



**Regular City Council Meeting Minutes**  
**City Hall Council Chambers, 2660 Civic Center Drive**  
**Monday, February 22, 2016**

**1. Roll Call**

Mayor Roe called the meeting to order at approximately 6:00 p.m. Voting and Seating Order: McGehee, Willmus, Laliberte, Etten and Roe. City Manager Patrick Trudgeon and City Attorney Mark Gaughan were also present.

**2. Pledge of Allegiance**

**3. Approve Agenda**

Mayor Roe noted tonight's amended agenda to move former Consent Agenda item 8.g to Public Hearing and Action Consideration Item 12.b; considering a MINOR SUBDIVISION of two residential properties into three parcels for Oakwood Heights Holding 40652, LLC at 888 – 892 County Road B.

Councilmember McGehee requested removal of Consent Item 8.c for separate consideration.

Laliberte moved, Etten seconded, approval of the agenda as amended.

**Roll Call**

**Ayes:** McGehee, Willmus, Laliberte, Etten and Roe.

**Nays:** None.

**4. Public Comment**

Mayor Roe called for public comment by members of the audience on any non-agenda items.

**a. Brian Balfanz, 946 Burke Avenue W**

With 2016 Ramsey County construction scheduled to close Lexington Avenue at Highway 36, Mr. Balfanz expressed concern during reconstruction with even more congested traffic in that area, particularly at County Road B. Mr. Balfanz noted the difficulty in controlling driving behavior when frustrated, and reported that even now, drivers often attempted to avoid traffic back-ups at Calvary Church and entered the adjacent cul-de-sac with significant speed, and attempting that as an alternate route even though clearly marked as a dead end. Mr. Balfanz further noted this involved those heading west on County Road B to southbound Lexington choosing to use Burke Avenue. Mr. Balfanz publically asked the City Council to look at opportunities now to install a sidewalk, since the curb cut is already in place, to facilitate pedestrian and bicycle traffic from Burke Avenue to County Road B and Lexington Avenue, as well as that addition allowing better and safer access to the new Lexington Park community building, the ice rinks and Calvary's after-school activities. Mr. Balfanz opined that there was only one

missing property, and asked that the City Council seriously consider this opportunity to install a sidewalk on the east side of Lexington Avenue if at all possible prior to the start of this summer's construction project.

**5. Council & City Manager Communications, Reports, and Announcements**

Mayor Roe announced an opportunity for residents to serve on the Cedarholm Golf Course Clubhouse Advisory Team to look at alternatives and options going forward, and advise the city accordingly.

Mayor Roe further announced the advisory commission vacancy process, interview and appointment process, encouraging residents to apply prior to tonight's deadline, announced the State of the City address later this week at Affinity Credit Union's meeting room; opportunities for assistance with house painting for those qualifying to participate through income and/or disability eligibility requirement; and upcoming seminars at the Ramsey County Library – Roseville branch – for solar energy installations, sponsored in part by the City of Roseville, Ramsey County and the Midwest Renewable Energy Association.

Councilmember Etten reported on his privilege in attending a recent meeting at Galilee Lutheran Church in Roseville related to the Rice Street Gardens, a public garden space planned for the community with the goal of helping newer immigrants and/or apartment dwellers to grow their own food. Councilmember Etten encouraged residents to seek further information at the website: [ricestreetgardens.org](http://ricestreetgardens.org). Councilmember Etten expressed his favorable impressions with the organization and planning done to-date, opined that it was a tremendous program, and noted that it involved many partners; and announced that the group was still interested in others willing to help with these efforts.

Councilmember Laliberte reported on her recent attendance at the Local Town Hall Meeting for area State Senators and Representatives. While most issues were state or federal-related, Councilmember Laliberte noted the reading by Mr. Balfanz's daughter at the meeting, reiterating the request for the sidewalk as stated earlier by her father.

City Manager Trudgeon reported on the conversion of lighting in the Council Chambers to LED, pending bids, with the goal of providing more equal lighting in the Chambers and for those viewing at home. Mr. Trudgeon advised that a more definitive plan will be available soon; and noted part of the delay was due to challenges in finding an opportunity to perform the installation due to the frequent use of the room.

At the request of Mayor Roe, City Manager Trudgeon provided an update on a communication concern raised by a resident during public comment at the previous City Council meeting, specific to the 2015 Victoria Street project in front of her home. City Manager Trudgeon reported that a letter had been sent to Ms. Rose and her neighbors as a follow-up, but noted that the project involved installation of a sidewalk across from her home; with Ramsey County deciding to replace curb which had not been anticipated at the start of the project. While the neighbors had received communication prior to that, and Mr.

Trudgeon reported that he had communicated that to the neighbor, he had not received a response after either the written or one-on-one communication efforts he had made.

Mayor Roe asked if water shut-off notices had also gone out to neighbors; with City Manager Trudgeon reporting that he had acknowledged to the neighborhood in his written response that proper notice specific to that shut-off had been missed, and had apologized for that error, advising that it would be used as a learning opportunity going forward.

**6. Recognitions, Donations and Communications**

**a. Introduce City Attorney Natalie Staehli**

City Attorney Mark Gaughan introduced the newest member of their firm, Erickson, Bell, Beckman & Quinn, Ms. Natalie Staehli, serving as cities served by the firm in civil and municipal matters for criminal prosecution. Mr. Gaughan provided a brief summary of Ms. Staehli's career to-date, including serving for a Dakota County Judge; noting that she had also served their firm as a Certified Student Attorney during her schooling at William Mitchell College of Law. City Attorney Gaughan expressed his confidence that Ms. Staehli would do a tremendous job for the city.

Ms. Staehli expressed her excitement to serve in this capacity, and noted her favorable impression with Roseville Police Officers in her new role to-date. Having dealt with Dakota County law enforcement officers as well as those in Roseville, Ms. Staehli opined that, while not all created equal, she was impressed with the police reports she'd seen and expressed her excitement in working with Roseville in the future.

Mayor Roe welcomed Ms. Staehli and thanked her for those comments.

**b. Proclaim Women's History Month**

Mayor Roe read a proclamation proclaiming February 2016 as Women's History Month in Roseville, inviting all members of the Roseville community to recognize the 2016 theme: "Working to Form a More Perfect Union: Honoring Women in Public Service and Government;" honoring women who have shaped America's history and its future through their public service and government leadership.

Laliberte moved, Willmus seconded, proclaiming February 2016 as Women's History Month in Roseville.

**Roll Call**

**Ayes:** McGehee, Willmus, Laliberte, Etten and Roe.

**Nays:** None.

**7. Approve Minutes**

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

**a. Approve January 25, 2016 City Council Meeting Minutes**

Willmus moved, Etten seconded, approval of the January 25, 2016 City Council Meeting Minutes as amended.

**Corrections:**

- **Page 13, Line 12 (Roe)**  
Typographical Correction: Change "Vogels" to "Vogel's"
- **Page 18, Line 11 (Laliberte)**  
Typographical Correction: Change "not" to "no"
- **Page 35, Line 26 (Laliberte)**  
Typographical Correction: Change 'of' to or"

**Roll Call**

**Ayes:** McGehee, Willmus, Laliberte, Etten and Roe.

**Nays:** None.

**b. Approve February 8, 2016 City Council Meeting Minutes**

McGehee moved, Etten seconded, approval of the February 8, 2016 City Council Meeting Minutes as amended.

**Corrections:**

**Page 6**

- **Line 20 (McGehee)**  
Correct to read: "...address these issues as they arise, some of them having [~~done so~~] [*been outstanding*] for some time.
- **Line 25 (McGehee)**  
Delete: "...as well." at end of last sentence.
- **Page 30, Lines 7 – 8 (McGehee)**  
Correct to read: "...Trudgeon's proposal understanding that it needed to remain [*flexibility*] as a pilot program, allowing City Manager Trudgeon the discretion for that flexibility."
- **Page 41, Lines 5 – 16 (Councilmember McGehee; Mayor Roe)**  
Correct all references to "BMPs" to remove the apostrophe.

**Roll Call**

**Ayes:** McGehee, Willmus, Laliberte, Etten and Roe.

**Nays:** None.

**8. Approve Consent Agenda**

At the request of Mayor Roe, City Manager Trudgeon briefly reviewed those items being considered under the Consent Agenda; and as detailed in specific Requests for Council Action (RCA) and related attachments, dated February 22, 2016.

**a. Approve Payments**

Willmus moved, Etten seconded, approval of the following claims and payments as presented and detailed.

ACH Payments	\$1,050,851.29
80419 – 80577	618,602.52
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$1,669,453.81</b>

**Roll Call**

**Ayes:** McGehee, Willmus, Laliberte, Etten and Roe.

**Nays:** None.

**b. Approve Business & Other Licenses & Permits**

Willmus moved, Etten seconded, approval of business and other licenses and permits for terms as noted.

**Roll Call**

**Ayes:** McGehee, Willmus, Laliberte, Etten and Roe.

**Nays:** None.

**c. Receive Annual Police Forfeiture Report**

Willmus moved, Etten seconded, receipt of the 2015 summary memorandums of forfeiture accounts as submitted.

**Roll Call**

**Ayes:** McGehee, Willmus, Laliberte, Etten and Roe.

**Nays:** None.

**e. Approve Rental Licenses**

Willmus moved, Etten seconded, approval of the multi-family rental dwelling licenses as presented.

**Roll Call**

**Ayes:** McGehee, Willmus, Laliberte, Etten and Roe.

**Nays:** None.

**f. Approve Information Technology (IT) Shared Agreement with the Little Canada Fire Department**

Willmus moved, Etten seconded, approval of the shared services agreement as presented with Little Canada Fire Department for the purpose of providing IT support services.

**Roll Call**

**Ayes:** McGehee, Willmus, Laliberte, Etten and Roe.

**Nays:** None.

**9. Consider Items Removed from Consent**

**d. Approve General Purchases and Sale of Surplus Items in Excess of \$5,000**

At the request of Mayor Roe, City Manager Trudgeon briefly reviewed this item as detailed in the RCA and related attachments, dated February 22, 2016.

In her review of Police Forfeiture Account funds, Councilmember McGehee noted the availability of approximately \$488,568 in funds, and asked how the determination was made as to how and when those funds could be used. With the continued increase in those funds over the years, and now with the IT expenditure for mobile radio replacements, Councilmember McGehee questioned if funding for those replacements couldn't be taken from forfeiture funds instead of as a budgetary item.

City Manager Trudgeon advised that he was unable to respond specific to this item, but was aware that staff looked to any optional funding besides the budget whenever possible. City Manager Trudgeon advised that he would look into this particular use from forfeiture funds and report back to the City Council, even though he suspected that option was not viable in this instance.

City Attorney Gaughan noted that this question had come up in the past, and reiterated his previous comments that ongoing capital or routine equipment needs often didn't fall under the appropriate spending categories for use of forfeiture funds. City Attorney Gaughan agreed with City Manager Trudgeon that he suspected that was the situation in this case.

Mayor Roe asked if there was a way municipalities could voluntarily refuse not to receive forfeiture funds if not deemed needed.

City Attorney Gaughan noted that, while not mandatory, if a municipality chose to refuse the funds they were in essence forfeiting funds received from instruments used for crime in their community (e.g. vehicles). Mr. Gaughan noted that the forfeiture fund was intended as a mechanism to get the item of crime off the street and liquidate that asset, with those monies going into the forfeiture fund. While not mandatory for a law enforcement agency to collect the funds, City Attorney Gaughan submitted to the City Council that it would not serve as a best practice to refuse the funds.

Mayor Roe noted his question was based on whether or not a statewide fund could benefit from those forfeiture funds instead.

City Attorney Gaughan advised that a law enforcement agency typically received 70% of the funds, with the state taking a percentage of them at the outset.

Councilmember McGehee referenced page 2, showing proceeds used in the past to bridge the CIP, and therefore, opined that she interpreted that to mean it was an open door for potential expenditures.

Etten moved, Willmus seconded, approval of general purchases and contracts for services as noted in the RCA and Attachment A entitled, "2016 Capital Improvement Plan Summary," dated January 31, 2016.

Mayor Roe noted a correction on the IT expense for desk workstations and chairs, noting that was a CIP item, not a budget item; with City Manager Trudgeon duly noting that correction.

**Roll Call**

**Ayes:** McGehee, Willmus, Laliberte, Etten and Roe.

**Nays:** None.

**10. General Ordinances for Adoption**

**a. Request by Community Development Department for a Zoning Text Amendment to Building Materials for Residential Districts, Commercial and mixed-Use Districts, Employment Districts, and Institutional Districts**

City Planner Thomas Paschke briefly summarized the request as detailed in the RCA dated February 22, 2016.

Councilmember Willmus asked that Mr. Paschke review and describe the type of housing units affected in Section 1005.01; with Mr. Paschke doing so and clarifying that the affected were all multi-family units and did not include single- or two-family units.

Councilmember Willmus also asked that staff define "plain concrete block," opining that he could see that being a subjective problem going forward and suggested it be further defined as "colored with pigment" to differentiate from interpretations for color charts for things considered by the city as plain concrete.

Mr. Paschke advised that staff would determine that in the field during site visits, and while unaware of any definitions available, stated that he didn't anticipate any issues.

No public comment was received on this issue.

McGehee moved, Willmus seconded, enactment of Ordinance No. 1494 (Attachment C) entitled, "An Ordinance Amending Selected Text of Roseville City Code, Title 10 (Zoning Ordinance).

**Roll Call**

**Ayes:** McGehee, Willmus, Laliberte, Etten and Roe.

**Nays:** None.

City Manager Trudgeon noted a typographical error in the title of the Ordinance Summary, and submitted the following corrected title: “An Ordinance Summary Amending Selected Text of Roseville City Code, Title 10 (Zoning Ordinance) to Section 1 (1004.06.I – Exterior Finishes), Section 3 (1005.02.F – Exterior Materials), Section 4 (1006.02 – Combined Materials), and Section 5 (1007.02.F – Exterior Finish Materials Percentages).”

Etten moved, McGehee\_\_\_ seconded, enactment of Ordinance Summary No. 1494S (Attachment D, *with title amended accordingly*) entitled, “An Ordinance Amending Selected Text of Roseville City Code, Title 10 (Zoning Ordinance).”

**Roll Call**

**Ayes:** McGehee, Willmus, Laliberte, Etten and Roe.

**Nays:** None.

**b. Proposed Text Amendments to City Code Chapter 907, Registration of Residential Rental Property of 1 to 4 Units**

RHRA Executive Director Jeanne Kelsey briefly summarized this request as detailed in the RCA dated February 22, 2016. Ms. Kelsey reported that all affected property owners of known residential rental properties of 1-4 units had been notified of these text amendments to Chapter 907 to alert them of the criteria to register their property(ies).

Mayor Roe noted that these proposed text amendments had come before the City Council previously, and clarified that no substantial changes had been made since that previous presentation, other than the addition of an ordinance summary for publication rather than the lengthy ordinance itself.

Councilmember McGehee asked that Ms. Kelsey go into more detail related to boarders in rental units, based on several emails she'd received and her discussion with Ms. Kelsey earlier today about problem issues with boarders.

Ms. Kelsey reported that the largest issue was identifying and providing notice to those property owners with boarders; noting that it had to essentially be an honor reporting measure, as there was no definitive way for staff to proactively notify those property owners. Even if a property was purchased by a parent, Ms. Kelsey advised that the property could still be homesteaded in their child's name; and the only way staff could catch those situations was if mailing addresses for property taxes were different. If that was the case, Ms. Kelsey advised that staff would then notify the parties about required registration of their rental property; but if mailed to the same address, it would be difficult and challenging for staff to moni-



tor and enforce those situations, ending up a “he said, she said” situation in neighborhoods. As noted in the RCA, Ms. Kelsey noted that there are various circumstances and complications in administering and regulating this program.

Councilmember McGehee noted, with confirmation by Ms. Kelsey, that property owners were still held accountable for code violations (e.g. multiple cars) and other issues; and that valid complaints could still be brought forward.

**Public Comment**

2 written comments as bench handouts

**Annette Phillips, 3084 Shorewood Lane**

*Ms. Phillips provided her comments in writing as well, via an email dated February 18, 2016.*

Ms. Phillips advised that following the February 8, 2016 City Council meeting and her comments at that time, she had completed reading the 53-page report; and stated that she still had the same concerns she had addressed at that meeting. While Ms. Phillips reported that she had subsequently had a discussion with Ms. Kelsey about those concerns last week, she had already prepared her written comments for the City Council and even though she viewed her discussion with Ms. Kelsey as a good one, she still wanted to again voice her concerns.

Even though earlier tonight, Mayor Roe indicated there had been no significant changes made to the ordinance, Ms. Phillips referenced Section 907.02 and terminology changes made between the February 8 and tonight’s ordinance. Ms. Phillips noted that, in her discussion with staff, Ms. Kelsey had agreed that the terminology used in the February 8<sup>th</sup> version was confusing; and had subsequently been rewritten accordingly and as noted in her written comments.

Even after her discussion with staff, Ms. Phillips opined that the rewrite of the definition section for single-family units remained very ambiguous and should involve rental licensing for any rental property. Ms. Phillips stated that she was sympathetic to staff and difficulties in implementing and enforcing this ordinance, but stated that elimination of part of the ordinance was difficult for her to envision. Ms. Phillips opined that many of the reasons cited for identifying these particular units remained valid for many other reasons in 1-4 unit facilities.

Referencing the report done by the Intern, Ms. Phillips noted that he stated that in 2014, 164 properties were identified as potential rental properties in Roseville but had not responded to city inquiries as to their status, supporting the concern that licensing those properties proved to be a very difficult issue. Ms. Phillips noted that licensing in addition to staff review of property addresses versus their location, opining that registration happened with a self-reporting aspect, and those

property owners should know that if they had rental property, they had to comply with city code, as well as address any complaints from surrounding properties.

Ms. Phillips further opined that counting members of rental units was very confusion and in her discussion with staff specific to Section 907.03, Item 6 of the revised ordinance, she asked that the City Council look at it further, with current language stating a maximum occupancy per unit of four unrelated adults or one family. However, if there was a mix of unrelated adults and family, Ms. Phillips noted there would be residents in violation at that rental property; and therefore, it needed further clarification. When she previously spoke at the February 8<sup>th</sup> meeting, Ms. Phillips noted that Community Development Director Bilotta addressed that requirement and mixing, with all members then counted as unrelated; and opined that this clarification should be included in the revised ordinance.

Ms. Phillips opined that the residential rental ordinance should require licensing of all properties in Roseville with renters; and further opined that if owner-occupied rentals are not registered, four out of five purposes would not be fulfilled and the city would have not record to identify and track that this was actually a rental; nor would the city be able to provide educational material to owners and/or renters and therefore not guarantee its responsibility to ensure the health, safety and welfare of Roseville residents was being complied with and ensuring the adequate maintenance of those rental properties. Ms. Phillips opined that rental properties would only continue to grow in Roseville.

Ms. Phillips opined that Section 907.02 (Definitions) should specifically stated "owner occupied" and "owner not-occupied" rental properties must be registered for licensing. Ms. Phillips also opined that Section 907.03, Item 6 should be clarified to state that, "if there is a mixture of unrelated adults and family members in a rental unit, the number of all renters in the unit shall be determined as if all the renters were unrelated."

**Doug Floreen, Stanbridge & Wheeler**

As a long-time realtor, Mr. Floreen read a prepared statement and referenced specific examples of eight properties now being used as rentals, and provided a before and after view of them. Mr. Floreen opined that those properties were not being maintained as rentals compared to how they had been when owner-occupied homes; and were compromising the quality of the neighborhoods; and further opined that occupancy rules were not being followed. Mr. Floreen opined that the University of MN and other St. Paul campuses were experiencing these same issues.

Mr. Floreen provided photographic testimony of various rentals on his street and code enforcement issues, including parking and conditions of the yards during the tenure of a previous renter in one unit.

Mr. Floreen asked that the city consider a maximum cap of non-occupied owner homes to prevent the continued decline of neighborhoods, noting that other communities had taken this step to alleviate this type of situation.

**Timothy Callaghan, 3062 Shorewood Lane**

*Mr. Callaghan provided his comments in writing as well, via an email dated February 19, 2016.*

Mr. Callaghan opined that the city was making a serious mistake in not requiring registration for individuals renting out their homes (owner-occupied rentals); but requiring registration for non-owner-occupied rentals. While recognizing that it may be hard to enforce, Mr. Callaghan opined that it was a mistake; and further opined that the city shouldn't be concerned in writing rules to make it easier; with the only problems arising when enforcement is needed. As Ms. Phillips stated, Mr. Callaghan opined that it would depend on how the city chose to enforce its ordinance; and agreed that the current language revisions are confusing.

**Council Discussion**

Specific to Section 9078.02 apparently confusing to some, Mayor Roe noted that it clearly states that the property must be registered if rented, even if owner-occupied. Mayor Roe opined that was pretty clear based on his interpretation, but sought suggestions of his colleagues.

Councilmember Willmus suggested that comments may be specific to owner-occupied rentals, where only a bedroom is being rented out; and if that was the case, he understood their perspective and confusion.

Mayor Roe duly noted that situation.

Councilmember McGehee opined that she found the public arguments quite compelling; and expressed her sympathy to those in the neighborhood addressed by Mr. Floreen. Councilmember McGehee suggested it may be useful for the Community Development Department to consider a cap for those areas with burgeoning single-family rental issues. Councilmember McGehee further suggested that if complaints were received, the city should be able to access the property and determine whether or not it was registered to provide additional enforcement clout. While unable to catch each and every situation, Councilmember McGehee opined that some could be identified.

Councilmember Willmus referenced recent case law from the City of Winona, which had been previously discussed at the City Council level, and encouraged staff and the City Council to review it further to potentially inform a similar use for certain areas of the community. Councilmember Willmus agreed that he would like to visit definitions in Section 907.02 to address the issue of boarders in owner-occupied dwellings, opining that was a reasonable consideration being

asked by the public. Councilmember Willmus also asked for staff's clarification of Section 902.03, Item 6 regarding occupancy and who makes up that mix.

At the request of Mayor Roe, Community Development Director Paul Bilotta provided a response, while not having the full definition available. Mr. Bilotta noted that there were several definitions of "family" that could be categorized for group homes or other situations. Mr. Bilotta noted that "four unrelated adults" fell into that category and while you can be any one of those things, you couldn't add to them, providing examples of various situations, even though he admitted it could prove confusing. However, Mr. Bilotta noted that one category had to be chosen, and enforcement was based on that category for rental registration accordingly.

Mayor Roe asked Mr. Bilotta if Section 907.03, Item 6 was referenced in another section of city code if not in the rental registration ordinance, but still applicable for enforcement.

Mr. Bilotta advised that it was addressed by language defined by the state legislature specific to four unrelated adults versus family pieces, which was addressed by city staff accordingly and used for clarification purposes.

In response to the complaint related to public comment tonight, Mr. Bilotta advised that the city's enforcement staff was in the process of following up on that situation.

In response to Councilmember McGehee's question of enforcement versus interpretation, Mr. Bilotta advised that staff utilized normal language versus legal language in enforcement notices.

In an effort to further clarify language further in Section 907.03, Item 6, Mr. Bilotta suggested inserting the word "either" regarding maximum occupancy per unit to read: "The number of renters in the unit (per Roseville City Codes, Section 906.06D and 1001.10), the maximum occupancy per unit is 4 unrelated adults or one family, *[either or]*." With reference to Roseville City Code as noted, Mr. Bilotta opined that this indicated that code was the final determination.

Councilmember Laliberte opined that she thought all renters should be required to register; even though she understood the difficulties, but to eliminate language in Section 907.02 wasn't something she was comfortable with.

Mayor Roe clarified, in line 32, that language could be revised to state "owner alone" or "owner solely" if only the owner was involved.

Mr. Bilotta suggested that the entire line be stricken as noted on Attachment A); with language of lines 32-33 stricken for this line as follows: "~~*In multi-unit*~~

~~properties, where the owner occupies one of the units, all units must be registered except for the unit occupied by the owner.]”~~

Councilmember Etten stated that he was fine with the changes as suggested by staff; but noted his interest in addressing concerns through the city’s regular nuisance ordinance.

McGehee moved, Willmus seconded, enactment of Ordinance No. 1495 (Attachment A) entitled, “An Ordinance Amending Roseville City Code, Chapter 907 (Registration of Residential Rental Property of 1 to 4 Units);” *amended as follows:*

- *Section 907.02 (Definitions); Strike the following language in lines 33-32 of Attachment A: “[In multi-unit properties, where the owner occupies one of the units, all units must be registered except for the unit occupied by the owner.]”*
- *Section 907.03 (Registration Requirements), Lines 72-73; with the definition section addressing anyone renting whether a room, floor or unit and anyone renting required to register.*

**Roll Call**

**Ayes:** McGehee, Willmus, Laliberte, Etten and Roe.

**Nays:** None.

McGehee moved, Etten seconded, enactment of Ordinance Summary No. 1495S (Attachment B) entitled, ““An Ordinance Amending Select Text of Roseville City Code, Chapter 907 (Registration of Residential Rental Property of 1 to 4 Units).”

**Roll Call**

**Ayes:** McGehee, Willmus, Laliberte, Etten and Roe.

**Nays:** None.

Mayor Roe thanked public speakers for bringing their comments to the attention of the City Council.

**11. Presentations**

**a. Receive Presentation about a Grant Received by the Lake McCarrons Neighborhood Association to Host Community Conversations in Southeast Roseville**

Two bench handouts were made available related to this presentation, *attached hereto and made a part hereof*, consisting of a timeline entitled “Development of Partnership between the Community Engagement Commission and the Advocates for Human Rights;” and a Press Release dated February 19, 2016 entitled “New Initiatives Aim to Create Welcome for Refugees in Minnesota...”

Mayor Roe welcomed Sherry Sanders representing the Lake McCarrons Neighborhood Association, Ms. Madeleine Lohman representing The Advocates for Human Rights, and Ms. Teresa Gardella, representing the City's Community Engagement Commission.

Speaking on behalf of the partnership, Ms. Sanders provided an update on a grant award for the partnership through "The Linking Communities (TLC) Project" as detailed in the press release. Ms. Sanders noted that these efforts had been underway for approximately one year and resulted from conversations with the Community Engagement Commission and like-minded interest in addressing some of the issues in the SE area of Roseville. With the assistance of Ms. Lohman, Ms. Sanders reviewed how the project will be funded, and subsequent application for and award of grant funds to assist those efforts and the process moving forward. Ms. Sanders advised that the partnership had recently met with City Manager Trudgeon to address their activities and more specificity of the efforts.

City Manager Trudgeon concurred with the comments of Ms. Sanders, and summarized their most recent conversations and the major priorities in SE Roseville and how they can be improved upon. City Manager Trudgeon advised that initial concerns that various groups may be working counter-productively on those efforts had been alleviated through that person-to-person exchange with areas of mutual interest addressed and those identified as being more specific to the neighborhood. Mr. Trudgeon noted that the three sessions were intended as three separate sessions: one sponsored by the Karens of Minnesota (KOM) in the Karen language, one with the Lake McCarron's Neighborhood Association and specific to the neighborhood, and the other with the School District on school-related concerns. After having that conversation with the partners, Mr. Trudgeon advised that he was much more comfortable that this is a supplemental effort and focus than that of the City's broader picture; and expressed his strong belief that this effort will also provide input and inform subsequent city processes. Mr. Trudgeon applauded the grass roots efforts by the Lake McCarrons Neighborhood Association.

Ms. Gardella agreed with City Manager Trudgeon, and noted that it would also provide yet another opportunity for the Community Engagement Commission to listen to residents, and support the efforts of the Commission in informing its future work and strategies and its role in providing recommendations to advise the City Council on community engagement. Ms. Gardella advised that the sponsors of the listening sessions would draft a report on the themes emerging from those discussions, which would also be helpful to the Commission and City Council in addressing broader SE Roseville challenges and opportunities.

Mayor Roe agreed that this was a great opportunity to start those conversations and obtain the information that would subsequently feed into the city's broader picture. To be clear for the benefit of the public, Mayor Roe clarified that no city resources were being contributed. Mayor Roe advised that, as he and Councilmember Laliberte had learned in past educational opportunities they'd attended about community engagement, it was important that the city didn't dictate all of those efforts to the community, and that by those opportunities taking different forms, they would prove more valuable in the long-term. Mayor Roe also applauded this effort and offered his support for them moving forward.

Councilmember Willmus expressed his appreciation of the efforts and congratulated partners on their grant award. Councilmember Willmus referenced a similar situation developing with the City's Human Rights Commission and process concerns coming forward, but also resolution of those misconceptions as well.

Ms. Gardella expressed appreciation for recognizing that process error, and noted clarification at the Community Engagement Commission level regarding future due diligence.

Along with the work underway with community gardens in this area, Councilmember McGehee opined that this would provide a good basis to bring things back to share with the City Council and rest of the community.

Councilmember Etten also thanked the partners for their work, including the tremendous work being accomplished by the Lake McCarrons Neighborhood Association in spearheading the community garden project along with these sessions. Councilmember Etten opined that the city needed to catch up with those efforts and be more proactive in getting to know people; and expressed his personal thanks to the association for fostering those efforts.

Councilmember Laliberte echoed the comments of her colleagues, and thanked the partners for pursuing this. Councilmember Laliberte agreed with the comments of Councilmember Willmus about the process and clarifying that this was an individual effort by residents of the community seeking engagement opportunities and without city involvement. However, Councilmember Laliberte noted the importance in providing that clarity in the future to make sure everyone knows what is happening. With the three different sessions planned and each focusing on a theme, Councilmember Laliberte opined that it should serve as an addendum to the Community Engagement Commission's purpose and function as they address how to engage the community with the civic portion in working with their government.

Ms. Sanders agreed that the focus of the KOM in session one should advise overall and future processes.

Councilmember Laliberte agreed, opining that the Karen resources and facilitation was previously a missing component.

Ms. Lohman clarified that the KOM was well-connected, and rather than promoting their resources was interested in serving as a liaison for the community, intending to facilitate the first session and translate into the Karen language. Ms. Lohman recognized that this initial effort had involved a shortened process and didn't necessarily follow channels, but advised that it had been intentional that these were intended as very flexible sessions. While city staff and council members are more than welcome to attend, Ms. Lohman noted that there was no intended or specific role for the city other than asking questions that may evolve from that; and also to serve as a pilot to determine if this form of engagement works and not specific to where the interest of the Community Engagement Commission may or may not lie. If this proves successful for the Lake McCarrons Neighborhood Association, Ms. Lohman suggested that perhaps that model could be used elsewhere and allows the expertise of the Association to move forward, but not specific to civic engagement.

Referring to the timeline provided, Ms. Gardella advised that the hope was for the first conversation toward the end of March, with another in April and the last in May; followed by report writing in June of 2016. Ms. Gardella invited city staff and council members to add their questions or comments to the focus to provide beneficial results of those conversations, especially related to city-specific concerns in SE Roseville.

Councilmember McGehee noted the ECHO videos and civic topics addressed through that venue, opining that out of all these pieces, future discussions and efforts should grow.

Ms. Gardella noted, in discussions by the Community Engagement Commission, that conversation suggests doing community building before civic engagement and use that for the broader community. Ms. Gardella opined that this process was somewhat parallel in building community and how people may want to be involved in civic engagement in the future.

Councilmember Laliberte referenced past community conversations held by the Human Rights Commission, followed by new immigrant forums held by the City of Roseville and other partners, then this effort. Councilmember Laliberte stated that she would find it instructional if a comparison could be provided outlining what worked well, what didn't and what to avoid repeating in the future. Councilmember Laliberte opined that this would prove helpful for those going forward with similar efforts.



Since each had a different purpose, Mayor Roe suggested that what was learned would be an outgrowth of what was trying to be accomplished from each model or area of focus.

Having been involved with the efforts of the Roseville Human Rights Commission, Ms. Lohman opined that their event was very similar to this and noted that this effort had actually grown out of that original effort. Ms. Lohman reported that it had been one of the most successful events held statewide and has been used to design this project going forward; not necessarily part of the description but learning from that initial experience. Ms. Lohman stated the intent of the Advocates for Human Rights was to continue with those efforts.

Ms. Sanders advised that the partnership would be presenting this to the Human Rights Commission to determine their interest in partnering as well.

**12. Public Hearings and Action Consideration**

**a. Consider Resolution Approving the Vacation of an Easement for Oakwood Heights Holdings Minor Subdivision**

Public Works Director Marc Culver provided a brief summary of the request as detailed in the RCA dated February 22, 2016. Mr. Culver displayed a map showing the easement areas, noting the purpose of this action was to correct an error in the 1957 legal description specific to the actual location of pipes within the easement area allowing for sufficient construction space to access those lines.

Mr. Culver noted, as stated in Item 3 (page 3) of the draft resolution, this vacation approval of the easement would be contingent upon filing of the new easement, with certification of completion provided and the vacation filed with Ramsey County at that time.

Mayor Roe opened the public hearing at approximately 7:35 p.m., clarifying this requested action and its specificity to the old easement and its vacation.

**Public Comment**

**Brian Balfanz, 946 Burke Avenue W**

As a resident living on the impacted street, Mr. Balfanz sought clarification in vacating the existing easement and reallocation of the new easement; related to the need to create the new easement due to the original one being out of alignment.

Mayor Roe assured Mr. Balfanz that this action would be made contingent upon the new easement being ready to file; and advised that the official vacation of the existing easement would not be done administratively until the new easement was in place. Mayor Roe noted this was referenced by Mr. Culver and addressed in lines 19 – 24 of the draft resolution.

With no one else appearing for or against, Mayor Roe closed the public hearing at approximately 7:36 p.m.

Etten moved, McGehee seconded, adoption of Resolution No. 11300 (Attachment A) entitled, "A Resolution Approving the Vacation of an Easement located on the East 160 Feet of the West 780 Feet of the East 8-1/3 acres of the North 20 Rods of the Northwest Quarter of Section 414, Township 29, Range 23, Except the North 33 Feet Thereof Taken for County Road B West, according to the Government Survey Thereof, Ramsey County, MN *AND* All of the East 8-1/3 acres of the North 20 Rods of the Northwest Quarter of Section 14. Township 29, Range 23, Except the West 780 Feet Thereof, also Except the East 245 Feet Thereof, and Except the North 33 Feet Thereof Taken for County Road B West, according to the Government Survey Thereof, Ramsey County, MN."

**Roll Call**

**Ayes:** McGehee, Willmus, Laliberte, Etten and Roe.

**Nays:** None.

**b. Approve a Minor Subdivision of Two Residential Properties into Three Parcels**

Senior Planner Bryan Lloyd briefly summarized the requested action as detailed in the RCA dated February 22, 2016 and displayed map (Attachment A), specific to Planning File 16-004. Mr. Lloyd noted that the map illustration differs from that included in the agenda packet materials, and showed the line between Parcels 1 and 2.

Conditions of approval were reviewed by Mr. Lloyd; and he noted that in discussion with the applicant, they were seeking some additional time for development of Parcel 3 to see if the existing garage structure could be used versus relocating it to Parcel 1. Mr. Lloyd reported that this was supported by staff and still maintained an end date to allow the applicant to make that determination (reference Condition h, lines 132 – 135 of the RCA). Specific to Condition f (lines 126-129), Mr. Lloyd opined that staff did not anticipate Ramsey County allowing driveway access onto County Road B based on their previous rulings in not granting additional access onto a major roadway under their jurisdiction.

At the request of Councilmember Willmus, Mr. Lloyd confirmed that since this subdivision was occurring under Section 1104.04 of City Code, boundary survey and definitions may not necessarily or ultimately be approved, but that this initiated the 30-day window for the applicant to get those processes started and submit them to staff (subd. E).

For this and future action items, Councilmember Willmus suggested that be specifically addressed as part of the requested motion or as a condition, that the subdivision was taking place under that City Code Section. Councilmember Willmus

opined that if there were any conflicts in lot size, it would be beneficial for the public to know from reading through packet materials that this was not the final document that would ultimately be approved. Councilmember Willmus asked that staff note this for future reference to protect the city from any misperception of the plat to actually be recorded, and provide another specific note for the process.

At the request of Councilmember McGehee, Mr. Lloyd confirmed that the accessory garage building on Parcel 3 had an existing curb cut. Councilmember McGehee questioned when staff anticipated hearing from Ramsey County on whether or not they would approve a curb cut for Parcel 2 onto County Road B.

Mr. Lloyd responded that typically the County's response was much quicker, but he anticipated he would hear soon and that they would not allow the issue to linger long.

Noting that this starts the 30-day clock for the applicant to get a plat into City Hall for staff's review and approval, but recognizing the 60-day window, Councilmember Willmus asked if the applicant was in a position to proceed in that timeframe given the outstanding questions remaining.

From staff's perspective, Mr. Lloyd advised that there should be no problem, and noted that the follow-up with Ramsey County only involved one connecting phone call since it didn't involve a major policy issue from their perspective. Further, Mr. Lloyd advised that drawing up the easement providing an access road across Parcel 1 was not difficult to draw up based on the level of detail provided already versus a typical sketch plan. Overall, Mr. Lloyd opined that this suggested to him that the applicant is much further down the road to being ready than this initial request requires.

For the benefit of the public, Mayor Roe noted that, in accordance with City Ordinance, if the applicant is unable to fulfill their obligations within the prescribed time frame, this approval is moot.

**Ms. Erin Mather, Applicant Representative**

Ms. Mather responded to the specific questions of the City Council for this request to subdivide two existing plots into three lots. Ms. Mather confirmed that a thirty-day timeframe to work out remaining details provided plenty of time, with drawings and legal descriptions, as noted by staff, already well-developed. Ms. Mather opined that the next few weeks should be more than sufficient to work through the remaining items with staff, including additional easements and related documents.

Regarding the curb cut for Parcel 2 onto County Road B, Ms. Mather agreed with staff and stated that she didn't see the applicant standing a chance of getting it with the turn lane on County Road B. Therefore, Ms. Mather advised that they anticipated

drafting a simple driveway easement on Parcel 1 that will serve Parcel 2, and stated that they anticipated no problem recording that to effectuate easements and move forward.

Councilmember Etten asked Ms. Mather to define her timeframe for extension of Condition h specific to additional time to consider resolution for the existing detached garage on Parcel 1.

Ms. Mather responded that she would appreciate extending that deadline to December 31, 2016 to determine if construction of a home on Parcel 3 was possible with leaving the existing garage to save two significant mature trees near it. Ms. Mather advised that plans were underway to determine if plans could incorporate it and avoid setback issues; but she assured the City Council that resolution of some type would be completed before December 31, 2016; and anticipated that the City Council would hear from them sooner rather than later.

Mayor Roe opened the public hearing at approximately 7:52 p.m.

#### **Public Comment**

##### **Darren Cox, 940 W County Road B**

Mr. Cox advised that his lot goes through from County Road B to Burke Avenue, and was directly across the street from the subject property.

Mr. Cox advised that previously, the owner of 892 W County Road B had been a Professor of Botany and Agronomy at the University of MN for many years and had planted thousands of native Minnesota plants, some listed on endangered or protected species lists. In effect, Mr. Cox opined that this created a private nature preserve for plants and animals, and even seven years after his death, those dreams had been realized. When that previous owner had sold several acres of his property to the city in the past for new utilities and a cul-de-sac to be built, Mr. Cox reported that he had asked that the vegetation be preserved. Even though those wishes had not been honored and many endangered species lost, Mr. Cox noted some areas of the remaining parcels displaying Showy Lady Slippers, with a patch on the west side of the property still existing.

Mr. Cox respectfully asked that attempts be made to preserve endangered species of flora on the property, and specifically the Showy Lady Slippers that currently exist there. Mr. Cox referenced laws regarding moving or transplanting this State Flower, but admitted he was not sure if this had ever been taken into account.

Also, even though the applicant's representative stated that she didn't anticipate being granted a curb cut from Ramsey County for Parcel 2 onto County Road B, Mr. Cox expressed his heartfelt hope that it would be versus an easement that could provide even more traffic coming down the cul-de-sac to Burke Avenue.

Referencing Mr. Balfanz' comments earlier tonight, Mr. Cox opined that most of that traffic was church-related with people thinking they could get through the dead end street, even though it was clearly marked as such. If access is not granted for Parcel 2 onto County Road B, Mr. Cox asked that, at a minimum, it doesn't end up going through the edge of Parcel 3 to get back onto that parcel.

**Brian Balfanz, 946 Burke Avenue W**

Mr. Balfanz stated that he was initially opposed to this request; reporting that he had not received a post card notice of this until last week; and had been unable to view the packet and related reports until last Friday. However, since then and after talking to his neighbors who were in agreement with him now, Mr. Balfanz opined that they felt it would be fantastic for the development as proposed in preserving the original house and limiting Parcel 1 to one.

However, Mr. Balfanz stated that he had some concerns, including if Parcel 2 did not receive access from County Road B and required a permanent easement from Parcel 1, he noted the high slope into the stormwater ponding area. Mr. Balfanz sought reassurance that the City of Roseville had an ethos to protect natural areas, including buffers around stormwater parcels. As residents of that area, Mr. Balfanz stated that this was important to residents, especially since their children raised in that natural area and playing in the cul-de-sac often explored by the stormwater pond, often seeing wild turkeys, deer and other nature that was important to the neighborhood's quality of life.

If looking at additional and particular flora already on the subject property, Mr. Balfanz suggested that the City look to extend a preservation easement on the sloped part of the parcels to restrict further construction while addressing the mutually beneficial restriction. If possible, Mr. Balfanz suggested a hybrid between the tree preservation ordinance and cash-in-lieu-of land if possible; noting that his family would certainly appreciate those efforts.

Regarding preservation of the existing garage, Mr. Balfanz opined that this was good news to him, especially in the applicant's attempt to preserve mature trees. While respecting the apparent good intent of the develop, Mr. Balfanz asked that the City Council take a closer look and limit this or future development at only LDR-1 for single-family use and no higher density.

Councilmember Willmus clarified that any higher density would require a rezoning process.

Mr. Balfanz noted that it was important to neighbors that the City consider density, available space and traffic flow; and asked that the City Council consider their comments and look at the overall area especially with other summer traffic concerns; and seek to work cooperatively with the contractor to preserve whatever natural flora is possible, and to not subject the neighborhood to any more noise or

construction than necessary by tightening things up even further than normal city standards, particularly for residents and for the benefit of Burke Park. Mr. Balfanz opined that this would provide some relief versus what they would be experiencing on the Lexington side, and allow for an area of respite for the neighborhood.

Mr. Balfanz suggested that the \$3,500 park dedication cash-in-lieu-of property would provide a fantastic down payment in getting a sidewalk installed along Lexington Avenue for access; and expressed his happiness if that was an outcome of this project. Mr. Balfanz expressed his gratitude for the work of City Planners and the proposed developer in maintaining the original structure and defining the parcel size by not trying to cram more into that area than it should.

With no one else appearing for or against, Mayor Roe closed the public hearing at approximately 8:02 p.m.

#### **Council Discussion**

Mayor Roe directed response to public questions as the first part of this discussion, and asked City Attorney Gaughan to specifically confirm that any preservation easement would be voluntary on the part of the property owner and could not be required by the city as a condition of approval for this minor subdivision.

City Attorney Gaughan agreed that such an easement would certainly be unusual, and stated that he couldn't recall any done in the past. To that end, Mr. Gaughan noted that the City's Tree Preservation Ordinance and policy was in place for that particular purpose, and questioned if an additional preservation easement was necessary.

At the request of Mayor Roe, Mr. Lloyd confirmed that for stormwater ponding to the east of these properties, they would be subject to shoreland standards, including impervious surface restrictions.

Specific to the existing flora on this site, Councilmember Willmus noted that something addressing that would have been needed on the books prior to receiving this application to be applicable. Therefore, Councilmember Willmus opined that it would prove difficult for the City to stipulate that as a condition of approval for this subdivision.

Related to that and possible other state requirements protecting those species and if and how the property owner would need to comply with those regulations, Mayor Roe deferred to Councilmember McGehee.

Councilmember McGehee advised that she was aware of the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) having regulations about moving those species and who could do so. Councilmember McGehee asked if anyone had a list or identification materials of those plants on this particular site. If so, Councilmember McGehee

opined that this would be the time to find them; and suggested perhaps someone in the neighborhood having worked with the previous owner may have that information.

Mayor Roe questioned if it was relevant to tonight's requested action.

Councilmember McGehee stated that it was relevant to the discussion she wanted to have with the applicant, if they were aware of any endangered species on the site; and the possibility of citizens asking for an Environmental Assessment Worksheet (EAW) if they desired to do so. Since this was brought to the City Council's attention, Councilmember McGehee opined that the city should have some capacity and interest in it.

Mayor Roe clarified that the issue is what can and cannot be required by the City as part of a minor subdivision application and approval. Therefore, Mayor Roe expressed concern in attempting to do what can't be done by the City Council; and looked to the City Attorney for his opinion on whether or not a list of or inventory of existing plant on the site or similar issues would apply.

Councilmember McGehee reiterated that since it had been brought to the attention of the City Council as an area with endangered species of flora, they had an obligation to further understand that situation.

City Attorney Gaughan clarified that the City Council can require any applicant to follow government laws and DNR rules in place, noting that went without saying. However, City Attorney Gaughan sought clarification as to whether or not Councilmember McGehee was advocating for conditioning this minor subdivision approval on that inventory or asking if one existed.

Councilmember McGehee stated that she was asking if a list existed and the types of plants being discussed, seeking an understanding on the part of the developer and City Attorney and the City Council whether the DNR would come in and remove or relocate plants or relocate them to the Nature Center or another appropriate site in the arboretum.

City Attorney Gaughan responded that he was not aware if the DNR would do so or not.

Mayor Roe clarified that the city removing or relocating plants was not related to the action before the City Council at this time in approving a minor subdivision, basically involving drawing lines on a map; and opined it was venturing outside its parameters.

**Applicant Representative, Ms. Mather**

Councilmember McGehee asked Ms. Mather when they intended to begin work on the site.

Ms. Mather noted, as indicated on the application for a single-family home for Parcel 3, the intent was to begin within the next sixty days.

Councilmember McGehee asked if the applicant would be willing to work with individuals, or neighbors, in identifying some of the areas they believe will be dug up first before spring and blooming of these subject species, to determine if there are plantings in those specific areas.

Ms. Mather stated that the applicant is always willing to talk to neighbors for the purpose of this application and requested subdivision. However, Ms. Mather clarified that they had applied under current City Code requirements, and would like to stick to them. Ms. Mather acknowledged that both the husband and wife, identified as previously owners, had been botanists. However, Ms. Mather also pointed out that the existing home where the prior owner lived had been vacant for four years, and that the property had not been maintained as it had been when they resided there. Therefore, Ms. Mather questioned the condition of any flora on the site that had been largely held but not maintained in it may have been expected for a fair amount of time.

At Mayor Roe's query as to whether the applicant would be willing to talk to neighbors specifically about the existing flora, Ms. Mather responded that she felt she would be ill-advised to continue this conversation beyond her previous comments at this point.

Councilmember McGehee clarified that the conversation could be apart from this approval, but if neighbors could identify and work out an arrangement to move or protect that flora, and sought Ms. Mather's willingness to do so.

Ms. Mather reiterated that she could not agree to that now, since this was new information brought to her attention tonight; at this juncture, she said she would have to respond negatively, while not indicating that the conversation with neighbors may not occur, but clarifying that she was not interjecting that possibility tonight without having more information available.

Willmus moved, Etten seconded, approval of a MINOR SUBDIVISION allowing the properties at 888 – 892 County Road B to be subdivided in to three conforming parcels *in accordance with Roseville City Code, Section 1104.04.E*; based on staff comments and findings and input received during public hearing and subject to the conditions as detailed in the RCA dated February 22, 2016; *and further amended as follows:*

- *Condition h revised to allow extension to December 31, 2016 rather than the July 1, 2016 date as drafted (lines 134-135.)*



Councilmember Etten expressed his hope that the City's newly-robust Tree Preservation Ordinance serves this property well.

Mayor Roe stated that he didn't want to give the impression that the city didn't care about what was planted on a site, but clarified the legal parameters under which the city needed to operate and requirements under current City Code for a minor subdivision of property and this requested action. Mayor Roe further clarified that he was attempting to explain why the city could not address those specific neighborhood concerns; but offered interest in the neighbors and developer working together to honor the previous property owners.

**Roll Call**

**Ayes:** McGehee, Willmus, Laliberte, Etten and Roe.

**Nays:** None.

**Recess**

Mayor Roe recessed the meeting at approximately 8:14 p.m., and reconvened at approximately 8:23 p.m.

**13. Budget Items**

**14. Business Items (Action Items)**

- a. Approve Joint Powers Agreement between the Cities of St. Paul, Little Canada, Maplewood, Falcon Heights, No. St. Paul, Lauderdale, White Bear Lake, New Brighton, Lake Johanna Fire Department, and the City of Roseville for Automatic Dispatch of the Closest Emergency Unit**

Fire Chief Tim O'Neill and Battalion Chief of Operations David Brosnahan were present to review this request as detailed in the RCA. Chief O'Neill noted that initial discussions had begun in late summer of 2015 with the Ramsey County Fire Chiefs Association and the Ramsey County Communications Center with the result that all joint powers agreement (JPA) cities have the agreement in place by the end of February 2016.

Battalion Chief Brosnahan provided a brief presentation outlining the request for an agreement to actively participate in the Closest Unit Dispatching process for area fire departments within Ramsey County.

Councilmember Etten sought more detail for costs of the program.

Chief O'Neill advised that there should be no additional cost for the majority of anticipated calls, as most were addressed under normal circumstances now, and only additional calls to Roseville's southern border in the City of St. Paul would be additional. However, Chief O'Neill advised that he was unable to determine how many calls that would generate at this time and related costs. Chief O'Neill

**Regular City Council Meeting**

**Monday, February 22, 2016**

**Page 26**

advised that those costs would be evaluated moving through the process; and the only significant cost he could define would be tied to the amount of time required for the call and need to call back in those firefighters off duty. If indicated, Chief O'Neill noted that a limit could be built in that would limit the number of times that could happen.

Councilmember Etten suggested there could be benefits for the City of Roseville during this summer's construction and closing of a portion of Lexington Avenue.

Chief O'Neill agreed that there would be give and take on both sides.

Councilmember Willmus noted, as did his colleagues, that he did not have a copy of the draft JPA; and advised that, prior to his approval he needed to review it, again with agreement of his colleagues.

Chief O'Neill apologized for this omission, and asked if the City Council would consider this on their Consent Agenda for their March 7, 2016 meeting.

Without objection, Councilmembers agreed to consider the draft JPA at that future meeting.

As a tangential cost, Mayor Roe asked if Ramsey County Communications Center dispatch costs would change due to potential special program to facilitate this concept.

Chief O'Neill advised that he was not aware of any additional costs, as they wouldn't need to make any significant changes; and the current fee was based on call volume, and this should represent less than twenty calls per year.

Even though Ramsey County is part of the activities involved, Mayor Roe noted that they were not listed as a party to the JPA, and questioned rationale for not including them.

Chief O'Neill advised that, based on the review by multiple City Attorneys, including the City of Roseville's, no issues had been brought forward along that line.

Mayor Roe further clarified that there was no agreement with Ramsey County for them to dispatch services being considered.

Chief O'Neill advised that the departments told dispatch preferences to dispatch and they provided the services per contract with them for that service.

At the request of Councilmember Laliberte, Battalion Chief Brosnahan advised that of the departments that could be included, only the City of Vadnais Heights had opted out.

Councilmember Willmus asked that staff provide the draft JPA to the City Council sooner rather than later to allow sufficient review and questions to be answered before the next business meeting; with that request duly noted by staff.

**15. Business Items – Presentations/Discussions**

**a. Housing and Economic Development Program Discussion**

Community Development Director Paul Bilotta referenced the staff report and attachments dated February 8, 2016 to facilitate this and future discussions. Among those attachments, Mr. Bilotta highlighted a map showing current zoning locations for High Density-1 or 2 zoning parcels citywide, noting that most of those groupings were adjacent to Ramsey County roads and/or MnDOT highways; noting those areas having developed as HDR-2 representing actual construction and development.

Mr. Bilotta reviewed the Metropolitan Council's projections for the City of Roseville's share of growth in the broader metropolitan area, noting that with Roseville being considered to be fully-developed, the projected number of additional units didn't require much, and with population numbers dropping from now to those projected in 2040, only 100 additional units were designated over the next twenty years.

Specific to the Metropolitan Council's calculations for the amount of affordable housing Roseville should provide, Mr. Bilotta advised that it was based on the population, access to transit and job development; and that projection from 2021 to 2030 was a total of 142 units in that category. Mr. Bilotta noted that there were options recognized by the Metropolitan Council to provide that affordable housing component, including which option(s) the city designates land for density zoning; with Roseville showing a minimum of 18 acres available, which would calculate out to 8 units per acre or 13 units total with that higher density option. Mr. Bilotta noted that the city actually has a lot more land available than that; and the city simply needed to demonstrate that it could provide it, but was not obligated to do so, just that it had zoned appropriately to accommodate it. Mr. Bilotta noted that the Metropolitan Council encourages compliance through an incentive program, actually a scoring system to determine how well a city was performing. Even though it is a complex calculation with many components, Mr. Bilotta reported that the Roseville's final 2015 housing performance score was a perfect 100%.

In conclusion related to multi-family units in Roseville, Mr. Bilotta noted that currently there was a considerable number of areas designated HDR that may no

longer be feasible, providing some examples (e.g. south side of County Road C with the railroad track parallel on the north side, overhead power lines, and very intensively developed properties) and suggested a review of HDR sites to determine if they needed to be guided another way.

To confirm for Councilmember Willmus, Mr. Bilotta agreed that his calculations show the Metropolitan Council's requirement was for 18 acres; and the City of Roseville showed an available 58 acres citywide of undeveloped HDR-1 and 2 properties, including lots in the Community Mixed Use (CMU) and Community Business (CB) zoning designations to a lesser extent.

At the request of City Manager Trudgeon, Mr. Bilotta clarified the number of acres needed to meet the Metropolitan Council's projections based on the entire Roseville population, not all HDR designations, with the city open to how to meet that goal. However, Mr. Bilotta reiterated that, as a fully-developed community, there were limited options to accommodate that number of units. Mr. Bilotta concurred with City Manager Trudgeon's observation that the city had sufficient land guided for HDR, and even if tweaking some available space to a lesser density, there was no eminent danger of failing to meet Metropolitan Council density guidelines.

At the request of Councilmember Willmus, Mr. Bilotta reviewed the map showing those vacant parcels designated HDR; and those having projects pending or HDR on them already as a land use.

Mayor Roe noted past discussions had included converting some HDR to MDR designations; and expressed appreciation for staff's clarification that by doing so, the city would not be in any danger of falling below what was needed for other requirements. Mayor Roe suggested one way to change some of those designations to a lower designation may be to consider allowing potential multi-family as a permitted use in Regional Business (RB) zoning areas as well, especially with those areas providing a connection to transit and walkability. Mayor Roe noted the ongoing tensions in attempting multi-family in the proximity of single-family due to height and density concerns raised by neighbors. Therefore, Mayor Roe opined that for RB zoning designated areas, not necessarily adjacent to single-family housing, there may be less conflict and provide some valid rationale.

Councilmember McGehee offered her continuing preference for 20% or some percentage of affordable housing in every HDR development to achieve both goals of providing affordable housing that include amenities for all those living there. Councilmember McGehee opined that this should go beyond her personal philosophy but also be that of the city in providing better quality housing citywide and addressing preferred amenities for the community as a whole.

Mayor Roe stated that, while he concurred that there should be a mix, he was uncomfortable proscribing that mix, depending on the financials of a prospective development. As an example, Mayor Roe noted the former Sherman development with one building designated for affordable housing based on their funding calculations. Mayor Roe suggested that one way to meet the goals of Councilmember McGehee would be to consider requiring that affordable unit mix and similar amenities to market rate units as criteria if and when the city is asked to provide any financial assistance to make sure the quality of the units, the building and amenities are consistent and available to all.

Councilmember McGehee noted that in her reading of the Metropolitan Council's housing need information, it appeared that the 20% was their goal as well, even though she reiterated that she wasn't necessarily committed to that percentage.

Mayor Roe stated that the issue became balancing the Metropolitan Council's description of the need and what the market place was providing and able to sustain.

Addressing the 20% affordable housing goal, Mr. Bilotta suggested staff come back with a housing subsidy policy for the City Council to consider, similar to their policy for the Twin Lakes Redevelopment Area, as part of future discussions to determine what made sense and what didn't. Mr. Bilotta noted that there was also a business subsidy required at the state level; and suggested also having discussions with developers to get their perspective on what ideas the City Council would support or not and vet those against complex financing to make sure any eventual City policy worked.

Mayor Roe and Mr. Bilotta agreed that a take away from the Sherman process was that a full financial picture was needed before seeking approval by the City Council, noting that was not how the Sherman project had evolved with grant applications involved before approval, and not all questions raised and answered before that, creating difficulties in the project proceeding.

Councilmember Willmus agreed that when projects are fluid and frequently drag out over several years, and changing over that time period, it was difficult to grasp the intended final project. Councilmember Willmus stated that one of his concerns with a policy was in finding a developer to see a project through for multiple years in term of their commitment if tax increment financing (TIF) funds are involved and retaining those units as affordable housing over the life of those TIF proceeds and how to guarantee that and prevent the developer from securing TIF dollars and them taking the building to market rate status.

Mr. Bilotta noted that got into the TIF agreement, including options for lower density levels for permanent affordability and land trusts that would stay with the land permanently.

Mayor Roe asked how that would work with tax credits and related time frames.

Mr. Bilotta deferred that response to HRA Executive Director Jeanne Kelsey.

Ms. Kelsey reviewed options to provide 30-40 year covenants guaranteeing affordability units that could not be removed without loss by a developer of their tax credits; any change from affordable to market rate of units would be subject to Internal Revenue Service (IRS) tax laws with a minimum requirement of fifteen years, and the State of Minnesota's allocation plan requiring thirty years.

Councilmember Laliberte referenced her request for this conversation some time ago, noting areas in Roseville with HDR designation to provide a variety of housing stock that may be better-suited to MDR designation. Councilmember Laliberte noted that there was a certain demographic in the community looking to move from their large houses and yards, but not yet ready for senior living, creating a need for that in-between housing stock, not currently available in Roseville. Councilmember Laliberte stated that, while obviously up to a developer if such housing made sense to them financially in Roseville, it made sense to discuss in which zone that type of housing should be located.

Councilmember McGehee asked how and if rent-regulated apartments, popular on the east coast, would work in Roseville.

Ms. Kelsey responded that every state had different requirements, including qualification criteria for tax credits, rent and income limits on rents charges, and how many units could be declared based on area medium income.

Councilmember Willmus noted that in the Twin Cities metropolitan market, rents were seen to be declining, which was bucking national trends, indicating to him that certain markets are overbuilt. Councilmember Willmus questioned how closely staff followed those trends.

Mr. Bilotta responded that staff periodically runs housing market studies, and had just last week met with its housing consultant to determine if an update on the last study was needed. Mr. Bilotta advised that staff looked at things from that perspective as well as tracking all local information as it became available.

Ms. Kelsey added that, in talking to market study experts, Roseville continued to trend below area market averages, with no new multi-family construction built over the last 25 years. However, Ms. Kelsey admitted that Roseville could not establish the same market as Minneapolis for example, currently charging over \$2 per square foot; with Roseville trending well below that and not seeing that issue being reflected in local rents.

Councilmember Willmus stated that his reason for bringing that up was to recognize that the rental market was as cyclical as anything else in the economy; and cautioned that the city not overbuild. Councilmember Willmus opined that if the city was 2-3 times over its allocation of what was needed, it would raise flags.– Mayor Roe suggested that a developer could propose rezoning an area from HDR to MDR if the market place was pushing that noting that it should be easier to down zone in those areas.

Mr. Bilotta noted that zoning designation did affect property sales prices and made it some projects less feasible to accomplish rather than the city having that zoning in place ahead of time.

Councilmember Laliberte agreed, opining that developers may not look at the community and move on to another option. However, Councilmember Laliberte noted that, if the city had some options available for them to look at, and marketed as MDR, it would peak their interest.

Councilmember Etten offered his interest and support in looking at housing citywide, opining that this goal was being missed in some ways and he was open to that review. Councilmember Etten also spoke in support of looking at parcels for MDR zoning designation. Councilmember Etten agreed with the need for single-level townhomes in that category, with them not often for sale and not getting to the market for resale based on their demand.

Along those lines, Mayor Roe asked staff to prepare a map of all MDR designated parcels for future discussion; duly noted by staff.

Mayor Roe's asked for staff's perspective on his suggestion to consider looking at RB zoning designation for HDR as a permitted use, even if conditional.

Mr. Bilotta noted that more of that type of re-use was being found as malls continued to strain in today's marketplace, even though Roseville was not yet experiencing that in its retail malls. Mr. Bilotta advised that he had considered the current Motel 6 site as one area along the freeway for HDR designation; and noted other parcels that could be considered for rezoning accordingly if Roseville experienced a contraction in its retail markets over time.

Councilmember Willmus expressed his interest in staff looking to identify some areas for redevelopment citywide through use of the former Housing & Redevelopment Authority's (HRA) planning and strategic planning processes (e.g. land trust).

Councilmember McGehee agreed with Mayor Roe's suggestion to consider housing in existing or former mall areas; but also to make sure green space was part of that mix.

Mayor Roe suggested that may be a good discussion in considering future Planned Unit Developments (PUD).

In conclusion, Mayor Roe asked that staff provide, for the next discussion, whatever information and related maps the City Council needed to consider conversion from HDR to MDR; and background on development of a housing policy for any city subsidized developments for HDR going forward.

Councilmember Willmus asked that staff also review other avenues for affordable housing beyond rentals, such as owner-occupied affordable housing and/or partners that may be available (e.g. Habitat for Humanity). Councilmember Willmus noted that the greatest fear from people appeared to be with the type of housing needed to stabilize neighborhoods.

Mayor Roe noted there was a trend with more people renting than buying in general; and opined that the city needed to balance that situation.

Councilmember McGehee referenced the Dale Street Project and lower scale housing units creating a neighborhood community. Councilmember McGehee also referenced affordable housing for veterans partnerships and smaller homes available and not requiring considerable upkeep inside or outside.

Councilmember Laliberte noted fifty units pending at Cleveland Avenue and County Road B not being marketed as affordable and questioning why.

Mr. Bilotta clarified that it was an active project, but would require a comprehensive plan amendment and rezoning; with the full City Council needing to make that determination in the near future.

Councilmember Laliberte noted the recent presentation by Ramsey County Commissioner Blake Huffman on his veteran's housing projects and interest in a development in Roseville; and asked for a status report from staff.

Mr. Bilotta advised that staff had been working with Mr. Huffman over the last few months to determine a spot; but noted that Mr. Huffman has a number of ongoing projects at this time. Mr. Bilotta advised that there was one viable parcel identified, but staff was having trouble locating its owner; but noted that that location would serve to hit a lot of the buttons being discussed tonight. Mr. Bilotta assured Councilmembers that Mr. Huffman was still very much interested in Roseville and looking at a variety of models.

Mayor Roe also noted the possibility of and his interest in partnering for the 1716 Marion Street acquisition (e.g. AEON or Common Bond Communities) to look at existing buildings and the site to the north that may or may not be for sale at this



time. Mayor Roe opined that would prove a nice area between McCarrons Lake and Rice Street for a development project with the right partner if the city could incent or engage those partnerships.

Mr. Bilotta noted that staff has been working on that with those apartments perhaps coming on sale; and advised that staff would continue to alert those potential partners to keep them aware of potential areas of interest.

Economic Development Update

With the recent creation of the Economic Development Authority (EDA), and as part of ongoing discussions, Mr. Bilotta advised that he intended this initial discussion to be broad and not very deep, especially with the current low staffing level available for this effort. However, Mr. Bilotta noted that staff had been and would continue to work with partnerships, including the Greater Minnesota Housing Corporation, both area Chambers of Commerce, Ramsey County and others. As noted on attachments. Mr. Bilotta noted the wide range of programs staff was currently involved in, most falling into the areas of networking and involving grants and housing programs at this time, and also working on sustainability through the city's partnership with Xcel Energy. Mr. Bilotta advised that staff didn't get involved in things that took considerable time, and that included not having those face-to-face meetings that involved calling industrial and commercial brokers and related aspects that were areas not having staff time allocated to at this time.

Mr. Bilotta asked the City Council to address any areas standing out for discussion.

Councilmember Willmus asked what it would take for staff to have time for those face-to-face meetings with industrial and commercial brokers.

Mr. Bilotta advised that, initially he would work with City Manager Trudgeon and the City Council on ways to shift existing staff internally, but noted it would require another staff person as an additional resource to pursue it to any great degree.

Mayor Roe offered his interest in looking at that option to determine what it would take; or if it made sense to have an economic development consultant available for certain things.

Councilmember Willmus agreed, opining that if the city was going to be proactive and develop or redevelop some areas, it needed to be aggressive; and while in-house staffing would be great to have available, if not a model needed to be defined to determine who should be involved. Councilmember Willmus further opined that this needed to happen sooner rather than later.

Mr. Bilotta advised that his intent was to work that into the 2017 EDA budget.

Councilmember McGehee opined that the list of things being attempted was very impressive especially with a small staff.

Mayor Roe noted, as staff had brought up, fewer things and more focus were preferred.

Councilmember Etten referenced the monthly HRA report on Housing Resource Center (HRC) resources and use of loan programs for rehabilitation; and asked that staff make those part of monthly or bi-monthly Council packets to track where those programs were at. Councilmember Etten opined that an in-depth review over time of each of those programs was needed to see if and how they were being used. As the HRA had done last year, Councilmember Etten noted their robust discussions on how to make funds more available and to target those funds to increase housing values for owners. However, Councilmember Etten questioned if the City Council was as aware of those programs and their uses being supported through funding the HRC in their decision-making going forward.

Councilmember Laliberte asked staff if they were aware of any funding or loan programs that were duplicative with other agencies.

Mr. Bilotta responded that he and Ms. Kelsey frequently reviewed those programs, especially most recently in reviewing the City Council's Priority Planning Program (PPP) and the undefined economic development piece. Therefore, Mr. Bilotta advised that staff was reviewing existing programs and identifying any gaps. Using the recent Calyxt development and various grant programs, Mr. Bilotta opined that it didn't make sense for the City to provide the same type of funding as available through the Department of Education and Economic Development (DEED), but advised that there were gaps that could be addressed.

Mr. Bilotta noted that since Calyxt needed funds fast, using brownfield funding was prudent; and other options may be available to provide seed money early on for entrepreneurs. Mr. Bilotta noted that some of that discussion would need to be determining the City Council's preference in focusing on high income, head of household wages, or low income jobs for those having difficulty finding jobs, or somewhere in between. Mr. Bilotta advised that staff was currently putting together a matrix now and would return to the EDA to define those gaps and find where those areas of interest were indicated to fill.

Mayor Roe recognized that this is only the beginning of this conversation; and expressed appreciation for the staff-initiated review already underway, as well as their efforts related to housing.

**b. Community Survey Discussion**

Communications Manager Garry Bowman referenced the RCA and intent of tonight's discussion to consider moving forward with another community survey, and if so, what structure it should take. Samples of the surveys from 2014 (Attachment A) and the 1998 survey (Attachment B) were included, both performed by the Morris Leatherman Company. In order to continue using the survey as a benchmark for resident satisfaction, Mr. Bowman suggested that questions remain similar, but could include some additional questions on new areas of interest for the City Council.

Without objection, Mayor Roe noted there was no objection from Councilmembers for a 2016 community survey.

#### **Individual Councilmember Comments**

**Councilmember McGehee** initiated discussion on survey content based on her preferences. Recognizing the similarity of questions and responses from the surveys, Councilmember McGehee stated that she found the 1998 format easier and questioned why it had been changed. Councilmember McGehee suggested some of the questions could be removed. Councilmember McGehee suggested focusing on one particular community issue over a two-year process for applicable measurement of success or failure.

#### **Attachment A**

Councilmember McGehee's comments on specific questions are as follows:

- #6: What is the purpose of this question? As an older community, what type of services are people looking for and how to find them.
- #10: Revise to dig deeper as to why people felt that Roseville was a welcoming community or not.
- #13: Needs more specificity
- #17: The School District(s) are also important and this information could be passed on to them for finding ways they could be more appealing to young families or just in general.

Councilmember Willmus clarified that School District 623 used Morris Leatherman to perform their own periodic phone survey similar to this; and therefore questioned the value of adding them to this question. Councilmember Willmus opined that the only question he would have, and one struggled with by the City Council on the first round, was whether or not non-English speaking residents were being adequately reached.

- #25: Councilmember McGehee noted quite a lot had been done with pathways to-date.
- #26 and #27: Both the Park Renewal Program (PMP) and projects addressed.
- #32: Do we still want to spend time talking about the community center.
- #33 – 40: What city services should be addressed in the next two years; and what information is actually needed specific to each area.

- #55: This question has remained consistent over the last ten years, but wasn't very illuminating; and suggested it be a simple "yes" or "no" question.
- #82: Suggest getting rid of this section related to Organized Collection, having been there and done that; but may want to get reaction to organic collection.
- #90: Suggested digging deeper about communications and how best to reach people; annual report from the City Manager; increase in online traffic, but many residents still relying heavily on the printed word; and how the survey may inform that process.

Attachment B

Councilmember McGehee's comments on specific questions in Attachment B are as follows:

- #4: What comes to mind with "high quality" in Roseville; and suggested a different question that got people to answer their values off the top of their head.
- #8: The most serious issue facing Roseville; a good question to remain.
- #15-31: Should include a quick list of things having come before the City Council in the last 1.5 years in one way or another.
- #34-46: Another example of quick, easy answers that she found very informative.
- #67: Good question – asking what's missing.
- #79: Good question
- #80-84: Good questions related to customer service.
- #86-95: Good questions related to parks & recreation.
- #96-110: Community Center-related; questioned if it should be included, since experience has indicated residents want one but aren't willing to pay for it.
- #146: Do we want to talk about undergrounding utilities again?

Councilmember McGehee suggested the addition of a broad topic not yet covered: "Are you planning to stay in Roseville?" or "Are you planning to stay in your home (e.g. age-in-place) as long as you can, and if so, what services do you think you'll need?"

Mayor Roe opined that some questions were the same but said in different ways; and suggested a determination was needed as to which was more effective in obtaining a viable response.

**Councilmember Willmus** questioned the length of the survey, noting 180 questions were asked in 1998; and while understanding the need for consistency and a metric for measurement, also noted the time required for respondents to participate. Councilmember Willmus agreed that with some questions it made sense to look at and compare language for tweaking somewhat.

Attachment A

- #6: This is a valuable question to ask as over time, it was a measurement you wanted to be in a position to track.
- Park Renewal Program Questions: Drop those no longer relevant based on work completed to-date.

Attachment B

Councilmember Willmus noted some questions were done on this survey prior to that done two years ago; and expressed his interest in repeating some of those original questions to compare answers over a longer period of time.

Regarding the garbage survey question, Councilmember Willmus questioned if it should be removed completely, noting the fairly narrow questions done by the City of Mounds View with the same firm of Morris Leatherman; digging down deeper on the issue. Councilmember Willmus suggested following that example.

Councilmember McGehee advised that she was considering length as well; noting the difference in time required by a respondent in both survey samples. Councilmember McGehee suggested a broad list of things the City Council needed to know provided respondents with a quicker way to respond on the value they were receiving.

Councilmember Willmus expressed interest at a minimum in having a question formulated around organics collection; with concurrence by his colleagues.

Councilmember McGehee also suggested asking residents if they liked the current carts, if they were the right size, and if every-other-week collection was the right schedule; all issues brought up in the past and now available for review.

Councilmember Willmus agreed with asking frequency, but noted that a recent Speak Up! Roseville question addressed the carts, and indications that many residents would prefer a weekly pick-up.

Mayor Roe noted the new contract coming up this year, making those questions even more relevant.

**Councilmember Laliberte**

Attachment A

Councilmember Laliberte stated that she didn't disagree that tweaking of the document was prudent and irrelevant questions should be removed (e.g. those PMP questions no longer necessary). However, Councilmember Laliberte cautioned that if too many changes were made, the comparable worth from year to year would no longer occur; so therefore, she wouldn't recommend too many changes.

Regarding the specific question of organics, Councilmember Laliberte sought clarification as to what information was being sought, especially since Ramsey County would be mandating that eventually.

Councilmember McGehee suggested questions such as: "How often, how to do, and the preferred type of container."

Councilmember Laliberte suggested clarifying those questions for "waste" or "recycling" to avoid confusion; and suggested that staff research other communities who've included these type of organics collection questions.

Specific to the Community Center question, Councilmember Laliberte stated that she wasn't sure that was a relevant topic in the next few years or if needed, and deferred to the preference of her colleagues having served longer tenures on the City Council for that history.

Regarding open-ended questions at the end of the survey, Councilmember Laliberte stated that she would support a few to allow free flow to determine areas of repetition among residents.

Mayor Roe suggested coming up with a base list as well as open-ended questions as suggested by Councilmember McGehee, something not previously listed.

Councilmember Willmus suggested that if seeking more depth of information, housing was something missing. Councilmember Willmus suggested determining if a respondent was renting an apartment or house and if they wanted to move into ownership; and if so what relevant information could be harvested from those respondents.

Councilmember Laliberte suggested a question such as: "Are you in the type of housing you want to be in?"

Mayor Roe noted that the market study previously referenced by staff talked to a broader area beyond the City of Roseville.

Councilmember McGehee suggested finding out if respondents were interested in moving up or down, or the type of housing stock preferred or not currently available to them.

Councilmember Willmus suggested value in determining what housing program(s) missing that allowed residents to stay in their homes or move if that was their choice.

Relevant to this discussion, Mr. Bowman pointed out related questions #68 – 81 in Attachment A.

Councilmember Etten suggested adding the lower maintenance housing question, and not just focusing on move-up housing.

Councilmember McGehee suggested finding those preferring to stay in their homes versus moving to assisted living; and the services they needed to remain in their homes.

Mr. Bowman noted that 16% of previous respondents in 2014 were identified by age as over 80; based on 400 respondents

Councilmember Willmus asked that staff research the number of respondents in 1998.

Councilmember McGehee noted those residents that may move their aging parents into Roseville, but not in assisted living facilities, and their age of 65 or over; a situation that appeared to be happening with people returning to Roseville for one reason or another.

**Councilmember Etten**

Attachment A

- #25: Continue to determine if there is a continued demand.

The consensus of the body was to continue asking this question.

- #26-27: Appropriate questions to remove; as well as others related to the PMP that are no longer relevant.
- Councilmember Etten noted that just last week he had received an email about a Community Center, and suggested that the specific questions included in the 1998 survey could be saved for a specific survey on only that topic, but advised he was leaning toward keeping it in as a way to continue tracking that interest.
- #65: Adjust that question to consider the new format being used for periodic seminars and workshops versus the previous annual Home & Garden Fair (e.g. speaker series topics of interest to residents suggested by Councilmember Willmus).

Councilmember Laliberte suggested a question to determine if residents were aware of it versus whether they had attended.

Mayor Roe personally questioned if that was an important question to keep in.

Mr. Bowman advised that he was asking the City Council based on past debate about the future of the HRA; and further advised that the reason for asking was in that context, seeking awareness and/or attendance.

Councilmember Willmus noted that the HRA had run that information through their survey, and with well-attended workshops in the past, it had led to that question.

- #82-84: Councilmember Etten questioned the need to ask questions #82 and #83 at this point, but opined that he remained in favor of asking #84 about recycling. Councilmember Etten expressed interest in knowing if the every-other week collection and single-sort were working. However, Councilmember Etten admitted he wouldn't know what pertinent questions to ask on organics collection; and suggested asking contractors or Morris Leatherman what the community needed to ask to remain proactive; and offered his support for that focus.

Councilmember Willmus stated that he was interested in seeing what other communities were doing with organics collection; the type of designated container being used; and whether or not Morris Leatherman has ideas for those questions based on their work with other communities.

Without objection, Councilmembers agreed to remove questions #82 and 83.

Councilmember Laliberte suggested that any questions related to communications, the Speak Up! Roseville module be added.

Recognizing comments made by Councilmember McGehee at the start of this discussion, Mayor Roe suggested getting a perspective from Morris Leatherman based on their expertise on whether canned or general follow-up worked best rather than the City Council attempting to tell them how best to do their job.

Without objection, Councilmembers agreed to consider including volunteered answers to listed questions, such as those included in previous surveys.

Mr. Bowman encapsulated the preference of the City Council, with their concurrence that the attempt was to not pigeon-hole respondents, but allow some free form responses as well.

### **Summary**

In summary and for staff clarification, City Manger Trudgeon reviewed the directives he observed from this discussion:

- Remove questions #26, #27, #82, #83, and #84.
- Retain the Community Center question.
- Add a question related to the frequency of current curbside recycling, and rating of the single-sort approach.
- Questions #68-#78: Add a lower cost housing option.



Councilmember Etten suggested also adding lower maintenance housing as an option.

Mayor Roe noted that affordable rentals were discussed, but not specifically low-maintenance owner-occupied housing; and suggested that Mr. Bowman consult with Morris Leatherman on appropriate questions or wording.

- City Manager Trudgeon noted that the general concern of Councilmembers was to include some open-ended questions at the end of the survey unless already provided for within the survey itself.

Councilmember Etten suggested one such as what the respondent saw as the greatest problem or issue the city was facing; or defining what the city should be thinking more about.

- Retain #25 (trails)
- Modify #65 related to the speaking series versus the annual Home & Garden Fair and determine if they attend or not.
- Add "Speak Up! Roseville" to communication questions.
- Consult with Morris Leatherman about the value of open-ended versus canned questions.
- Consult with Morris Leatherman on ideas for aging-in-place questions and related services for seniors allowing them to remain in their homes.

Councilmember Laliberte noted that questions were included as to rental or ownership, but suggested considering a question related to whether or not homeowners were renting out their rooms.

Councilmember Willmus suggested a question related to whether or not the city was getting too many rentals.

Councilmember Laliberte suggested a question such as: "Is rental getting out of control in Roseville?"

Without objection, council members agreed with that question; with Councilmember Etten suggesting an open-ended question could be added for addressing that concern in more detail.

City Manager Trudgeon recognized Councilmember Willmus' interest in determining the number of people surveyed in 1998 and 2014; noting that the cost was based on the number of questions.

Councilmember McGehee suggested including a question about disability access to city buildings, amenities and city services. However, Mayor Roe suggested, with consensus of remaining Councilmembers, that that type of question was too

specific for a general population survey, and noted that the city would and did hear about any of those concerns in the general course of business.

Councilmember McGehee noted her observation of a person attempting to board a bus but unable to do so because of a snow bank; with Councilmember Etten clarifying that was more of a Metro Transit issue beyond the purviews of the City of Roseville. Mayor Roe agreed that this would be a question more specific to a Town Hall meeting, and much more specific than a general survey question.

City Manager Trudgeon advised that it was staff's intent to bring the draft 2016 survey to the City Council at their March 14, 2016 meeting for further tweaking.

Mr. Bowman advised that the intent was to make sure the survey was done before summer.

Mayor Roe suggested that individual Councilmembers feed their thoughts to staff between now and then to facilitate the process.

**Motion**

Laliberte moved, Etten seconded, extending the City Council's curfew to complete the next item in closed session and return to open session to provide a summary of that closed session.

**Roll Call**

**Ayes:** McGehee, Willmus, Laliberte, Etten and Roe.

**Nays:** None.

=====

Mayor Roe announced that, in accordance with Minnesota State Statute and exceptions to open meeting laws, he would entertain a motion to move into closed session for the purpose of evaluating the job performance of the City Manager

Mayor Roe noted the City Manager's option to conduct this periodic performance review in open or closed session; with City Manager Trudgeon responding that he preferred closed session.

Etten moved, McGehee seconded, recessing the City Council meeting at approximately 9:52 p.m. and convening in Closed Executive Session, per State Statute for the purpose of the City Manager's periodic performance review.

**Roll Call**

**Ayes:** McGehee, Willmus, Laliberte, Etten and Roe.

**Nays:** None.

**CLOSED EXECUTIVE SESSION**

Mayor Roe convened the City Council in Closed Executive Session at approximately 9:55 p.m. for the purpose of the City Manager's periodic performance review.

**Regular City Council Meeting**  
**Monday, February 22, 2016**  
**Page 43**

In addition to the Councilmembers, City Manager Trudgeon, City Attorney Gaughan were also present.

At approximately 10:23 p.m., Etten moved, Willmus seconded, adjourning the closed session and reconvening in open session.

**Roll Call**

**Ayes:** McGehee, Willmus, Laliberte, Etten and Roe.

**Nays:** None.

**16. City Manager Future Agenda Review**

**17. Councilmember-Initiated Items for Future Meetings**

**18. Adjourn**

Willmus moved, Etten seconded, adjournment of the meeting at approximately 10:24 p.m.

**Roll Call**

**Ayes:** McGehee, Willmus, Laliberte, Etten and Roe.

**Nays:** None.



\_\_\_\_\_  
Daniel J. Roe, Mayor

ATTEST:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Patrick J. Trudgeon, City Manager

mi 3  
2-27

**Development of Partnership between the Community Engagement Commission  
and the Advocates for Human Rights**

**Timeline**

**December 2014** – Community Engagement Commission (CEC) presents its strategic priorities, including “Host a Conference on Community Engagement,” to the City Council for discussion and approval.

**January 2015** – Commissioner Gardella and former Commissioner Mueller agree to lead up the work on hosting a conference.

**February 2015** – Commissioners Gardella, Mueller and Ramundt submit a proposal to the CEC recommending they step back from the plan to “Host a Conference on Community Engagement,” and think more broadly about “learning opportunities”.

**February 2015** – Madeline Lohman from the Advocates for Human Rights attends CEC meeting to discuss the Advocates’ report on immigrant rights in MN and discusses the potential for partnership with the CEC and/or City of Roseville.

**March 2015** – CEC agrees to remove “conference” from the description of activities and replace it with “listening/learning” opportunities.

**April 2015** – Madeline Lohman attends CEC to discuss potential strategies for a partnership, including “hosting forums.” Discussion that the CEC’s listening/learning opportunities dovetail will with the Advocates proposal to host forums. CEC members discuss formal partnership with the Advocates, and the need to inform Human Rights Commission and to work closely with the City.

**April 2015** – Commissioners Gardella and Sanders meet with Advocates for Human Rights to further develop the partnership and plan.

**May 2015** – Advocates partnership proposal provided in June packet outlining 3 listening sessions. CEC confirms that the “listening/learning” sessions (partnership with the Advocates) is replacing our early work to “Host a Conference on Community Engagement.”

**June 2015** – Advocates partnership proposal provided in June packet.

**July 2015** – Commissioners Gardella and Sanders meet with Advocates for Human Rights to further develop the partnership and plan in light of the City Council’s revised strategic priorities.

**August 2015** – Meeting packet includes another version of partnership proposal. Partnership proposal officially approved by CEC.

**August 2015** – CEC provides update to the City Council on strategic priorities and discusses change in priority from “hosting a conference” to hosting listening/learning sessions.

**October 2015** – Commission members Gardella, Sanders and Becker meeting with Mayor Roe and Councilmember Laliberte to review partnership proposal and get feedback/suggestions.

**November 19, 2015** - Commissioners Gardella and Sanders meet with Advocates for Human Rights to provide more details to the plan based on feedback from the Mayor and Councilmember Laliberte. Discuss opportunity to focus listening/learning in SE Roseville given the City’s focus in 2016, along with potential groups to host and include. Madeline shares grant opportunity with the “Linking Communities Project” that could support translation, food, etc. We agree to apply with the Lake McCarrons Neighborhood Assoc. being the applicant as a 501c3.

**December 4, 2015** – Grant to TLC is due.

**December 2015** – CEC Commission is apprised of grant. Commissioners Gardella and Sanders received feedback that the preferred process was to get buy-in and agreement from the City, City Council and full Commission before applying.

**January 2016** – Grant from The “Linking Communities Project” is approved for \$4,000.

**January 2016** – Commissioner Gardella sends an update on partnership with the Advocates, detailing intention to focus conversations in SE Roseville and on the grant process and approval.

**February 2016** – Human Rights Commission agrees to partner with Lake McCarrons and the Community Engagement Commission on the listening/learning sessions.

**February 2016** – Sherry Sanders, Madeline Lohman and Scot Becker meet with City staff to discuss the project and ensure it aligns with the City’s efforts in Southeast Roseville.

min  
2-22

**For Immediate Release**

February 19, 2016

**Media Contact:** Gabe Cahn, West End Strategy Team, [gabe@westendstrategy.com](mailto:gabe@westendstrategy.com),  
212.398.4900, c: 202.412.1678

**New Initiatives Aim to Create Welcome for Refugees in Minnesota**

*The Linking Communities (TLC) Project will fund nine local projects*

MINNEAPOLIS—At a time when our nation’s proud tradition of welcoming refugees is continually at risk of being tarnished, several innovative Minnesota-based organizations have received funding for nine local projects to serve the local refugee population. The initiatives include new networking and training opportunities for refugees, establishing community gardens, and forums for telling the stories of refugees through art.

“Now more than ever, supporting local organizations that have fresh ideas for sharing information about refugees with their neighbors is critical,” said **Melanie Nezer, Vice President for Policy and Advocacy at HIAS**. “The projects in Minnesota will help dispel the misinformation about refugees that is so prevalent these days and we hope that successful projects will be replicated in communities across the country.”

The Linking Communities (TLC) Project: Creating Welcome for Refugees, now in its third year, is a collaborative project of the national refugee resettlement agencies\* that is coordinated by HIAS. TLC grew out of a HIAS report recommendation to build capacity at the local and national levels to generate and maintain broad-based commitment to refugee resettlement in local communities throughout the United States.

The diverse and effective projects to improve the environment for refugees in Minnesota will help to combat the presidential candidates, elected officials and others seeking to pause or completely halt the resettlement of refugees into the United States, and working to send a message that refugees are not welcome in their states.

Projects in Minnesota funded by the TLC Project partners will receive between \$3,000 and \$5,000

Funded initiatives in Minnesota:

**African Development Center** in Minneapolis, Minnesota will host a series of **Community Conversations** to provide African refugees and immigrants in the Twin Cities the opportunity to meet with community members, business leaders, and government officials and share their experiences, challenges, aspirations, and needs.

**Asian Economic Development Association** in St. Paul, Minnesota will create a **public art project** as part of MANIFEST: Pop-Up Arts and Culture, an art and cultural showcase bringing visibility to multi-generational refugee and immigrant narratives around resettlement experiences through art, culture, food, facilitated conversation, and community outreach.

**Lake McCarrons Neighborhood Association**-working closely with The Advocates for Human Rights, the City of Roseville Community Engagement Commission, and the Karen Organization of Minnesota-will host a **series of conversations** in Roseville, Minnesota to bring together the Karen refugee community with neighbors and government officials to build relationships, work across cultural barriers, and increase welcome for the Karen population in Roseville and beyond.

**Labor Education Service, University of Minnesota-Twin Cities** will work in St. Cloud, MN- with the East Central Area Labor Council, Minnesota AFL-CIO and St. Cloud State student organizations- to conduct a **series of trainings** for community members, students and others who want to share information with their neighbors and make St. Cloud a safe and welcoming community for refugees.

**The Minnesota Council of Churches** will work throughout the state to showcase a series of portraits and first-person narratives of refugees in Minnesota. The project will include a **traveling photo exhibit** in Mankato and St. Cloud, public art installations, a multimedia web application, and a book of portraits and stories.

**The English Learning Center**-a program of Our Saviour's Community Services-will launch a Volunteer Advocacy Initiative, offering **monthly training sessions** for volunteers who wish to increase welcome for refugees through community outreach and education, guest speakers, and social media. ELC will produce a series of infographics highlighting the stories of refugees as an outreach tool.

**Somali Action Alliance Education Fund** will host a series of **community forums** in Minneapolis, St. Cloud, and Willmar focused on educating Minnesotans about the Somali experience in the state, and creating a new narrative about the ways in which the Somali community contributes to building a more vibrant Minnesota.

**The International Institute of Minnesota**-in collaboration with Galilee Lutheran Church and Rice Street Community Garden-will establish a **community garden** that will offer half its slots to refugees and other new Americans, allowing communities to come together through gardening. Events will include refugee demonstrations of garden techniques and social gatherings to unite refugee communities with the broader community.

**Lutheran Social Services of North Dakota** will work together with the Afro American Development Association to publish a series of **stories highlighting the journeys of refugees** resettled in the greater Moorhead, Minnesota area. These stories will be disseminated to the public through print and social media.

**\*TLC Project partners:**

HIAS; Center for Applied Linguistics; Church World Service; Episcopal Migration Ministries; Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Services; the U.S. Committee for Refugees

and Immigrants; and the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, working closely with Welcoming America and Refugee Council USA.

For more information about TLC or the grantees, please visit [www.hias.org/TLCproject](http://www.hias.org/TLCproject). To speak with a project coordinator, please contact [gabe@westendstrategy.com](mailto:gabe@westendstrategy.com).

###

*HIAS is the global Jewish nonprofit that protects refugees—including women and children, and ethnic, religious, and sexual minorities—whose lives are in danger for being who they are. Guided by our values and history, HIAS helps refugees rebuild their lives in safety and advocates to ensure that all displaced people are treated with dignity. More info at [@HIASrefugees](https://www.facebook.com/HIASrefugees), [Facebook](https://www.facebook.com/HIASrefugees) and [hias.org](http://hias.org).*



min  
2-22

**Kari Collins**

---

**Subject:** FW: Online Form Submittal: Contact City Council

---

**From:** [noreply@civicplus.com](mailto:noreply@civicplus.com) [mailto:noreply@civicplus.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, February 19, 2016 12:28 PM  
**To:** \*RVCouncil; Kari Collins; Pat Trudgeon  
**Subject:** Online Form Submittal: Contact City Council

### Contact City Council

Please complete this online form and submit.

---

Subject Update to rental registration

---

Contact Information

---

Name: Timothy Callaghan

---

Address: 3062 Shorewood Lane

---

City: Roseville

---

State: MN

---

Zip: 55113

---

This form goes to the Mayor, all Councilmembers and certain City Staff. Due to the volume of emails submitted, a personal reply is not always possible.

---

How would you prefer to be contacted? Remember to fill in the corresponding contact information.

Email

---

Email Address:

---

Phone Number: *Field not completed.*

---

Please Share Your Comment, Question or Concern

I was reading the update to the rental registration and I feel that it has problems in clarity that will cause problems. I section 907.02 Paragraph 1 it says that the unit occupied by the owner does not have to be register. Most people who are renting units to others from their home would consider their home to be a single unit and that they would not have to register. I realize that if you read further that paragraph 2 says that a home with

---

areas rented would be considered more than one unit. But dealing with people not used to legal documents they would miss this. I would recommend that paragraph 1 be changed so that it is apparent the the non-registration apply only to the area occupied by the owner and any rental space would have to be registered.

---

Unless restricted by law, all correspondence to and from Roseville City government offices, including information submitted through electronic forms such as this one, may be public data subject to the Minnesota Data Practices Act and/or may be disclosed to third parties.

---

Email not displaying correctly? [View it in your browser.](#)

min  
2-22

**Kari Collins**

---

**Subject:** FW: Online Form Submittal: Contact City Council

---

**From:** noreply@civicplus.com [mailto:noreply@civicplus.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, February 18, 2016 9:43 AM  
**To:** \*RVCouncil; Kari Collins; Pat Trudgeon  
**Subject:** Online Form Submittal: Contact City Council

## Contact City Council

Please complete this online form and submit.

---

**Subject** Rental Licensing of 1 to 4 Units

---

**Contact Information**

---

**Name:** Annette Phillips

---

**Address:** 3084 Shorewood Ln

---

**City:** Roseville

---

**State:** MN

---

**Zip:** 55113

---

This form goes to the Mayor, all Councilmembers and certain City Staff. Due to the volume of emails submitted, a personal reply is not always possible.

---

How would you prefer to be contacted? Remember to fill in the corresponding contact information.

---

**Email Address:**

---

**Phone Number:**

---

**Please Share Your Comment, Question or Concern**

February 18, 2016 Dear Mayor and City Council, At the last council meeting, I commented to the Council on changes made to the Rental Licensing Ordinance. After rereading the entire document by Trevor Johnson, some of the changes proposed are not just a rewrite but a significant modification. In the proposed ordinance, owner occupied properties are to be exempted from the requirement to license. The statement

added in 907.02 Definitions No. 1. "The term "residential rental property" means ..."intended to be used as habitable space in which the owner of the dwelling or unit does not reside". As stated, if the owner of the unit resides at the unit it does not need to obtain a license. That would mean that the owner living in the unit, could have renters (boarders, roommates) in that unit or house and be exempt from the ordinance. As a citizen of Roseville and also a neighbor to Northwestern College, I do not want the ordinance changed so that owner inhabited units in 1 to 4 unit properties are automatically exempt from registration and licensing. I initiated and met with city staff (Jeanne Kelsey, Paul Bilotta and Jane Reilly) on Tuesday of this week to discuss this change in the ordinance. They asked me to wait to send this letter to the Council until they consulted with staff and the city attorney. Jeanne called me this morning (Thursday) to say they did revise the wording in 907.02 Definitions No 1 since it was confusing. She said staff has decided to keep the exemption for owner occupied rentals. The packet for the 22nd council meeting will reflect the change in wording and also the city attorney's opinion on the matter. The packet is due out this evening (Thursday) so I have not seen it. The purpose of rental licensing of 1 to 4 rental units of Roseville is stated in paragraph 907.01 Purpose of. The current ordinance (and in essence the proposed ordinance) states it is "to identify and quantify small rental units in the City and provide information and a method to enforce minimum standards to meet City and State safety, health, fire and zoning codes within the City and to provide a more efficient system to ensure that the stock of rental property within the City is properly maintained. The City recognizes that the most efficient system to provide information on the rental status of certain residential properties is through the creation of a program requiring the registration of all residential rental property with 1 to 4 units within the City." By exempting owner occupied rentals, these owners and their renters will not be provided with educational materials concerning their rights and the health, safety and various zoning codes within Roseville. Please take another look at the impact of the changes proposed to the rental licensing ordinance with regard to the purpose and benefit of all residents of Roseville. Annette Phillips

---

Unless restricted by law, all correspondence to and from Roseville City government offices, including information submitted through electronic forms such as this one, may be public data subject to the Minnesota Data Practices Act and/or may be disclosed to third parties.

---

Email not displaying correctly? [View it in your browser.](#)