, along with whether or not  
429 | they would work out. Chair Becker stated that he shared the view of  
430 | Commissioner Grefenberg; however, he argued that teens were currently  
431 | under-represented in the community, ~~and~~ opined that a lack of having a  
432 | youth representative representation on the CEC was probably not the best  
433 | way to get their youth involvement or make them feel welcome ~~in such a~~  
434 | ~~leadership development opportunity, but it~~ and allowing for youth  
435 | commissioners would create a space to receive their input depending how  
436 | it was eventually defined and the age cut off for that youth involvement  
437 | (e.g. up to age 25). Chair Becker noted the goal was to open up ways for  
438 | youth participation in their community, not to enhance college  
439 | applications.

441 | Commissioner Grefenberg thanked Chair Becker for his perspective,  
442 | reiterating his support for integrating that effort with the school system or  
443 | through some other vehicle.

445 | Specific to the third bullet point on his list, Chair Becker advised that he  
446 | had been intentional in listing the groups (e.g. renters and businesses)  
447 | based on the specific feedback from the City Council. However, Chair  
448 | Becker stated he had not intended that ~~it~~ to exclude any groups other than  
449 | those cited.

451 | Commissioner Grefenberg stated that some members of the Neighborhood  
452 | Association Task Force had indicated that they felt “businesses”  
453 | received enough attention assistance from the City, citing the example of a  
454 | full page dedicated to businesses interests in the *City News* newsletter and

455 | ~~encouragement by~~ the Community Development Department on-going  
456 | efforts to relocate or expand in Roseville. Commissioner Grefenberg  
457 | clarified that the task force had taken no explicit position on that issue, but  
458 | recommended it be left up to individual neighborhood associations. He  
459 | indicated that he had brought that comment forward as a ~~valid~~-sentiment  
460 | that some in the community felt that businesses were ~~fully served and~~-not  
461 | under-represented.

462 |  
463 | Instead of getting too detailed at this point, Commissioner Gardella  
464 | suggested sticking with main bullet point strategies for outreach, and  
465 | allowing the City Council to provide their feedback, after which the CEC  
466 | could determine those needing the most immediate outreach.

467 |  
468 | Commissioner Grefenberg stated that he felt strongly about adding seniors  
469 | to the current list in the outreach bullet point.

470 |  
471 | Specific to business outreach, Commissioner Sanders noted past  
472 | discussion about joining residents and businesses to work cooperatively  
473 | rather than separately.

474 |  
475 | Commissioner Grefenberg recalled the Task Force not recommending  
476 | including businesses as part of neighborhood associations, but letting  
477 | individual associations make that determination, as appeared to be the  
478 | opinion of several Task Force members.

479 |  
480 | Speaking for the Lake McCarron's Neighborhood Association that she  
481 | represented, Commissioner Sanders advised that they included businesses  
482 | with the goal to see them succeed.

483 |  
484 | Consensus of the CEC was to include "seniors" and "businesses" in the  
485 | third bullet point at this time, pending ~~possible~~-further discussion in the  
486 | future.

487 |  
488 | While in agreement with the consensus, Commissioner Manke opined that  
489 | there were ways to engage businesses in the community beyond current  
490 | outreach efforts (e.g. connecting seniors or youth with appropriate  
491 | businesses and other opportunities), providing several examples to  
492 | accomplish that effort.

493 |  
494 | Specific to his next bullet point," (~~e~~Continue engagement infrastructure  
495 | work)," Chair Becker reviewed the subpoints listed under that main bullet  
496 | were he'd included based on previous City Council feedback. Chair  
497 | Becker suggested this would serve to form common semantics and the  
498 | basic framework for the CEC recommendations for how Roseville should  
499 | be engaged. Chair Becker noted this also incorporated one of  
500 | Commissioner Gardella's points, and the input received ~~from~~-from Mayor



501 Roe and Councilmember Laliberte from their attendance at a community  
502 engagement conference in early 2015. As already recognized by Mayor  
503 Roe, Chair Becker noted that the SE Roseville efforts were already  
504 underway; therefore the CEC may get involved in that retroactively or use  
505 it as a learning curve to inform future processes.

506  
507 As part of that infrastructure tool, Commissioner Grefenberg asked Mr.  
508 Bowman for a report on how many entries on Speak Up! Roseville had  
509 been dropped, squelched or deleted to-date.

510  
511 Chair Becker suggested Mr. Bowman address that later in tonight's  
512 meeting during his regular staff report.

513  
514 Chair Becker clarified that the Speak Up! Roseville module was one tool  
515 to be used and while the CEC needed to remain focused on and be  
516 shepherds of that tool, other advisory commissions needed to be ~~were~~  
517 involved as well. Chair Becker noted that the listening/learning sessions  
518 were another tool as were the items brought forward from the conference  
519 by Mayor Roe and Councilmember Laliberte. Chair Becker suggested  
520 future discussion would involve determining which are most important or  
521 which had been done or would be done and when to do so, with some  
522 valid now and others for future consideration.

523  
524 Commissioner Gardella opined that the foundational piece centered on the  
525 listening/learning sessions and the format of implementation –for those  
526 ~~depending on their location;~~, stressing that with engagement was informed  
527 by those ~~yo who u~~ want to engage ~~with~~. As such listening was critical as a  
528 initial step before the City planned engagement opportunities.

529  
530 At this point, Commissioner Gardella opined that this remained an  
531 unknown since the CEC could come up with a set of tools for the city to  
532 use, but a more productive idea may be for the CEC to develop best  
533 practices on how to conduct those listening sessions, and how to develop  
534 those relations to support engagement. Commissioner Gardella stated that  
535 was the challenge from her perspective, and as discussed by the first  
536 original task force, how to shift ~~that the~~ culture of City Hall to ~~or~~ orientate  
537 it yourself –in terms of where and when to open up city decisions and  
538 policies.

539  
540 At the request of Chair Becker, Commissioner Gardella stated she didn't  
541 have a better term than "infrastructure" ~~and~~ but didn't feel ~~that~~ it was  
542 incorrect terminology, ~~but from her perspective,~~ since that term involved  
543 establishing that practice or process for each effort, such as a listening  
544 session, and required a different way to think about various engagement  
545 processes. Commissioner Gardella noted that this could involve the  
546 frequency of engagement processes as well.

547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592

Commissioner Grefenberg spoke in support of Commissioner Gardella’s comments, suggesting assessing those vehicles over the next year or so to determine which were working and ~~how they were working~~ which were ~~or~~ not.

Mr. Bowman noted that the Community Development Department had initiated most of those processes, and clarified that they revolved around projects (e.g. Dale Street, Old Highway 8, and zoning changes) and while some may have already been in place, most were specific to issues rather than a generalized process.

While not having included it on his list of 2016 priorities, Commissioner Grefenberg suggested ~~having incorporating into Speak Up Roseville~~ the Mayor’s give the next State of the City Address” ~~annually in January or February~~ to allow the community to be more engaged and allow public comment. With the incorporation of the Speak Up! Roseville website, Commissioner Grefenberg suggested that tool provided that opportunity in a controlled, positive way. While agreeing with Chair Becker’s fourth bullet point, Commissioner Grefenberg stated he didn’t think only including three subpoints ~~we was re~~ sufficient, and suggested addressing the Mayor’s State of the City address as another subpoint.

Chair Becker reiterated that the subpoints were taken from his notes of their ~~joint~~ meeting ~~of~~ with the City Council, ~~and~~ CEC ~~and~~ were not intended to be exclusive. Chair Becker suggested the CEC take this up annually and develop further patterns of how the city can engage.

Specific to his fifth bullet point (Accomplish select items from 2014 Community Engagment Commissions), Chair Becker noted that Commissioner Miller’s list included something similar (second bullet point about town hall meetings). As stewards of 2014 CEC recommendations, Chair Becker suggested the CEC continually review those policies and strategies; determine which had been accomplished and what remained attainable yet this year. Chair Becker advised that he had included some as a cross-reference, and some he’d removed after their completion, with others remaining for work. Chair Becker asked for commissioner feedback on others to include or delete.

Commissioner Gardella noted her priorities and pointes those of Commissioner Manke appeared to be incorporated in their entirety in Chair Becker’s list.

Commissioner Grefenberg expressed his concern in the term “community visioning,” opining that had already been done in the *Imagine Roseville 2025* process. However, as part of the comprehensive plan update,



593 Commissioner Grefenberg noted he had long been an advocate for and  
594 continued to support including a vision chapter as part of the  
595 comprehensive plan update, but preferred a different heading than that of  
596 “community visioning.”  
597

598 Chair Becker clarified that he was suggesting that the CEC assist in  
599 alignment of that vision, not develop a new vision; but to take the *Imagine*  
600 *Roseville 2025* document and incorporate it and its goals into the update  
601 process and, as alluded to by Mayor Roe, to align past documents with the  
602 2017 Comprehensive Plan update.  
603

604 Mr. Bowman stated that a goal of the Community Development  
605 Department between now and initiating the comprehensive plan update  
606 process was to use the Speak Up! Roseville website tool to throw out ideas  
607 and gain community input to inform the update and use that module as a  
608 sounding board to initiate community thought and crowd-sourcing.  
609

610 Commissioner Grefenberg clarified that community involvement work  
611 done prior to the Comprehensive Plan update would be a large-labor  
612 intensive product-project and thus he was not interested in doing another  
613 visioning project.  
614

615 In reviewing Commissioner Grefenberg’s list of priorities, Chair Becker  
616 opined that he found the first four priorities included in some form in the  
617 discussion list being used tonight. However, Chair Becker questioned if  
618 or where Commissioner Grefenberg’s fifth point was covered.  
619

620 Commissioner Grefenberg noted his priority #5 had been a result of his  
621 latest presentation to the Gavel Club as an other opportunity to cover more  
622 areas and involve civic organizations as well or, as suggested by  
623 Commissioner Manke, incorporating community events. Commissioner  
624 Grefenberg suggested that the City’s website provide an outlet to get that  
625 information out to the public or by leveraging financial support for the  
626 *Roseville Review* to gain added promotion. Commissioner Grefenberg  
627 suggested encouraging various commissions to utilize the City’s website  
628 and Speak Up! Roseville to facilitate discussion in the community.  
629

630 Discussion ensued related to whether or not the City of Roseville or other  
631 communities provided financial support or had any financial ownership in  
632 the *Roseville Review*, with Chair Becker stating it was the legal newspaper  
633 for publishing notices for the City.  
634

635 Chair Becker suggested keeping Speak Up! Roseville as a tool and-to  
636 involve staff more than Commissions, but to involve other eCommissions  
637 in the listening/learning process.  
638

639 Commissioner Gardella opined that it would be great for the community to  
640 know more details about what advisory commissions were doing, their  
641 priorities, and for those commissions to know more about the work of  
642 their colleagues on other advisory commissions. Commissioner Gardella  
643 suggested the CEC's role may be in determining how to foster that  
644 communication, whether in partnership or some form of communication  
645 (e.g. party in the park booths with advisory commissions invited as a great  
646 first step) and bringing them into the process to learn more about each  
647 other and their charges.

648  
649 Discussion ensued regarding involving civic and neighborhood  
650 associations to submit to Speak Up! Roseville; expectations of initiating  
651 such recommendations in 2016 as previously discussed; timing constraints  
652 in getting timely news into the *City News* newsletter due to design,  
653 printing and mailing deadlines (e.g. 5-6 weeks lead time); current weekly  
654 updates to the City's website for more current information and weekly  
655 updates via e-mail for those having signed up to receive those updates; and  
656 other social media outlets available and currently used, including  
657 NextDoor.com.

658  
659 Chair Becker reiterated that these more detailed subpoints could be  
660 addressed in the near future, after this 2016 priority document was  
661 formally adopted by the CEC and gained the support of the City Council.

662  
663 Commissioner Manke stated she was not opposed to getting all advisory  
664 commissioners together at one point, whether through social opportunities  
665 or a program with each group providing an overview of their purpose and  
666 work, followed by a question and answer time, finishing with a discussion  
667 about how each group could work together on a common goal.

668  
669 Referencing the "open house" concept in the second subbullet point of the  
670 his Proposed 2016 Priorities discussion document, Chair Becker suggested  
671 that Commissioner Manke's idea would fit into that concept, similar to the  
672 Commission's Party in the Park effort last summer. Chair Becker  
673 suggested this may also be a way to recruit community members for  
674 advisory commissions as well as providing for a joint working session to  
675 get to know each other at the commissioner level.

676  
677 While agreeing that was very insightful, Commissioner Grefenberg opined  
678 that he didn't want to give up on the broader discussion to improve  
679 communication with residents. As part of that, Commissioner Grefenberg  
680 questioned whether the welcome packet should be a high priority, when  
681 that information is available on the website for new residents.

682  
683 Mr. Bowman admitted that the online welcome packet and updating the  
684 information from various sources was not staff's highest priority. Having

685 done outreach with other communities statewide to determine whether  
686 they used an actual welcome or informational packet or simply provided  
687 the information on their website, Mr. Bowman advised that the few  
688 communities responding to-date indicated only 4-5 are still printing the  
689 packets out.

690  
691 -Mr. Bowman noted that challenge was getting the information into the  
692 hands of potential new residents to help their transition into the  
693 community, as well as the cost, causing most communities to go the online  
694 route. Mr. Bowman further noted that there were various ways to invest in  
695 it and go about it, with those cities printing the information out in packet  
696 form, admitted they frequently forgot to sent the packets out, as it wasn't a  
697 high priority for those communities either. However, Mr. Bowman noted  
698 that didn't indicate whether it should or should not be a high priority.

699  
700 Chair Becker noted that he'd put quotation marks around "packet" for that  
701 reason.

702  
703 Commissioner Becker opined it made more sense to have it available  
704 online, suggesting that the only question should be if the packet was also  
705 available secondarily as a mailing, since anything can be printed off the  
706 website and actually then provided three different options.

707  
708 Chair Becker proposed that the CEC agree on the "big bullet" points  
709 tonight and formally adopt them before forwarding them on for the joint  
710 meeting with the City Council. If the main points are agreed upon tonight,  
711 Chair Becker offered for revise the 2016 priorities using his list of five  
712 bullet points and incorporating those areas of consensus for presentation of  
713 the formalized draft for the January 2016 CEC meeting for formal  
714 adoption of specific recommended policies/strategies for 2016, before  
715 moving it to the City Council for a tentative February 2016 joint meeting.  
716 Chair Becker noted this would allow individual commissioners to digest  
717 the priorities between now and January; and then in January concentrate  
718 more on the subpoints of each priority.

719  
720 For the sake of tonight's discussion, Commissioner Grefenberg opined  
721 that the CEC at least needed to surface to the City Council the need for  
722 administrative support to foster more effective community engagement,  
723 and to advocate for a new city position to accomplish that. Commissioner  
724 Grefenberg opined that as the city got serious about this, the city needed a  
725 part-time staff person, as several other communities had done, to promote  
726 and facilitate civic engagement.

727  
728 Chair Becker noted he had included that in his fifth bullet point copied  
729 directly out of the previous CEC priority report. Chair Becker spoke in  
730 support of at a minimum attempting to promote a new employee or

731 developing a job description and cost-benefit analysis as part of the 2016  
732 CEC work plan; and outline whether it should be a new hire or additional  
733 duty for existing staff.

734  
735 Commissioner Manke recognized the reality that this position was  
736 unlikely to happen in 2016; with Chair Becker concurring, suggesting the  
737 CEC simply highlight gaps in the current model.

738  
739 Commissioner Grefenberg noted the annual budget process of the city and  
740 advised that staff and the City Council would actually be starting the 2017  
741 budget ~~in~~ around May of 2016. Mr. Bowman clarified that staff actually  
742 began working on the next year's budget in March given the long process  
743 and many steps involved.

744  
745  
746 ~~Mr. Bowman clarified that staff actually began working on the next year's~~  
747 ~~budget in March given the long process and many steps involved.~~  
748

749 Based on priorities under discussion by the CEC and past desires  
750 expressed by the City Council, Commissioner Gardella opined it was  
751 nearly impossible to accomplish the goals as a volunteer commission  
752 without staff. Moving forward, Commissioner Gardella opined it could be  
753 part of the CEC's role to highlight those priority areas that require staff  
754 support. However, Commissioner Gardella questioned if it could be  
755 effective if added on to an existing staff person's job description or work  
756 schedule without setting it up for failure. Commissioner Gardella  
757 suggested it may be the job of the CEC to begin making the case with the  
758 realization that the goal may take some time to accomplish.

759  
760 Chair Becker opined that as the CEC became more effective, the City  
761 Council and community would support more of their recommendations,  
762 recognizing the reality of Commissioner Gardella's comments.

763  
764 Referencing his fifth bullet point and those subpoints not otherwise  
765 aligned with other priorities, Chair Becker suggested he'd leave them in  
766 the next draft of the document as talking points with the City Council;  
767 with additional subpoints added or removed at the January CEC meeting  
768 as more specificity was reviewed.

769  
770 At the request of Commissioner Grefenberg, referencing Chair Becker's  
771 2<sup>nd</sup> page of proposed 2016 priorities –(last subpoint #10), Chair Becker  
772 questioned what was meant by and what the CEC wanted to accomplish  
773 with “meaningful volunteerism” and “participation on advisory boards,  
774 etc.”

775

776 Based on previous 2014 CEC recommended policies and strategies,  
777 Commissioner Gardella clarified that this was prior to the City's hiring of  
778 the Volunteer Coordinator position, and suggested that subpoint be tabled  
779 for now.

780  
781 As talked about at previous meetings, Commissioner Grefenberg spoke in  
782 support of inviting the Volunteer Coordinator to a meeting of the CEC.  
783

784 Chair Becker noted that had been attempted in the past but had  
785 encountered scheduling conflicts and could be considered for a future  
786 meeting.  
787

788 Commissioner Grefenberg asked that priority #6 on his list as well; and as  
789 he'd previously referenced with the November 30, 2015 City Council  
790 meeting minute excerpt he'd distributed earlier, be included in 2016  
791 priorities based on the City Council's interest in having every commission  
792 to reassess their roles under current ordinance.  
793

794 Chair Becker concurred that the City Council specifically wanted that  
795 accomplished by the HRC and CEC. However, with that role taking a  
796 very short time to review, as noted by Commissioner Grefenberg, Chair  
797 Becker advised he intended to put that as a January 2016 agenda item, but  
798 opined that it didn't need to be included in the 2016 CEC work plan. As  
799 this document is being framed, Chair Becker opined that the review was  
800 more of a micro request and different than 2016 general priorities or a  
801 work plan.  
802

803 Commissioner Sanders reported that the HRC had that review included on  
804 their last night's meeting agenda.  
805

806 As noted previously, Chair ~~Scott~~ Becker sought consensus in next steps:  
807 using the five bullet points from his list as a broad and preliminary list that  
808 he would wordsmith; further and more detailed discussion at the January  
809 2016 meeting with more informed ideas to present to the City Council at a  
810 joint meeting to receive their feedback; and formal adoption of the plan.  
811

812 Chair Becker asked Commission Sherry Sanders whether she had anything  
813 to add to the Commission's evolving list of 2016 priorities. Commissioner  
814 Sanders said she was in agreement with the priorities brought forth in the  
815 Commission's discussion.  
816

817 **Becker moved, Manke seconded,** adoption of the five main bullet points  
818 based on Chair Becker's outline and as follows:  
819

- 819 • Assist in community visioning alignment;
- 820 • Expand city learning/engagement opportunities;
- 821 • Form strategies for outreach to under-represented groups;



- 822 • Continue engagement “infrastructure” work; and
- 823 • Accomplish select items from 2014 CEC recommended policies and
- 824 strategies.
- 825

826 | Chair Becker confirmed that these points were preliminary –and also  
827 clarified that at their January 2016 meeting, the CEC would further refine  
828 the talking points for the joint meeting with the City Council, and after  
829 making sure the City Council was in alignment, move forward with more  
830 specificity on how to accomplish each priority or goal.

831  
832 Commissioner Grefenberg stated his confusion with the first bullet point  
833 entitled “assist in community visioning alignment” and how that came  
834 could come into play to engage residents in the upcoming  
835 eComprehensive plan process. While recognizing that came from Mayor  
836 Roe, Commissioner Grefenberg admitted he didn’t fully understand the  
837 intent of “community visioning alignment”.

838  
839 **Ayes: 5**

840 **Nays: 0**

841 **Motion carried.**

## 842 843 **6. Chair, Committee and Staff Reports**

### 844 845 **a. Chair’s Report**

#### 846 847 **i. Overview of Council Discussion/Action on Commissions**

848 In addition to the November 30, 2015 City Council meeting minute  
849 excerpts provided by Commissioner Grefenberg and the discussion  
850 already held tonight, Chair Becker reported on the City Council’s  
851 discussion. Chair Becker advised that the City Council had decided to  
852 fill the HRC vacancies as part of their–this spring’s 2016 advisory  
853 commission appointment process, and therefore anticipated having  
854 those three open positions posted and filled by April 1, 2016.

855  
856 Chair Becker spoke to how that impacted the CEC. As he’d  
857 previously alluded to, Chair Becker advised that the City Council had  
858 asked the HRC to revisit the language of the ordinance and provide  
859 their input to them, specifically their thoughts on meeting frequency  
860 and scope. As part of the City Council’s discussion, Chair Becker  
861 reported that the City Council eliminated their consideration of  
862 merging the Ethics–Human Rights Commission with the CEC.  
863 However, Chair Becker reported that the City Council was considering  
864 a different structure for the Eethics Commission by appointing an  
865 individual from each standing advisory commission to serve on an  
866 Ethics Commission for the purpose of coordinating annual ethics  
867 training as an ad hoc body and to meet annually or as needed. Should

868 the City Council formally adopt that proposal, Chair Becker advised  
869 that could affect the CEC as it may be asked to appoint 1-2  
870 commissioners to serve.

871  
872 In referencing the City Council's meeting minutes (page 7), Chair  
873 Becker noted City Council discussion and concerns raised related to  
874 the CEC's role of policy-oriented versus performing work (e.g.  
875 listening/learning events), suggesting the CEC consider how they  
876 present things to the City Council, opining that the CEC would find  
877 support future efforts and recommendations by having them better  
878 defined. Specific to the previous feedback, Chair Becker noted the  
879 concerns with overlap of the HRC and CEC had been addressed; and  
880 upon his review of both ordinances he was confident the CEC was  
881 ~~now~~ in line with their role and charged. However, since the City  
882 Council requested all advisory commissions to review their specific  
883 organizational ordinance, he advised that he would include that  
884 discussion as a specific agenda item in January 2016.  
885

886 For the record, Commissioner Grefenberg pointed out that one  
887 councilmember questioned the City Council's charge to the CEC was  
888 being adhered to by the Commission since that council member  
889 understood that and their understanding that the intent was that the  
890 CEC was would aggressively pushing to form neighborhood  
891 associations in Roseville. Commissioner Grefenberg questioned how  
892 that misperception had occurred, clarifying that the CEC's focus had  
893 consistently been was to on makeing recommendation to the City  
894 Council to assist and facilitate those associations, ~~but~~ not to form  
895 them.  
896

897 Chair Becker, in referencing the City Council's meeting minutes,  
898 noted that the majority of the City Council considered the CEC to be  
899 on point and overall were meeting their expectations. Chair Becker  
900 opined that when four of the five council members appeared to agree  
901 ~~that on what~~ the CEC should be doing, ~~and stated~~ he intended to focus  
902 on that majority opinion unless other CEC members felt differently.  
903

904 Chair Becker advised that he had spoken to members of the City  
905 Council after that meeting, and reviewed the work of the CEC to-date  
906 and made them aware of what was currently being discussed and  
907 prepared by the CEC. Chair Becker advised that several council  
908 members thought the language of the discussion had come out stronger  
909 than they intended, and based on his viewing of the meeting, didn't  
910 think the City Council or the CEC were as far apart as the meeting  
911 minutes might indicate. However, as part of the CEC's due diligence,  
912 Chair Becker advised he wanted to confirm that when meeting jointly  
913 with the City Council early in 2016.



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  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959

Based on his experience in serving as a chairperson of another advisory commissions, Commissioner Grefenberg stated that he and other chairpersons paid attention to what the City Council said. Commissioner Grefenberg expressed his confidence that the CEC had not done anything they didn't assume the City Council was supportive of; and expressed his favorable impression with the CEC's record -and Chair Becker's leadership.

As a reference point, Chair Becker encouraged individual commissioners to review the City Council meeting minutes of November 30, 2015 in their entirety and view that portion of the meeting before the joint meeting with the City Council.

**b. Staff Report**

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

Mr. Bowman reported that there was nothing of note coming up involving or of concern to the CEC.

Specific to Speak Up! Roseville module questions raised earlier tonight, Mr. Bowman provided a report to-date. Mr. Bowman reported that the module had approximately 85 sign-ups to-date; and given the timing of launch and current holidays, after consulting with the vendor, this was average. Mr. Bowman noted that there weren't currently a lot of action or burning issues, even though the launch was too late in the year to significantly impact community interest and feedback on the City Council's consideration of the wildlife management proposal, tree preservation ordinance revisions, or budget process, which could have sparked interesting and informative community discussion.

Moving forward with more issues and information available from staff and advisory commissions, Mr. Bowman stated he anticipated more interest-generating topics beyond general city business, including areas of interest to the community from public works and/or park and recreation operations. Going into the holiday season, while not experiencing a lot of activity, Mr. Bowman advised that he wasn't disheartened, anticipating things would pick up after the first of the year.

At the request of Chair Becker, Mr. Bowman expressed interest in discussion topics to bridge the holidays.

Commissioner Gardella agreed that this tool would take time to become familiar, and suggested a reminder on the City's website

960 and/or newsletter for residents. Commissioner Gardella also suggested  
961 opportunities (e.g. video) of demonstrations on how to use the module  
962 and its function.

963  
964 Mr. Bowman questioned who would be available on staff to coordinate  
965 such a demonstration, but assured that it was fairly intuitive to use.

966  
967 Commissioner Gardella cautioned that anything regarding reliance on  
968 the web involved losing a certain portion of the population through  
969 intimidation, necessitating the need to show the value of that tool for  
970 them.

971  
972 Mr. Bowman advised that he could give it a more prominent position  
973 in the next available newsletter; as well as promoting it ~~more~~ on Next  
974 Door.com and the City's social media options, allowing it to grow  
975 organically.

976  
977 Suggesting informative video made by staff, such as the Public Works  
978 Department, Commissioner Sanders suggested using that as a link to  
979 the City's website and seeking input through Speak Up! Roseville.

980  
981 Mr. Bowman admitted capturing that on screen items was challenging  
982 without online software, but advised he would look into video  
983 demonstration ideas.

984  
985 At the request of Commissioner Grefenberg, Mr. Bowman clarified  
986 that from staff's monitoring to-date, they had only removed or muted  
987 one comment from the module based on the person making fun of  
988 Speak Up! Roseville while using a false identity and his interpretation  
989 that it was not within the spirit of what was being attempted with this  
990 communication tool nor adopted site policy.

991  
992 Commissioner Sanders opined that responses for the Public Works  
993 Department had been very good to-date.

994  
995 **ii. Other Items**

996  
997 **7. New Business**

998  
999 **a. Adopt 2016 Meeting Schedule**

1000 Chair Becker referenced the draft 2016 meeting schedule, with meetings  
1001 regularly occurring on the second Thursday of each month; and not  
1002 appearing to conflict with any major holidays.

1003  
1004 Becker moved, Grefenberg seconded, approval of the 2016 meeting  
1005 schedule as presented.

1006  
1007  
1008  
1009  
1010  
1011  
1012  
1013  
1014  
1015  
1016  
1017  
1018  
1019  
1020  
1021  
1022  
1023  
1024  
1025  
1026  
1027  
1028  
1029  
1030  
1031  
1032  
1033  
1034  
1035  
1036  
1037  
1038  
1039  
1040  
1041  
1042  
1043  
1044  
1045  
1046  
1047  
1048  
1049  
1050  
1051

Specific to the January 14, 2016 meeting, Commissioner Grefenberg asked if that meeting could be delayed one week to facilitate his completion of the two reports he was working on for the CEC. He indicated he was feeling some pressure to complete work on the Commission's final recommendations to the Council, and to complete drafting the Joint Task Force on Zoning Notification for presentation to both that task force and the Commission. He noted that this work all was coming to a head within the same general time frame which, unfortunately, also included Christmas.

Discussion ensued related to how a one-week delay would impact the intended joint meeting with the City Council; discussion anticipated at the January 2014 CEC meeting of city expectations of neighborhood associations and information those associations anticipated receiving ~~form~~ from the city; and possible attendance of representatives of the City of St. Louis Park and/or Edinal to speak to their process in facilitating neighborhood associations.

Chair Becker stated that he was willing to squeeze in any speaker depending on their availability; but if not coming in person, he was more than willing to accept a written summary from Commissioner Grefenberg, but advised that since it wasn't critical, it could also wait until the February 2016 CEC meeting.

Commissioner Gardella asked Commissioner Grefenberg if that would relieve some of ~~the his~~ pressure, since the major focus of the January 2016 meeting was finalizing 2016 work plan priorities.

Commissioner Grefenberg stated he had heard that this CEC may become a 2016 election issues, which caused him concern. Commissioner Gardella questioned what that had to do with neighborhood associations.

~~Commissioner Gardella questioned what that had to do with neighborhood associations.~~

Commissioner Grefenberg responded that the sooner the ~~topic report to the~~ Council was finished, the better for the CEC before filings for municipal election occurred in May of 2016.

Chair Becker questioned how that would or could affect the CEC and their work load in January, ~~one of the reports on which he was working.~~

Commissioner Grefenberg asked if the ~~CEC~~ Commission anticipated having something available in January from the zoning notification task force.

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  
1090  
1091  
1092  
1093  
1094  
1095  
1096  
1097

Chair Becker responded that he was hoping for their final recommendation to the CEC as soon as possible, but was unaware of any deadline.

Commissioner Grefenberg advised that he would therefore put a priority on that report; but questioned if he could have a presentation to the Commission comparing the processes of the cities of Edina and St. Louis Park ~~to the CEC~~ by the January meeting date.

Chair Becker opined that the higher priority was the Roseville Task Force's ~~coordination effort~~ with the ~~other two advisory Planning Commissions~~ to address zoning notification. If the final report was not available by the anticipated joint meeting with the City Council, Chair Becker advised that the CEC could at least inform or alert the City Council that they were finalizing their recommendations with the advisory commissions before presenting them to the City Council.

If the CEC could further alleviate the workload and pressure for Commissioner Grefenberg, Chair Becker asked him to advise how they could help.

Commissioner Grefenberg advised that the delay was ~~with one member of the four on the task force~~ in finalizing meeting minutes of the task force for the report; and as noted by Commissioner Manke, noted that Community Development Director Bilotta also needed to weigh in with information his review.

As a member of the ~~Zoning Notification Task Force~~, Commissioner Manke noted that nothing could progress without having those previous task force meeting minutes; and suggested if they were not readily available, it was time for the task force to meet again and work together on the presentation rather than depending so heavily on Commissioner Grefenberg and Planning Commissioner Jim Daire to write it. Commissioner Manke noted that Commissioner Daire was absent from at least two of those task force meetings; and suggested if she, Mr. Bilotta, Commissioner Grefenberg and Planning Commissioner Boguszewski were available to meet it would make the report process move faster.

Commissioner Grefenberg offered to provide a preliminary report to allow the task force something to respond to versus a blank page since they had assigned him and Commissioner Daire to draft the beginning of a report; with the ~~scope of work to be~~ provided by Mr. Bilotta coming from a different focus, his perspective as head of the Community Development Department. He added that Mr. Bilotta had been meeting with and assisting the Zoning Notification Task Force.

1098 Commissioner Manke suggested continuing this discussion off line; but  
1099 agreed that the neighborhood association report didn't need completing by  
1100 next month; with concurrence by Chair Becker.

1101  
1102 Commissioner Grefenberg responded that this would alleviate some of the  
1103 pressure; with Chair Becker reiterating the CEC's support to assist him in  
1104 any other way to facilitate the zoning notification report availability by the  
1105 January 14, 2016 CEC meeting.

1106  
1107 **Ayes: 5**  
1108 **Nays: 0**  
1109 **Motion carried.**

1110

1111 **8. Commission Communications, Reports, and Announcements**

1112 Chair Becker referenced the recap presentation by Commissioner Grefenberg to  
1113 the Gavel Club included in packet materials.

1114

1115 Commissioner Grefenberg thanked Mr. Bowman for his assistance with the Gavel  
1116 Club presentation; and having served on the outreach and communications  
1117 committee for some time, admitted he'd appreciate assistance with those efforts,  
1118 stating he didn't want to keep being the only Commissioner responsible for those  
1119 speaking engagements.

1120

1121 Commissioner Gardella agreed that others were available to do so and that  
1122 Commissioner Grefenberg should not need to carry that responsibility alone.

1123

1124 **9. Commissioner-Initiated Items for Future Meetings**

1125 Noting that the January agenda would prove to be busy, Chair Becker reviewed  
1126 those items on the agenda, including: the next step in the neighborhood  
1127 association process; preparation for the joint meeting with the City Council; a  
1128 placeholder should representatives of the City of St. Louis Park and Edina attend  
1129 in person, and if not a written report would be received later (February?) from  
1130 Commissioner Grefenberg; review of the CEC ordinance related to its scope,  
1131 duties and functions (available to individual commissioners on the City's website)  
1132 and asked that each review the ordinance and bring their feedback to the January  
1133 meeting.

1134

1135 Commissioner Gardella suggested individual commissioners also bring forward  
1136 any questions of the City Council needing clarification after the CEC now having  
1137 +- almost 2 years of experience under its belt.-

1138

1139 Discussion ensued regarding the current vacancy on the CEC after Commissioner  
1140 Adedayo's recent resignation; with staff providing an update on the process with  
1141 two vacancies coming forward given Commissioner Miller's advisement- notice  
1142 that he would not be reapplying. Mr. Bowman alerted Commissioner Gardella  
1143 that she had not sent in her reappointment form, either. Mr. Bowman advised that

1144 he would be making mention to all commissioners up for reappointment in the  
1145 next city newsletter, as well as other positions open on advisory commissions.  
1146

1147 Commissioner Grefenberg suggested making it clear for those applying that this  
1148 and other commissions may require more than just a monthly meeting.  
1149

1150 Chair Becker advised that he would do some outreach as well, and recognized that  
1151 the City Council typically had a good pool from which to choose their appointees.  
1152

1153 **10. Recap of Commission Actions This Meeting**

1154 Member Gardella reviewed actions of the CEC at tonight's meeting, including  
1155 Chair Becker's revising the bullet points for 2016 priorities in preparation for  
1156 CEC review in January and subsequent presentation to the City Council for their  
1157 feedback; follow-up by she and Commissioner Sanders with the Advocate for  
1158 Human Rights representative on the resources, dates and timeframe for the grant  
1159 proposal and follow-up with City Manager Trudgeon, Mayor Roe and  
1160 Councilmember Laliberte on reaching out with further developed plans; and  
1161 individual CEC commissioner review of the organization's ordinance and its  
1162 charge.  
1163

1164 **11. Adjournment**

1165 Gardella moved, Manke seconded, adjournment of the meeting at approximately  
1166 8:48 p.m.  
1167

1168 **Ayes: 5**

1169 **Nays: 0**

1170 **Motion carried.**  
1171

1172 **Next Meeting – Thursday, January 14, 2016 at 6:30 p.m.**  
1173

1174

1175

1176 **[Attachment: Becker Proposed 2016 Priorities](#)**

## **Manke – Proposed 2016 Priorities**

- Wrap up / Extend current work on NA & Community Listening / Learning Events (I see these as something that will go through the whole year)
- Wrap up with Task Force
- Welcome Packet
  - Is this something CEC should undertake
  - If so, move forward on to develop and submit something to the Council
    - Web based / Mailer?
    - Extend into business community?
- Explore Senior Concerns
  - Roseville has a large population of senior. What can be done to assist our Seniors in our community.
  - Seek to understand the needs in housing, transportation, health and engagement.
  - Find a way for Seniors to center around a place where they can seek information and engage with other seniors on common issues and concerns.
    - Website page, meetings, classes etc.
    - Bring in involvement with Fire and Police
- Explore Teen (Youth) Concerns
  - How do we engage?
  - Seek to understand their needs in family issues, education and engagement within our community.
  - Idea - Creation of a Teen (Youth) Commission or Focus Group.
    - <http://www.startribune.com/teen-commission-proposed-in-golden-valley-to-advise-city-council/243545271/>
    - Bring in involvement with Fire and Police



## City Recognition of Neighborhood Associations

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

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

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

---

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

- Anti-Discrimination: The neighborhood association does not discriminate on the basis of race, creed, color, national origin, place of residence, disability, marital status, status with regard to public assistance, gender, sexual orientation, veteran status, pregnancy, age or any other class protected by local, state or federal law.<sup>5</sup>

Other neighborhood association recognition criteria considered by the Task Force but not yet agreed upon are the following:

- Communications about the City: The association will commit to encouraging its membership to become involved in community engagement and civic activism.
- Association Organization: The association will submit with its application its bylaws or a statement of its purposes, a description of its process including any membership requirements and standards of appropriate conduct, its structure, and its method of governance.
- Annual meeting: The association will hold at least one meeting of the general membership per year.

One advantage of requiring recognition criteria is that they facilitate awareness and understanding of the association by the City, they facilitate city/neighborhood two-way communication, and they can promote important City values (e.g., inclusiveness). A disadvantage is that too many criteria or too strict of criteria could unnecessarily inhibit the formation and variation in neighborhood association purposes, priorities, formality, structure, and activity level. The Task Force recommends that further consideration be given to recognition standards for neighborhood associations by the CEC, including whether only one association per geographic area is recognized.

Recognized neighborhood associations and unrecognized neighborhood groups are not administrative or legislative bodies. Both types of entities will not be assumed to speak on behalf of all residents in its neighborhood. Both types of entities are voluntary, and no resident will be required to participate. Both types of entities will not limit the ability of any individual resident or group to participate in the local civic process on their own. Communication with a recognized neighborhood association will not replace the City's methods of communicating with City residents.

---

<sup>5</sup> Supported by all five members present at the July 22<sup>nd</sup> meeting. This text is modified from Roseville's official non-discrimination commitment.

Revised January 5, 2015

## **Roseville City Council Rules of Procedure**

### **Rule 1 Rosenberg's Rules of Order**

The Council adopts Rosenberg's Rules of Order for all Council meetings.

### **Rule 2 Timing of Council Packet Formation and Delivery**

Every effort will be made to send draft agendas and supporting documents to Councilmembers ten days in advance of an item appearing on a Council agenda. This additional time will give Councilmembers adequate time to study an issue and seek answers to questions.

### **Rule 3 Agenda**

The following shall be the order of business of the City Council:

- 1) Roll Call
- 2) Pledge of Allegiance
- 3) Approve Agenda
- 4) Public Comment
- 5) Council Communications, Reports and Announcements
- 6) Recognitions, Donations and Communications
- 7) Approval of Minutes
- 8) Consent Agenda
- 9) Items Removed from Consent
- 10) General Ordinances
- 11) Presentations
- 12) Public Hearing & Action Consideration
- 13) Budget Items
- 14) Business Items – Action
- 15) Business Items – Presentation/Discussion
- 16) City Manager Future Agenda Review
- 17) Councilmember Initiated Future Agenda Items
- 18) Adjourn

The Council will schedule a 10 minute break after approximately two hours of meeting.

Councilmembers are encouraged to introduce new items including background information and supporting materials for discussion and possible action. Councilmembers have the right to place items on the agenda as follows:

A Councilmember may, at a council meeting, request that an action item be placed on a future council agenda, or;

A Councilmember may make a request for an agenda item outside of a council meeting by submitting an email request to the city manager, with a copy of the email to the other Councilmembers, no later than noon of the Wednesday preceding the council meeting. That agenda item will be included on the agenda for the next council meeting under the heading "Councilmember Initiated Future Agenda Items" for notice purposes only, not for action or removal from future agendas, but will not be an action item. The item will become a regular council agenda item (i.e., for discussion and action) at the subsequent council meeting, or;

A Councilmember may request the addition of an agenda item at the same meeting at which the item is to be addressed. However, the addition of an agenda item shall require the approval of a majority of the Councilmembers present.

**Rule 4 Electronic and/or Paper Agenda Packets**

In an effort to reduce the amount of paper generated, documents will be made available electronically, when feasible.

**Rule 5 Public Comment**

The City Council will receive public comment at Council meetings in accordance with the following guidelines:

- a. Public Comment at the beginning of a Council meeting and not pertaining to an agenda item is for the purpose of allowing the public the opportunity to express their viewpoints about policy issues facing their City government. Presentations will be limited to 5 minutes per speaker.
- b. Public Comment pertaining to agenda items is for the purpose of allowing any member of the public an opportunity to provide input on that item. These public comments will generally be received after the staff presentation on that agenda item and before Council discussion and deliberation. These public comments are also limited to 5 minutes per speaker.
- c. Members of the public are always free, and encouraged, to reduce to writing their comments about city business and to submit written comments to the Council or staff before, during, or after a Council meeting.
- d. Signs may be held and displayed during Council Meetings but only at the back of the Council Chambers so that the view of the seated audience is not obstructed.
- e. Public comment, like staff and Councilmember comments, will pertain to the merits of an issue; personal attacks will be ruled out of order.
- f. The Mayor or presiding officer may make special time-length arrangements for speakers representing a group.

**Rule 6 Issue and Meeting Curfew**

The Council recognizes that meetings are for the benefit of the citizens of Roseville so Council meetings will end by 10:00 p.m. Council meetings may be extended upon the vote of the City Council, but at no time will a meeting run past 11:00 p.m. If Council business remains on the agenda, the Council may continue the meeting to a future date or table such items until the next meeting, if needed.

**Rule 7 City Council Task Force or Subcommittee Formation**

The Council shall, as issues arise, establish a two-member task force to study the issue. The membership will be agreed upon by the full Council. The task force will have a specific topic or issue to address and the task force will report its findings or recommendations by a specific deadline established by the Council.

**Rule 8 Recording of Meetings**

Except for closed executive sessions authorized under state law, all meetings of the City Council shall be shown live when technically possible and recorded in their entirety for replaying on the municipal cable channel and for web streaming except when the City Council directs by motion otherwise.

**Rule 9 Suspension of Rules**

Pursuant to Rosenberg's Rules of Order, these Rules may be suspended in specific situations upon a 2/3s vote of the City Council.

**Rule 10 Effective Date**

These Rules shall become effective upon adoption by a majority of the City Council and shall remain in effect until amended or repealed by subsequent vote of the Council.

## CHAPTER 209

### COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT COMMISSION

#### SECTION:

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

#### **209.01: ESTABLISHMENT AND MEMBERSHIP:**

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

#### **209.02: SCOPE, DUTIES AND FUNCTIONS:**

The City Council has created the Community Engagement Commission to serve in an advisory capacity regarding the effective and meaningful involvement of Roseville residents in their community. The Commission shall make recommendations, review policies, and suggest strategies that will help to improve City communication and increase a sense of community.

The duties and functions of the Commission may include:

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

F. Advise the City Council on the community's visioning process.

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





# Draft 2016-01-25 Joint Meeting Outline

Wednesday, December 23, 2015 1:17 PM

- **Status update on 2015 priority projects**
  - Assist and encourage the formation of Roseville neighborhood associations
  - Create learning events on community engagement in Roseville
  - Joint task force with Planning Commission to study notification issues and formats
  - Online civic engagement module for new city website
  - Assist in the resumption of Roseville U
  - Involvement of renters in Roseville decision-making and civic affairs
  
- **Overview of adopted 2016 priority projects**
  - Complete remaining active 2015 priority projects
  - Assist in alignment with community vision
    - Start community visioning work prior to 2017 comprehensive plan
    - Align with community aspirations in 2025 visioning document
  - Expand city learning/engagement opportunities
    - Implement a City "Open House" (in part a replacement of the Living Smarter Fair), including opportunities for learning about commissions, volunteering, the budget process, and other civic/community engagement topics
    - Re-establish some form of a welcome "packet"
    - Evaluate format/content of Roseville U, especially with respect to what is adopted via the above
    - Drive additional engagement via the Rosefest Party in the Park
  - Form strategies for outreach to under-represented groups

- Including, for example, renters, seniors, youth, and businesses
- Plug into ongoing SE Roseville work
- Continue engagement "infrastructure" work
  - Catalog types of engagement processes and advise as to which to use in what circumstances
  - Define process for how to identify stakeholders
  - Identify engagement stages and define tools to use at each stage
- Accomplish select items from 2014 Community Engagement Commission Recommended Policies & Strategies
  - (Those that are not otherwise aligned with the above priorities)
  - 1.1: The City should work to enrich and strengthen civic engagement at city hall, and encourage employees and elected officials to appreciate civic engagement as an asset.
    - *b) The City Council should hold one regularly scheduled town-hall style meeting each year, with topics solicited from the eight City commissions.*
  - 2.1: The City should foster public participation at both the council and commission level.
    - *a) Encourage each commission to hold community meetings.*
  - 4.1: The City should make available administrative support to foster more effective volunteerism and public participation.
    - *a) Repurpose an existing or create a new City position to support effective community and civic engagement across all departments. This position would coordinate neighborhood and community relations; he/she could develop procedures and methods to improve, track, and provide clear and consistent two-way communication between City government and residents and businesses, and find opportunities for more effective civic engagement. We recommend that this position also work with the Community Engagement Commission.*
  - 6.3: The City should make readily available City Council and

Commission agenda items, minutes, and recorded meetings through its website and CTV cable television.

- *a) Publish approved city council and commission meeting minutes on the city website in a timely manner, such as within one (1) week of approval.*
  - *i) If public meeting minutes are not approved in a timely manner, such as within one month, publish draft minutes on its website until minutes are finalized.*
- *b) Offer the full text of meeting agendas in the body of email alerts and meeting notices rather than requiring the extra step to click a link to learn of the full agenda.*
- *c) Include a link to the specific recorded televised city meeting on the same page as the meeting minutes and/or agenda*

THE MORRIS LEATHERMAN COMPANY  
 3128 Dean Court  
 Minneapolis, Minnesota 55416

City of Roseville  
 Residential Survey  
 FINAL APRIL 2014

Hello, I'm \_\_\_\_\_ of the Morris Leatherman Company, a polling firm located in Minneapolis. We have been retained by the City of Roseville to speak with a random sample of residents about issues facing the community. This survey is being conducted because the City Council and City Staff are interested in your opinions and suggestions about current and future city needs. I want to assure you that all individual responses will be held strictly confidential; only summaries of the entire sample will be reported.

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

5. What do you think is the most serious issue facing Roseville today?
- |                          |     |
|--------------------------|-----|
| DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....  | 5%  |
| NOTHING.....             | 24% |
| HIGH TAXES.....          | 13% |
| RISING CRIME.....        | 13% |
| POOR CITY SPENDING.....  | 5%  |
| LACK OF JOBS/BUSINESS... | 2%  |
| AGING POPULATION.....    | 11% |
| AGING INFRASTRUCTURE.... | 7%  |
| STREET REPAIR.....       | 12% |
| SCATTERED.....           | 8%  |
6. All in all, do you think things in Roseville are generally headed in the right direction, or do you feel things are off on the wrong track?
- |                         |     |
|-------------------------|-----|
| RIGHT DIRECTION.....    | 93% |
| WRONG TRACK.....        | 5%  |
| DON'T KNOW/REFUSED..... | 3%  |
- IF "WRONG TRACK," ASK: (n=18)
7. Please tell me why you feel things have gotten off on the wrong track?
- |                         |     |
|-------------------------|-----|
| DON'T KNOW/REFUSED..... | 6%  |
| HIGH TAXES.....         | 17% |
| POOR CITY SPENDING..... | 11% |
| STREET REPAIR.....      | 6%  |
| RISING CRIME.....       | 22% |
| GROWING DIVERSITY.....  | 17% |
| CITY PLANNING.....      | 11% |
| TOO MUCH RETAIL.....    | 11% |
8. How would you rate the sense of community identity among residents in Roseville -- would you say it is very strong, somewhat strong, not too strong, or not at all strong?
- |                         |     |
|-------------------------|-----|
| VERY STRONG.....        | 34% |
| SOMEWHAT STRONG.....    | 57% |
| NOT TOO STRONG.....     | 8%  |
| NOT AT ALL STRONG.....  | 0%  |
| DON'T KNOW/REFUSED..... | 2%  |
9. Please tell me which of the following do you feel the closest connection to -- the City of Roseville as a whole, your neighborhood, your School District or something else? (IF "SOMETHING ELSE," ASK:) What would that be?
- |                         |     |
|-------------------------|-----|
| CITY OF ROSEVILLE.....  | 21% |
| NEIGHBORHOOD.....       | 51% |
| SCHOOL DISTRICT.....    | 9%  |
| CHURCH.....             | 6%  |
| WORKPLACE.....          | 4%  |
| FAMILY/FRIENDS.....     | 9%  |
| DON'T KNOW/REFUSED..... | 1%  |
10. Do you feel accepted in the City of Roseville?
- |                         |     |
|-------------------------|-----|
| YES.....                | 98% |
| NO.....                 | 1%  |
| DON'T KNOW/REFUSED..... | 2%  |

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

11. Why do you feel that way?

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

Let's spend a few minutes discussing the future of the City of Roseville.

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 12. When thinking about a city's quality of life, what do you think is the most important aspect of that quality?                                  | DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....1%<br>SAFETY.....32%<br>SENSE OF COMMUNITY.....15%<br>GOOD SCHOOLS.....17%<br>UPKEEP OF CITY.....14%<br>OPEN SPACE/NATURE.....6%<br>PARKS/RECREATION.....3%<br>UPKEEP OF HOUSING.....2%<br>QUIET AND PEACEFUL.....10%<br>SCATTERED.....1% |
| 13. What aspects, if any, of the community should be fixed or improved in the future?  | DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....5%<br>NOTHING.....29%<br>LOWER TAXES.....15%<br>BETTER ROADS.....26%<br>MORE JOBS.....5%<br>MORE PUBLIC TRANSIT.....6%<br>MORE SENIOR HOUSING.....4%<br>LESS AFFORDABLE HOUSING.3%<br>SIDEWALKS.....2%<br>SCATTERED.....5%                |
| 14. What, if anything, is currently missing from the City of Roseville which, if present, would greatly improve the quality of life for residents? | DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....6%<br>NOTHING.....53%<br>MORE PUBLIC TRANSIT....10%<br>MORE JOBS.....7%<br>MORE ENTERTAINMENT.....9%<br>MORE AFFORDABLE<br>HOUSING.....11%<br>SIDEWALKS.....2%<br>SCATTERED.....2%  |

I would like to read a list of characteristics others have mentioned that indicate a city has a high quality of life.

15. Please tell me which one you think is most important for a city to have? (ROTATE AND READ LIST)

16. Which is second most important? (RE-READ LIST; OMITTING FIRST CHOICE)

17. Which is least important? (RE-READ LIST; OMITTING FIRST TWO CHOICES)

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

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

18. How would you rate park and recreational facilities in Roseville -- excellent, good, only fair, or poor?	EXCELLENT.....	36%
	GOOD.....	62%
	ONLY FAIR.....	2%
	POOR.....	0%
	DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	1%
19. Which Roseville recreation facilities, if any, do you or members of your household use most frequently?	DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%
	NONE.....	30%
	TRAILS.....	36%
	NEIGHBORHOOD PARKS.....	25%
	ATHLETIC FIELDS.....	9%
	SCATTERED.....	1%
20. How would you rate the upkeep and maintenance of Roseville City Parks -- excellent, good, only fair, or poor?	EXCELLENT.....	35%
	GOOD.....	60%
	ONLY FAIR.....	3%
	POOR.....	0%
	DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	2%
21. In the past year, have you or any members of this household participated in any city-sponsored park and recreation programs?	YES.....	41%
	NO.....	59%
	DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	1%



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

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

23. How often do you or members of your household use the trail system, weather permitting -- twice or more per week, weekly, two or three times per month, monthly, quarterly, less frequently or not at all?
- |                      |     |
|----------------------|-----|
| TWICE OR MORE A WEEK | 14% |
| WEEKLY               | 25% |
| TWO/THREE PER MONTH  | 18% |
| MONTHLY              | 10% |
| QUARTERLY            | 3%  |
| LESS FREQUENTLY      | 8%  |
| NOT AT ALL           | 23% |
| DON'T KNOW/REFUSED   | 0%  |

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

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

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

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

26. Are you aware of the Roseville Parks Renewal Program and its projects?
- |                    |     |
|--------------------|-----|
| YES                | 20% |
| NO                 | 79% |
| DON'T KNOW/REFUSED | 1%  |

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

27. What project are you most interested in?

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

28. Do you feel the current mix of recreational or sports facilities meet the needs of members of your household?
- |                         |     |
|-------------------------|-----|
| YES.....                | 97% |
| NO.....                 | 0%  |
| DON'T KNOW/REFUSED..... | 3%  |

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

29. What facilities do you feel are missing?

COMMUNITY CENTER, 100%.

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

30. Do you support or oppose the construction of a Community Center by the City of Roseville? (WAIT FOR RESPONSE) Do you feel strongly that way?
- |                         |     |
|-------------------------|-----|
| STRONGLY SUPPORT.....   | 15% |
| SUPPORT.....            | 49% |
| OPPOSE.....             | 20% |
| STRONGLY OPPOSE.....    | 6%  |
| DON'T KNOW/REFUSED..... | 11% |
31. If a Community Center were built, how likely would you or members of your household be to use the facility -- very likely, somewhat likely, not too likely, or not at all likely?
- |                         |     |
|-------------------------|-----|
| VERY LIKELY.....        | 20% |
| SOMEWHAT LIKELY.....    | 32% |
| NOT TOO LIKELY.....     | 19% |
| NOT AT ALL LIKELY.....  | 25% |
| DON'T KNOW/REFUSED..... | 5%  |

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

32. How much would you be willing to see your property taxes increase to fund this construction? Let's say, would you be willing to see your monthly property taxes increase by \$\_\_\_\_? (CHOOSE RANDOM STARTING POINT; MOVE UP OR DOWN DEPENDING ON RESPONSE) How about \$\_\_\_\_ per month?
- |                         |     |
|-------------------------|-----|
| NOTHING.....            | 40% |
| \$3.00.....             | 18% |
| \$6.00.....             | 16% |
| \$9.00.....             | 12% |
| \$12.00.....            | 3%  |
| \$15.00.....            | 2%  |
| \$18.00.....            | 1%  |
| DON'T KNOW/REFUSED..... | 9%  |

Moving on....

I would like to read you a list of a few city services. For each one, please tell me whether you would rate the quality of the service as excellent, good, only fair, or poor? (ROTATE)

	EXCL	GOOD	FAIR	POOR	DK/R
33. Police protection?	59%	38%	1%	2%	1%
34. Fire protection?	57%	41%	1%	0%	2%
35. Emergency medical services?	56%	37%	0%	0%	7%
36. Sewer and water?	26%	67%	1%	1%	6%
37. Drainage and flood control?	22%	64%	3%	2%	10%
38. Building inspections?	17%	60%	2%	0%	21%
39. Animal control?	25%	58%	5%	1%	11%
40. Code enforcement?	19%	67%	4%	2%	9%

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

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

Now, for the next four city services, please consider only their job on city-maintained streets and roads in neighborhoods. That means excluding interstate highways, state and county roads that are taken care of by other levels of government. Hence, Interstate 35W, Highway 36, Highway 36, County Road C or Lexington Avenue, should not be considered. How would you rate ....

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

46.	Do you consider the city portion of your property taxes to be very high, somewhat high, about average, somewhat low, or very low in comparison with neighboring cities?	VERY HIGH.....10% SOMEWHAT HIGH.....28% ABOUT AVERAGE.....44% SOMEWHAT LOW.....1% VERY LOW.....1% DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....17%
47.	Would you favor or oppose an increase in YOUR city property tax if it were needed to maintain city services at their current level?	FAVOR.....40% OPPOSE.....49% DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....11%
48.	When you consider the property taxes you pay and the quality of city services you receive, would you rate the general value of city services as excellent, good, only fair, or poor?	EXCELLENT.....9% GOOD.....73% ONLY FAIR.....7% POOR.....0% DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....11%

For each of the following long-term infrastructure projects, please tell me if you strongly support the City continuing to invest in it, somewhat support, somewhat oppose or strongly oppose.

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

Changing topics....

54.	Other than voting, do you feel that if you wanted to, you could have a say about the way the City of Roseville runs things?	YES.....71% NO .....22% DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....7%
55.	From what you know, do you approve or disapprove of the job the Mayor and City Council are doing? (WAIT FOR RESPONSE) And do you feel strongly that way?	STRONGLY APPROVE.....11% APPROVE.....77% DISAPPROVE.....3% STRONGLY DISAPPROVE.....1% DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....9%

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

56. Why do you feel that way?
- |                    |     |
|--------------------|-----|
| POOR JOB.....      | 7%  |
| POOR SPENDING..... | 20% |
| COULD IMPROVE..... | 20% |
| HIGH TAXES.....    | 7%  |
| DON'T LISTEN.....  | 47% |
57. From what you have heard or seen, how would you rate the job performance of the Roseville City staff -- excellent, good, only fair, or poor?
- |                         |     |
|-------------------------|-----|
| EXCELLENT.....          | 19% |
| GOOD.....               | 76% |
| ONLY FAIR.....          | 1%  |
| POOR.....               | 1%  |
| DON'T KNOW/REFUSED..... | 3%  |
- IF "ONLY FAIR" OR "POOR," ASK: (n=6)
58. Why do you feel that way?
- |                         |     |
|-------------------------|-----|
| POOR SPENDING.....      | 17% |
| COULD IMPROVE.....      | 33% |
| DON'T LISTEN.....       | 33% |
| RUDE/UNPROFESSIONAL.... | 17% |
- Thinking about another topic....
59. How would you rate the general condition and appearance of Roseville -- excellent, good, only fair, or poor?
- |                         |     |
|-------------------------|-----|
| EXCELLENT.....          | 33% |
| GOOD.....               | 63% |
| ONLY FAIR.....          | 4%  |
| POOR.....               | 1%  |
| DON'T KNOW/REFUSED..... | 0%  |
- IF "ONLY FAIR" OR "POOR," ASK: (n=17)
60. Why do you feel that way?
- |                         |     |
|-------------------------|-----|
| DON'T KNOW/REFUSED..... | 6%  |
| RUNDOWN HOMES.....      | 24% |
| MESSY YARDS.....        | 59% |
| RUNDOWN BUSINESSES..... | 6%  |
| JUNK CARS.....          | 6%  |
61. Over the past two years, has the appearance of Roseville improved, declined or remained the same?
- |                         |     |
|-------------------------|-----|
| IMPROVED.....           | 28% |
| DECLINED.....           | 6%  |
| REMAINED THE SAME.....  | 66% |
| DON'T KNOW/REFUSED..... | 0%  |
62. How would you rate the job the City does enforcing city codes on nuisances - excellent, good, only fair or poor?
- |                         |     |
|-------------------------|-----|
| EXCELLENT.....          | 15% |
| GOOD.....               | 72% |
| ONLY FAIR.....          | 7%  |
| POOR.....               | 2%  |
| DON'T KNOW/REFUSED..... | 5%  |
- IF "ONLY FAIR" OR "POOR," ASK: (n=32)

63. What nuisances does the City need to do a better job of enforcing?
- |                         |     |
|-------------------------|-----|
| DON'T KNOW/REFUSED..... | 0%  |
| MESSY YARDS.....        | 41% |
| RUNDOWN HOMES.....      | 25% |
| JUNK CARS.....          | 16% |
| LOOSE ANIMALS.....      | 19% |

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

64. Prior to this survey, were you aware of this housing program?
- |                         |     |
|-------------------------|-----|
| YES.....                | 55% |
| NO.....                 | 45% |
| DON'T KNOW/REFUSED..... | 0%  |

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

65. Were you aware of these workshops?
- |                         |     |
|-------------------------|-----|
| YES.....                | 56% |
| NO.....                 | 44% |
| DON'T KNOW/REFUSED..... | 0%  |

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

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

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

FIRST

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

67. How would you rate the amount of patrolling the Roseville Police Department does in your neighborhood -- would you say they do too much, about the right amount, or not enough?
- |                         |     |
|-------------------------|-----|
| TOO MUCH.....           | 3%  |
| ABOUT RIGHT AMOUNT..... | 91% |
| NOT ENOUGH.....         | 5%  |
| DON'T KNOW/REFUSED..... | 1%  |

Changing topics...

I would like to read you a list of characteristics of a community. For each one, please tell me if you think Roseville currently has too many or too much, too few or too little, or about the right amount.

- |  | MANY<br>/MCH            | FEW/<br>LITT | ABT<br>RGHT              | DK/<br>REFD |
|--|-------------------------|--------------|--------------------------|-------------|
| 68. Affordable rental units?   | 21%                     | 24%          | 53%                      | 2%          |
| 69. Market rate rental units?  | 12%                     | 17%          | 62%                      | 10%         |
| 70. Condominiums and townhomes?  | 10%                     | 8%           | 77%                      | 5%          |
| 71. Starter homes for young families?  | 3%                      | 30%          | 61%                      | 6%          |
| 72. "Move up" housing?   | 11%                     | 13%          | 69%                      | 7%          |
| 73. Higher cost housing?   | 16%                     | 10%          | 68%                      | 7%          |
| 74. Assisted living for seniors?   | 5%                      | 28%          | 57%                      | 10%         |
| 75. Parks and open spaces?   | 9%                      | 6%           | 85%                      | 1%          |
| 76. Trails and bikeways?   | 9%                      | 8%           | 82%                      | 1%          |
| 77. Service and retail establishments?   | 10%                     | 13%          | 77%                      | 1%          |
| 78. Entertainment and dining opportunities?  | 5%                      | 17%          | 78%                      | 0%          |
| 79. If you were going to move from your current home for upgrading, how committed would you be to stay in Roseville -- very committed, somewhat committed, not too committed or not at all committed?        | VERY COMMITTED.....     | 46%          | SOMEWHAT COMMITTED.....  | 42%         |
|  | NOT TOO COMMITTED.....  | 5%           | NOT AT ALL COMMITTED.... | 4%          |
|  | DON'T KNOW/REFUSED..... | 4%           |                          |             |
| 80. And, if you were going to move from your current home for downsizing, how committed would you be to stay in Roseville -- very committed, somewhat committed, not too committed, or not at all committed? | VERY COMMITTED.....     | 42%          | SOMEWHAT COMMITTED.....  | 45%         |
|  | NOT TOO COMMITTED.....  | 6%           | NOT AT ALL COMMITTED.... | 3%          |
|  | DON'T KNOW/REFUSED..... | 4%           |                          |             |

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



81. Is there anything missing or that could be improved in Roseville that would make you committed to staying?

NO, 75%; AFFORDABLE HOUSING, 15%; MOVE-UP HOUSING, 3%; PUBLIC TRANSIT, 3%; LESS TRAFFIC CONGESTION, 5%.

Changing topics....

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Continuing....

85. How would you rate the City's overall performance in communicating key local issues to residents in its publications, website, mailings, and on cable television -- excellent, good, only fair, or poor?
- |                         |     |
|-------------------------|-----|
| EXCELLENT.....          | 19% |
| GOOD.....               | 72% |
| ONLY FAIR.....          | 9%  |
| POOR.....               | 0%  |
| DON'T KNOW/REFUSED..... | 1%  |
86. What is your primary source of information about the City of Roseville?
- |                         |     |
|-------------------------|-----|
| DON'T KNOW/REFUSED..... | 0%  |
| NONE.....               | 2%  |
| CITY NEWSLETTER.....    | 48% |
| LOCAL NEWSPAPER.....    | 28% |
| CITY WEBSITE.....       | 11% |
| CABLE TELEVISION.....   | 5%  |
| WORD OF MOUTH.....      | 5%  |
| SCATTERED.....          | 1%  |
87. How would you most prefer to receive information about Roseville City Government and its activities -- (ROTATE) e-mail, information on the city's website, city publications and newsletters, mailings to your home, local weekly newspaper coverage, cable television programming, the city's Facebook page or the City's Twitter feed?
- |                         |     |
|-------------------------|-----|
| E-MAIL.....             | 6%  |
| CITY WEBSITE.....       | 12% |
| PUBLICATIONS/NEWSLTRS.. | 43% |
| MAILINGS TO HOME.....   | 17% |
| LOCAL WEEKLY PAPERS.... | 17% |
| CABLE TV.....           | 4%  |
| CITY FACEBOOK PAGE..... | 0%  |
| TWITTER.....            | 0%  |
| WORD OF MOUTH.....      | 2%  |
88. Do you recall receiving the City publication -- "Roseville City News" -- during the past year?
- |                         |     |
|-------------------------|-----|
| YES.....                | 86% |
| NO.....                 | 14% |
| DON'T KNOW/REFUSED..... | 1%  |
- IF "YES," ASK: (n=342)
89. Do you or any members of your household regularly read it?
- |                         |     |
|-------------------------|-----|
| YES.....                | 92% |
| NO.....                 | 8%  |
| DON'T KNOW/REFUSED..... | 0%  |
90. How effective is this city publication in keeping you informed about activities in the city -- very effective, somewhat effective, not too effective, or not at all effective?
- |                          |     |
|--------------------------|-----|
| VERY EFFECTIVE.....      | 33% |
| SOMEWHAT EFFECTIVE.....  | 57% |
| NOT TOO EFFECTIVE.....   | 6%  |
| NOT AT ALL EFFECTIVE.... | 2%  |
| DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....  | 2%  |

I would like to ask you about social media sources. For each one, tell me if you currently use that source of information; then, for each you currently use, tell me if you would be likely or unlikely to use it to obtain information about the City of Roseville.

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

Now, just a few more questions for demographic purposes....

Could you please tell me how many people in each of the following age groups live in your household.

97. Persons 65 or over?	NONE.....	72%
	ONE.....	16%
	TWO OR MORE.....	12%
98. Adults between the ages of 50 and 64 years of age?	NONE.....	72%
	ONE.....	15%
	TWO MORE.....	13%
99. Adults between the ages of 18 and 49 years of age?	NONE.....	37%
	ONE.....	28%
	TWO.....	31%
	THREE OR MORE.....	4%
100. School-aged children and pre- schoolers?	NONE.....	77%
	ONE.....	10%
	TWO.....	8%
	THREE OR MORE.....	5%
101. Do you own or rent your present residence?	OWN.....	67%
	RENT.....	33%
	REFUSED.....	0%

102. What is your age, please? (READ CATEGORIES, IF NEEDED)	18-24.....3%
	25-34.....14%
	35-44.....19%
	45-54.....24%
	55-64.....18%
	65 AND OVER.....23%
103. Which of the following best describes your household: (READ)	SINGLE/NO OTHER.....29%
A. Single, no other family at home.	SINGLE PARENT.....5%
B. Single parent with children at home.	MAR/PARTN/CHILDREN.....24%
C. Married or partnered, with children at home.	MAR/PARTN/NO CHILD.....39%
D. Married or partnered with no children or no children at home.	SOMETHING ELSE.....4%
E. Something else.	DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....0%
104. Which of the following categories represents your ethnicity -- White, African-American, Hispanic-Latino, Asian-Pacific Islander, Native American, or something else? (IF "SOMETHING ELSE," ASK:) What would that be?	WHITE.....77%
	AFRICAN-AMERICAN.....8%
	HISPANIC-LATINO.....4%
	ASIAN-PACIFIC ISLAND.....8%
	NATIVE AMERICAN.....1%
	SOMETHING ELSE.....1%
	MIXED/BI-RACIAL.....1%
	DON'T KNOW.....0%
	REFUSED.....1%
105. Do you live north or south of Highway 36? (WAIT FOR RESPONSE) Do you east or west of Snelling Avenue?	NORTHWEST.....14%
	NORTHEAST.....49%
	SOUTHEAST.....23%
	SOUTHWEST.....14%
	DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....0%
106. Gender (DO NOT ASK)	MALE.....48%
	FEMALE.....52%