



**Regular City Council Meeting Minutes
City Hall Council Chambers, 2660 Civic Center Drive
Monday, November 7, 2016**

1. Roll Call

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

2. Pledge of Allegiance

3. Approve Agenda

Councilmember Willmus requested removal of Item 8.e from the Consent Agenda for separate consideration.

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

Roll Call

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

Nays: None.

4. Public Comment

Mayor Roe called for public comment by members of the audience on any non-agenda items. No one appeared to speak.

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

Mayor Roe recognized Veteran's Day and noted that City Hall would be closed in remembrance. Mayor Roe announced upcoming November events including, a seminar by Roseville Police on Identity Theft protection followed by Coffee with a Cop; the 4th annual Ovalumination and skating event.

Mayor Roe announced an upcoming volunteer opportunity at Cottontail Park for assisting with already cut Buckthorn debris.

Mayor Roe also noted upcoming community meetings for input on future land use for the former National Guard Armory site at 211 N McCarron's Boulevard and logistics of those meetings.

As part of the SE Roseville Working Group consisting of staff and elected officials from Ramsey County and the Cities of St. Paul, Maplewood and Roseville, Mayor Roe reported on the ongoing monthly meetings since the last community meeting to review feedback from the communities and develop next steps and actions. Mayor Roe reported another meeting would be forthcoming to provide a concise list of ideas put forth from that meeting and how to address the various components. Mayor Roe referenced the City of Roseville's website under the Community Development Department tab for more de-

Regular City Council Meeting

Monday, November 7, 2016

Page 2

tailed information and updates on revitalizing the Rice Street and Larpenteur Avenue area, in addition to the report having been emailed to all attending that community meeting who had provided their email addresses.

Mayor Roe advised that one of the next steps identified by the working group was to reach out to local businesses inviting their input in the process. Mayor Roe advised that commitment for funding for the planning portion was pending with sources anticipated from Roseville in the amount of \$40,000 from existing 2016 planning/development budgets; City of St. Paul 2017 budget funds (if approved) of \$50,000; City of Maplewood \$10,000 totaling \$100,000. Mayor Roe noted planning included developing a request for proposals (RFP) for a project management firm for consulting during the process to replace the efforts of the St. Paul Area Chamber of Commerce and their past time and financial commitment due to recent staff changes. Mayor Roe noted the City of Roseville was discussing Roseville-specific plans for SE Roseville that tied into this broader effort; with the county and all cities involved in approving the broader efforts by their governing bodies. Mayor Roe advised that the Chamber would likely serve as the fiscal agent, but each city would need approval of actions going forward for the broader effort, with individual City Council discussions and decisions accordingly, and allowing for additional public input along the way.

Mayor Roe reported on an anticipated report in 2017 from Ramsey County on the Rice Street corridor and how that street functions (e.g. mechanical and pedestrian amenities); including discussions about development at the Community School of Excellence at the former Linder's site in St. Paul.

Mayor Roe noted the next steps would include convening the neighborhood group again with the purpose of reporting and synthesizing the information gathered to-date and to provide an opportunity for more feedback on that information.

City Manager Trudgeon reported on absentee and early voting in Roseville to-date, with an average of 400-500 voters per day, with today's record of over 800 voters exceeding that average. Mr. Trudgeon noted that this represented a significant portion of the approximate 20,000 registered voters in Roseville. Mr. Trudgeon publically thanked city staff for their heroic efforts in accommodating this early voting option that had far exceeded expectations; and noted other communities in Ramsey County were also experiencing similar outcomes. Mr. Trudgeon noted Ramsey County Elections officials were looking at doing things differently locally and statewide; perhaps including legislation to change the process and address this huge burden on staff, especially since the current process is very time-consuming and involved.

Mr. Trudgeon reminded voters that for tomorrow's Election Day, they would need to vote at their assigned precincts, but that City Hall staff would be available to answer their questions. Mr. Trudgeon reported that absentee and early ballots were delivered to Ramsey County by city staff after polls closed each evening.

Regular City Council Meeting

Monday, November 7, 2016

Page 3

Mayor Roe thanked voters for their enthusiasm.

6. Recognitions, Donations and Communications

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 October 10, 2016 City Council Meeting Minutes

Mayor Roe thanked Councilmember McGehee for her rewrite of the section related to her presentation on policing services in Roseville.

Willmus moved, McGehee seconded, approval of the October 10, 2016 City Council Meeting Minutes as presented.

Roll Call

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

Nays: None.

b. Approve October 24, 2016 City Council Meeting Minutes

McGehee moved, Etten seconded, approval of the October 24, 2016 City Council Meeting Minutes as amended.

Corrections: 2

• Page 35, Lines 37 -38 (Willmus)

Correct to read: "Councilmember Willmus opined that the best position for the city would be [~~without that particular clause a better clause would be no clause~~] [to have an escape clause]."

Roll Call

Ayes: McGehee, Willmus, Etten and Roe.

Nays: None.

Abstentions: Laliberte.

Motion carried.

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) dated November 7, 2016 and related attachments.

a. Approve Payments

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

Regular City Council Meeting

Monday, November 7, 2016

Page 4

ACH Payments	\$686,900.29
83496 – 83645	251,152.10
TOTAL	\$938,052.39

Roll Call

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

Nays: None.

b. Approve Business and Other Licenses

McGehee moved, Etten seconded, approval of New 2016-2017 Massage Therapy Licenses as detailed, dependent on completion of successful background checks.

Roll Call

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

Nays: None.

c. Certify Unpaid Utility and Other Charges to the Property Tax Rolls

McGehee moved, Etten seconded, adoption of Resolution No. 11371 (Attachment A) entitled, “Resolution Directing the County Auditor to Levy Unpaid Water, Sewer and Other City Charges for Payable 2015 or Beyond.”

Roll Call

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

Nays: None.

d. Resolution Accepting the Voluntary Relinquishment of Liquor License #27969 and #27897 and Final Disposition of Proposed Liquor License Violation by Licensee Smashburger Acquisition – Minneapolis, LLC

McGehee moved, Etten seconded, adoption of Resolution No. 11372 (Attachment A) entitled, “A Resolution Accepting the Voluntary Relinquishment of Liquor Licenses #27969 and #27897 and Final Disposition of Proposed Liquor License Violation by Licensee Smashburger Acquisition – Minneapolis, LLC.”

Roll Call

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

Nays: None.

9. Consider Items Removed from Consent

e. Consider Approving Information Technology (IT) Shared Service Agreement with the City of Ham Lake

At the request of Mayor Roe, City Manager Trudgeon briefly reviewed this item being considered under the Consent Agenda; and as detailed in the RCA dated November 7, 2016 and related attachments.

Regular City Council Meeting

Monday, November 7, 2016

Page 5

Councilmember Willmus advised staff that this particular item had not been included in his meeting packet materials.

As this venture continued to roll out with other municipalities and agencies, Councilmember Willmus asked staff if the business model had been reviewed for use of other entities' employees rather than Roseville employees to offset staffing and travel costs.

Finance Director Chris Miller advised that this particular business model addressed cost-sharing; however, he clarified that many of the IT employees were not actually housed out of Roseville City Hall, but instead their work site was at other city halls as applicable. Therefore Mr. Miller reported that there was no added travel costs were incurred with their normal schedule, therefore no mileage allotment was included, with few exceptions other than those identified as "floaters" and reimbursed accordingly, but not to any significant amount.

Specific to personnel, Mr. Miller noted there were a number of nuances and complexities to this business mode, with Roseville currently having hired seventeen different IT employees parceled out to a number of different agencies. Mr. Miller also noted that some of these other cities or agencies had their own smaller IT staff who came into the business model mix and provided the City of Roseville and others partners with their unique areas of expertise (e.g. City of Maplewood) and share their resources consortium wide. While the seventeen employees are considered City of Roseville employees, their services are shared with other partners in the consortium, with current needs for additional staffing, but working well to-date. Mr. Miller opined that there was some inherent risk in Roseville carrying all the employees on its books; but also noted there had been no reported work place injuries to-date, nor any property liability risk with this business model and employee pool.

If this collaboration should ever be sized differently, or if an agency or city decides to leave, Mr. Miller advised that the remaining participating agencies would be approached for a collective decision on whether to downsize the consortium staffing, or for each agency or city to decide to keep the existing number of staff on the books and increase their share of the funding proportionately. To-date, Mr. Miller advised that none of the participants had left the consortium due to dissatisfaction.

At the request of Councilmember Willmus, Mr. Miller confirmed that each Joint Powers Agreement (JPA) was set up with built-in inflators to capture employee costs (e.g. COLA, benefits, etc.) and indirect paybacks to make the operation viable. If this business model went away, Mr. Miller reported that the City of Roseville would need another \$500,000 in its annual budget to retain the same network, equipment and services it not has; thus making it a definite benefit with this collaboration for the City of Roseville.

McGehee moved, Laliberte seconded, approval of a Shared Services Agreement with the City of Ham Lake for the purposes of providing IT support services.

Roll Call

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

Nays: None.

10. General Ordinances for Adoption

a. Fire Department City Code Ordinance Changes for Chapter 404 (Air Pollution) and Chapter 902 (Fire Prevention)

Fire Marshal Tim O'Neill; and Battalion Chief of Operations David Brosnahan were available for this item.

Chief O'Neill provided a brief introduction and background for this request and changes made to-date from several previous meetings with the City Council. Chief O'Neill noted changes made based on City Council feedback had been highlighted in the documents presented tonight, including ordinance summaries.

Mayor Roe noted most of the changes were due to changes in State Fire Code and City staffing models over the years since initially adopted.

Councilmember Etten noted his conversations with Chief O'Neill about amendments to Section 2.404.02 (Open Burning), removing Item D. for institutional recreation burning permits and safety concerns of Chief O'Neill related to the annual B-Dale Club Halloween burn. While recognizing the Chief's concerns that small brush and debris may blow out of that bonfire, Councilmember Etten asked the City Council to considering a permitting process that would allow for a bonfire to be safely run. Councilmember Etten noted that this annual event drew many people in the area and provided a positive family activity; and suggested support for a smart, safe way to make changes to this policy that would allow that event to continue.

From a different perspective, Councilmember McGehee stated she was ready to commend the Chief for eliminating this event, since it created a significant air pollution issue. Councilmember McGehee opined that an annual tradition and gathering such as this could be held without it serving as a giant air polluter at the same time; and expressed her personal appreciation of Chief O'Neill's efforts to limit these types of fires to a more reasonable size and length of time.

Councilmember Willmus asked Chief O'Neill what his proposed parameters would be if he was to consider a permitting process.

Regular City Council Meeting

Monday, November 7, 2016

Page 7

Chief O'Neill reviewed his rationale in recommending removal of this type of recreational burn from Section 404; since as it currently stands, there is little guidance provided for what could or could not be done, beyond the restrictions of the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) as to cubic feet of fire product, without any other restrictions such as how, when, where and the distance from adjacent property lines. When seeking the DNR's rationale about the reasonable nature of their limited restrictions, Chief O'Neill reported that their response had been that they didn't anticipate any such burns being done in the seven-county metropolitan area. From his perspective at this time, Chief O'Neill reported that there were few limitations he could place on that type of fire under current municipal legislation; but if directed to do so by the City Council, as far as permitting he would recommend an Interim Use permit individually considered for a particular event in order to condition such an approval on meeting Fire department and/or city requirements as mandated (e.g. setbacks, supervision, etc.). Chief O'Neill stated that his recommendation was that the city sticks with the 3 x 3 x 3' fire; but if the City Council directed otherwise, he would be more than willing to assist in developing recommendations.

At the request of Councilmember Willmus, Chief O'Neill confirmed that, due to setback and property line concerns, his recommendation at this time would be to leave the revised language as presented; and consider such institutional recreation burning requests for a later date through an Interim Use process if so directed by the City Council. At the further request of Councilmember Willmus, Chief O'Neill reviewed consequences if the Fire Department was called out to the scene of such a bonfire and their authority to mandate that the fire be extinguished. Chief O'Neill advised that the intent was that the Fire Department be able to retain the ability to understand the community as well as bonfire regulations; but if there were a number of neighbor complaints about air pollution, such as during a high dew point day, today the department only had the ability to ask the party to extinguish the fire. However, Chief O'Neill advised that new language proposed under Item F of this section provided the Fire Department the ability to demand or mandate that a fire be extinguished if conditions changed or as the Chief or his/her designee ordered.

Chapter 404

McGehee moved, Willmus seconded, enactment of Ordinance No. 1513 (Attachment A) entitled, "An Ordinance Amending Selected Text of Roseville City Code, Title 4, Chapter 404 (Air Pollution Control)."

Roll Call

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

Nays: None.

While supporting the motion, Councilmember Laliberte spoke in support of considering an IU for an institutional recreation burning event.

Mayor Roe noted the City Council could consider such action later in 2017 if related to the annual B-Dale club for their fall tradition.

McGehee moved, Willmus seconded, enactment of Ordinance Summary No. 1513 (Attachment B) entitled, "An Ordinance Amending Selected Text of Roseville City Code, Title 4, Chapter 404 (Air Pollution Control)."

Roll Call (Super Majority Vote)

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

Nays: None.

Chapter 902

McGehee moved, Laliberte seconded, enactment of Ordinance No. 1512 (Attachment C) entitled, "An Ordinance Amending Selected Text of Roseville City Code, Title 9, Chapter 902 (Fire Prevention)."

Roll Call

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

Nays: None.

McGehee moved, Laliberte seconded, enactment of Ordinance Summary No. 1512 (Attachment D) entitled, "An Ordinance Amending Selected Text of Roseville City Code, Title 9, Chapter 902 (Fire Prevention)."

Roll Call (Super Majority Vote)

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

Nays: None.

Recess

Mayor Roe recessed the meeting at approximately 6:35 p.m., and reconvened at approximately 6:36 p.m.

11. Presentations

a. Receive Presentation from Ramsey County Assessor, Stephen Baker, Reporting Roseville Commercial & Residential Valuation Trends in 2016

Mayor Roe recognized Community Development Director Kari Collins who in turn introduced and welcomed Ramsey County Assessor Stephen Baker.

Ms. Collins advised that earlier this year, city staff met with Ramsey County Assessor staff to discuss how valuations were determined and what the City of Roseville could do to increase market valuations for commercial and residential properties citywide.

Ms. Collins noted that staff felt the information would be beneficial to the City Council/REDA based on the current Policy Priority Plan (PPP) and desired objectives to increase market value in the community.

Ramsey County Assessor Stephen Baker

In addition to his presentation, attachments included the 2016 (Payable 2017) Ramsey County Assessor's Report.

Mr. Baker noted that Minnesota is recognized as a state having one of the most complex property tax systems in the nation; and while most citizens and local officials understand some aspects of property taxes, they don't grasp the total picture. Mr. Baker stated his goal tonight was not to make the City Council, staff, or those viewing the presentation as property tax experts, but to increase their understanding of the system.

As part of his presentation, Mr. Baker encouraged residents to maintain their homes, with the thought to finding out what amenities those in the buying market were seeking that would not only increase their home's value but encourage people to look at it once listed with a realtor.

Mr. Baker noted that, while school districts remained important to buyers, life style questions were becoming more important than seen in a long time (e.g. their location to transit such as Bus Rapid Transit and/or Light Rail) and amenities available in the immediate area. Mr. Baker advised that apartments continued to do very well in the market, with condominiums not having taken off again since the recession, and in part due to significant liability changes in Minnesota and Minnesota Housing Finance Agency (MHFA) funding changes, keeping apartments more reasonable and profitable. With both downtown St. Paul and Minneapolis short on available land, Mr. Baker noted that this provided good opportunities for inner-ring suburbs evidenced by the dearth of construction seen in suburbs and continuing market for apartments. However, Mr. Baker noted that many developers were choosing older complexes and repositioning them through remodeling and new amenities versus new construction. Mr. Baker advised that this created a new class at a much lower investment for a developer, and allowing them to sell them when rehabilitation is completed. With low rates available for refinancing, Mr. Baker noted it provided a good return on investment for existing owners.

Until interest in single-family homes returns to the exurbs comparable to the previous 10-15 year growth cycle before the recession, Mr. Baker opined with ongoing interest in the core area, Roseville was well-positioned for that growth, especially with BRT connections to light rail.

When reviewing more timely data and current trends for rental rates, Councilmember Willmus asked if indications were for a decline in multi-family rental rates, what did that indicate to Mr. Baker for the strength in that market.

Mr. Baker responded that the primary drivers of apartment rental rates (occupancy and vacancy rates, rental rates and expenses) were changing with landlords paying nearly all expenses in the past but now able to bill back utilities to renters even if not separately metered. Mr. Baker also noted a big driver is the lower capital rates and expectations of returns in the current low interest rate environment, allowing a potential 6.5% return on investment versus 1% interest on a bond or even less at a bank; and providing an opportunity for leveraging growth if mortgaged. Mr. Baker noted there was still pressure in the market for more units at a quicker pace until the demographics change back to owner versus renters slowing that demand for apartments, and depending on how long that took.

While not separating it out in his report as indicated by Councilmember Willmus, Mr. Baker advised that the county kept tracked of difference in new construction versus average sale prices for non-new construction by major class and city as also available through MLS data.

Councilmember McGehee referenced comments made by Mr. Baker during his presentation related to the impact of tax increment financing (TIF) on the city's tax structure, and asked that he elaborate on that comment.

Mr. Baker noted in general TIF is not put in place by a city except to help projects that otherwise would not occur and borne by others than the developer in order to proceed. While such a city decision affected property taxes, Mr. Baker noted during the time that property improvement was not on the tax rolls, with the new value increment going to the city's Housing & Redevelopment Authority (HRA) or the entity doing the TIF, it wasn't necessarily borne by the community at large in the meantime. Mr. Baker reported that those numbers weren't typically that large to begin with, and while they may be borne by other properties within the jurisdiction funding TIF collections, it didn't tell the true tale in each case, especially if and when the fiscal disparities tax was taken into account, even though the Truth in Taxation notices will show a number for TIF, it may not be mathematically correct.

At the request of Councilmember McGehee, Mr. Baker advised that he didn't have the fiscal disparities rate for Roseville available, but would get it and forward to staff for their dissemination to the City Council.

Noting that the city's tax rate breakdown had been 50%/50% between commercial and residential property for some time, Councilmember McGehee noted the current shift in that percentage to residential paying more than commercial proper-

ties. Councilmember McGehee asked if that was adjusted by the County Assessor's office or by legislation action by the State of Minnesota.

Mr. Baker responded that it was changed through legislative action; and reviewed the background of the most recent shift created by the legislature during Governor Ventura's administration in 2002 or 2003, creating a state general tax and dramatic class rate compression to reduce commercial rates seeking more equity between residential and commercial properties. However, Mr. Baker further clarified that this didn't ultimately result in a windfall reduction for commercial properties as the additional general tax was created on top of other tax rates. Mr. Baker noted the unfortunate consequences in making it more difficult for local officials and citizens to understand that interaction, and taxing authority changing from the city to state; and not necessarily being returned to a jurisdiction. Mr. Baker noted another unintended consequence was that the legislature couldn't agree on how to fund schools, and while reducing the rates and getting revenue back to the state level to accomplish that, it had proven more costly to run the schools and had ultimately shifted costs back to local jurisdictions and school districts as the State had no political will to fund schools.

Councilmember McGehee stated she had heard from residents in Roseville who had rehabilitated their homes and subsequently sold them that buyers wanted homes to be walk-in ready so they didn't have to make any improvements until they sold the home. From his broader perspective, Councilmember McGehee asked Mr. Baker what information he would share with Roseville residents seeking to update their homes in preparation for sale.

Mr. Baker noted that it seemed like the market was penalizing properties not nearly perfect right now; but if a nice home was in a great location, there might be stronger interest even if not considered perfect. However, most of the time, Mr. Baker suggested it was better for those selling to have things in good shape, and while not necessarily remodeling everything, open house indicators strongly supported staging houses (e.g. de-cluttering, painting) and other things to spur interest. Mr. Baker also noted the market was supporting increased home sales through kitchen upgrades, removing carpeting and refinishing original wood floors in older homes, and other things that were easier to do before moving in. Mr. Baker suggested that residents get a good realtor and seek their advice and to look at homes currently on the market and how they show. Mr. Baker opined that he was convinced that most people would rethink listing their homes before taking such steps if they checked out those homes already on the market.

Specific to properties receiving TIF and recognizing that taxing jurisdictions were not collecting the difference in before/after taxes that could have gone toward the tax levy, Mayor Roe asked if it was fair to say properties adjacent to or in the immediate area of properties receiving TIF or in the general area could see their values increase as a result of those improvements.

Mr. Baker stated that was a definite result, with new development serving as a catalyst for more development. As an example, Mr. Baker referenced the Twin Lakes Redevelopment Area that, even though it took considerable time to start moving, was now seeing ongoing and dramatic results in the broader area. Mr. Baker reiterated the intent of TIF for use on properties that wouldn't otherwise develop due to contaminated soil, large infrastructure expanses for roads or other reasons. Mr. Baker noted that those infrastructure improvements served a much broader area, as well as watershed improvements in some of those commercial areas and extending beyond just those few parcels receiving TIF.

While understanding how the assessor looked at property classes, Councilmember Laliberte asked Mr. Baker to provide more detail for apartments, such as value differentials for age-restricted versus market-rate apartments.

Mr. Baker advised that his office looked at apartments by size and type, as well as amenities or features (e.g. apartments versus walk-up only, underground parking, etc.). Mr. Baker noted senior buildings were in a unique class of their own, and those being built most frequently at this time cooperatives, with the most recent senior apartments seen being integrated campuses.

Councilmember Laliberte asked if Mr. Baker was seeing a trend with Roseville housing for senior housing stock compared with the remainder of Ramsey County.

Mr. Baker responded that, while Roseville was early in constructing senior buildings, there were significant senior projects happening all over Ramsey County in surrounding suburbs.

Councilmember McGehee asked Mr. Baker what he observed for the type of apartment and surrounding amenities that best drew young people in.

Mr. Baker advised that the current apartment market was struggling with that very question. However, Mr. Baker observed that great developers were the ones who identified a new or burgeoning market to explore and opened that up themselves. While there have been limited opportunities to do so thus far, Mr. Baker advised that some was starting to be seen happening in some places (e.g. Maple Grove near the transit home and in Minnetonka). Mr. Baker noted light rail is a big item driving the market, as well as other amenities, some in the units themselves and some in the buildings (e.g. dog walking services, bike repair centers, roof top grills and terraces, exercise facilities, free coffee lounges). Mr. Baker noted that developers attempt to put enough amenities in their buildings so tenants realize "one stop shopping" and don't have to expend those funds elsewhere beyond their rent and consider those lifestyle savings even while paying more rent for a tenant (e.g. Wi-Fi, no fitness center membership, etc.). Mr. Baker noted good bike con-

nections offset not having access to light rail, especially when BRT comes into the picture.

Regarding condos and continuum of care residences, Councilmember Etten asked where they fell within the classification system and their values related to other housing options.

Mr. Baker responded that continuum of care buildings are tough to classify other than on a case by case basis and their type of facility such as memory care, assisted living, independent living, or those more like an apartment and within the apartment class. Mr. Baker noted that licensed nursing homes are typically exempt when owned by a non-profit, but memory care units are treated differently if there are no kitchens connected for safety concerns, even though they may have a “fake kitchen” to make residents feel more at home. Specific to cooperatives, Mr. Baker reported that each unit could receive homestead credits, even though on one parcel, their value was split for each shareholder.

At the request of Councilmember McGehee, Mr. Baker clarified that nursing homes are separate and specific under property tax code and only licensed nursing home beds are exempt whether non-profit or in a very few cases, if a portion of a for-profit complex. Mr. Baker referenced specific statutory exemption #94 addressing non-discharge properties that accepted Medicare as full payment; with the majority falling under the 501.3.c category, and mostly non-profit versus for-profit facilities; but requiring further research on a case by case basis as he noted previously.

From the commercial aspect, Mayor Roe noted when reviewing changes in values for Roseville given the variable types and sizes, he looked at the overall value rather than median increase; and asked Mr. Baker if this provided an accurate way to view those values.

Mr. Baker stated there was no good way to determine shifts in property classes, with most ending up paying more percentage of taxes next year than the previous year, as shift occurred from one class to another (e.g. commercial). All things being equal, Mr. Baker agreed with Mayor Roe’s view as being a good barometer, even with different market segments all on different points of the real estate cycle. While industrial is currently strong, Mr. Baker noted that retail is coming along; while offices continue to struggle and not seen as adding as many jobs due to employers downsizing work space for existing employees. Mr. Baker noted there were many different trajectories at play in making that value determination.

Mayor Roe thanked Mr. Baker for his presentation, and asked that a copy be provided to city staff for their dissemination to the council.

b. Receive Presentation from Ehlers, Inc. and Discuss Criteria for Acquisition Framework

Mayor Roe welcomed Jason Aarsvold from Ehlers, Inc., who in turn introduced his colleague James Lehnhoff, who had just recently joined their firm and was also available at tonight's meeting.

Given the City Council's and Economic Development Authority's active interest in land purchases, including their consideration of four different properties for acquisition just this year, Mr. Aarsvold noted that they had agreed to repurpose dollars to develop both a public financing policy and an acquisition framework going forward. Mr. Aarsvold referenced Attachment A to the RCA of today's date to lead the discussion for criteria for such an acquisition framework, and to guide general feedback from the City Council for its development.

Mr. Aarsvold suggested the city consider four key questions as outlined in the preamble of the attachment. Subset questions for consideration in evaluation, even if varying from one property to another, were listed in Attachment A, with each category receiving feedback as outlined below.

Who should acquire property for development and redevelopment purposes?

Councilmember McGehee stated she favored both private developers and the city, seeing the city much more specifically involved if there was a community interest in the outcome; and whether there was specific direction from the community for financial participation or if there was insufficient control available through zoning to get the desired outcome for a city asset, or to assemble sites to move a development project forward.

Councilmember Willmus concurred with Councilmember McGehee on a combination of both depending on the desired outcome and community goals and risks involved.

Generally speaking, Mayor Roe stated he would default to the private developer; with concurrence by Councilmember Etten.

Mayor Roe stated he could agree to city or EDA involvement to meet city objectives or if involving a challenging site with benefits available if the city assembled the site if it wasn't organically developing, as long as those costs fell in line with the city's ability to acquire the property. However, Mayor Roe stated his preference by and large is that private developers do their own acquisition for a variety of reasons. Mayor Roe further stated his lack of interest in acquiring large sites and holding them for a long time, since those carrying costs could become a financial drain on the city unless that risk and its mitigation was identified ahead of time.

Mr. Aarsvold referenced the city's recent adoption of the Business Subsidy Policy that would serve to inform this additional feedback.

What is the purpose of acquiring the property? (e.g. Would a public acquisition align with community development and redevelopment goals)?

Similar to the Business Subsidy Policy, Councilmember Etten suggested a check-off list. For example, while the city didn't like blighted properties, it couldn't acquire every blighted property in Roseville. But if it acquired a blighted property (e.g. SE Roseville), Councilmember Etten stated he would look for a policy without one single item as the magic bullet, but consisting of a few things checked off on a particular site before it became amenable to the city to acquire or assemble parcels, such as meeting redevelopment goals or by providing controls beyond existing zoning designation and uses.

Councilmember Laliberte agreed with Councilmember Etten, opining that was well stated.

Mayor Roe also agreed with Councilmember Etten's statement, referencing the criteria listed on Attachment A (Item 2) as a sensible first look at achieving the goal, with others available for potential assembly under that list of criteria. Specific to public uses, Mayor Roe opined that it was outside the purpose of this policy unless a public use is associated with a larger goal and acquired as part of that. Mayor Roe further opined that park dedication was another way to acquire those properties (public uses as suggested in the "other" category).

Councilmember Etten suggested a bonus item on the bottom of the check-off list it could show criteria if a project met a public use as well as any other goals it achieved. However, Councilmember Etten stated he was not agreeable to purchasing parcels simply for that means alone.

Councilmember McGehee suggested moving "site control" above "blight" on the list.

From his perspective, Mayor Roe suggested "blight" could move far down on the list.

Councilmember McGehee suggested the goals need to be revisited by each sitting City Council.

Mayor Roe noted that the goal was to achieve one or more of these purposes, but suggested that while one priority may be less important than another priority, it could serve to inform future City Councils. Mayor Roe further suggested trying to achieve the City's goals, but not specifying what those City goals are in this policy.

Identification of costs and risks (Best Practices)

Mr. Aarsvold highlighted “appraised value,” “acquisition sources,” and “marketability.”

Councilmember Willmus opined that he didn’t know if any one of these criteria should be set aside, and that he found them all to be quite important. For instance, Councilmember Willmus stated that he’d advocate for appraisals on the front end to provide a better indication of other related costs of a project. Councilmember Willmus stated he felt strongly about appraisals before acquisition, as well as determining what projected holding costs might be.

Councilmember Etten agreed with Councilmember Willmus for appraisals prior to acquisition, noting they had proven helpful in past decision-making. However, Councilmember Etten stated he would have a low willingness to purchase a parcel exceeding its appraised value. Specific to holding costs, and long-term maintenance, Councilmember Etten stated it depended on whether it was a vacant parcel or if existing buildings were on the site and what long-term maintenance costs would involve unless the city was confident of an immediate sale without added maintenance costs. Regarding demand for future use, Councilmember Etten opined it was important to look at the market prior to any acquisition.

Councilmember Laliberte stated her agreement with Councilmembers Willmus and Etten: that appraised value should be found upfront, as well as other potential costs, providing a representation of the entire city investment. Specific to demand for future use, Councilmember Laliberte stated the importance of how the city foresaw the future use versus what the public or developer saw for that particular acquisition.

Councilmember McGehee suggested the holding costs take into consideration the costs of holding the property off the tax rolls for the duration. While not being a big believer in market studies, Councilmember McGehee suggested instead using the considerable development acumen around the community, depending on the size of the project, but if small to rely on the city’s and public’s judgment versus the cost of an appraisal and/or market study.

Mayor Roe stated his agreement Councilmember McGehee’s comments. However, on the market study side, Mayor Roe noted the city may have already commissioned a study (e.g. housing market study) on the broader demand, but not a project-specific study that could also help inform a project, and serve as a reliable source of information. On the other hand, Mayor Roe stated he’d seen other communities holding land for a long time because their goal was for a specific use, even though the market was not agreeing with that initial goal. Mayor Roe stated he wasn’t willing to risk such a venture just for the desire of the community at a given time, while not being a realistic goal for the community. Mayor Roe stated he wasn’t sure he was willing to acquire parcels without a good understand-

ing of turning it around quickly. However, Mayor Roe noted that made market studies even more informative and important in those types of situations.

Identification of potential benefits

In this category, Mr. Aarsvold highlighted “resale potential of land for development” and “change in market value and tax collection” criteria.

Councilmember McGehee stated she wasn’t a strong proponent of changing a project, design or goal simply to achieve grant eligibility. Councilmember McGehee stated grants by their very nature are not guaranteed, and their requirements may not fit the goal, thus structuring a project for a special grant may not be worth it if the idea and market are already in place.

Mayor Roe clarified unless the grant already aligns with a goal the city is seeking.

Councilmember McGehee agreed if it met other desired benefits or satisfied some need or goal in the community.

Councilmember Laliberte agreed with Councilmember McGehee in that the project itself should be the driver of what’s marketable versus trying to make the project fit the grant.

Referencing the earlier County Assessor presentation tonight, Mayor Roe suggested criteria when looking at impacts (e.g. TIF) valuation changes outside the borders of the project itself and how that might impact the ability to collect taxes to pay for services during the TIF District timeframe. Mayor Roe stated the reason this came to mind even before tonight was based on the Chapter 429 assessment process and appraisal of the increased value was to justify the assessment. Mayor Roe suggested a similar concept in analyzing impacts toward the goal of redevelopment and value on a site as well as for adjacent sites, especially trade-offs in considering the use of TIF and whether or not that tool can be used or would prove beneficial for the bigger picture from a neighborhood and/or regional impact.

Gap analysis and estimate of permanent investment

Councilmember Etten noted that the former HRA and new REDA had acquisition funds available, and suggested they be considered in future levies, but not in 2017 due to other levy increases in play. However, Councilmember Etten suggested money be available to allow the city the flexibility to take action if and when appropriate, as well as other funding sources or in addition to them, if the city intended to have a role in redevelopment sites.

Councilmember McGehee agreed with Councilmember Etten, but suggested other ways were needed to build that fund other than the levy, unless a highly specific need was identified and willingness to leave some funds available. Councilmem-

ber McGehee clarified that, from her perspective, this meant more than simply getting its initial investment back from an acquisition.

Specific to the last part of Councilmember McGehee's comment, Councilmember Etten suggested including as part of the check-off boxes when acquiring property whether or not the city was willing to take a loss to meet a specific goal depending on the community benefit or if making a profit was a goal.

Councilmember McGehee opined the city had already agreed on that in their commitment to keeping EDA funds solvent. However, Councilmember McGehee opined there were other ways to fund the EDA beyond levy support.

Mayor Roe noted one possibility may be revenue supported bonds depending on a particular project.

As a point of clarification, Mr. Aarsvold sought a response to a philosophical question he had heard for projects with a high degree of need, and spending down funds. However, Mr. Aarsvold asked if that included a strategy for the city to replenish those funds through increasing the EDA levy or by another means if/as identified.

The council concurred in that understanding.

Mayor Roe suggested if the gap couldn't be filled, a legitimate outcome of the project review would include whether or not to proceed with the project at all.

Community engagement and planning

Mr. Aarsvold highlighted engaging the community as a City Council priority similar to that expressed in the Business Subsidy Policy discussion. However, Mr. Aarsvold asked their preferred timing for that engagement, whether prior to acquisition, once the development is proposed, or not required at all. Mr. Aarsvold noted this would address City Council expectations for the framework and provide direction to city staff.

Mayor Roe opined that, if acquisition was for a single-family property, he wouldn't anticipate as much community engagement. But beyond that, Mayor Roe stated that if acquiring parcels for a project, he'd want public input early on and often. Mayor Roe referenced the Dale Street Fire Station project as an example of early involvement made the project more successful for the neighborhood.

Councilmember Willmus agreed with Mayor Roe on "early on and often."

Councilmember Laliberte agreed with the criteria in general, but asked that the city be mindful that when previous planning efforts had happened prior to acquisi-

tion (e.g. Parks Master Plan), new community engagement should not supersede that prior work and priorities, but could serve to enhance it.

Mayor Roe agreed that recognition of previous engagement was important.

Councilmember McGehee also agreed with comments thus far, while noting that things and neighborhoods changed; and while it was nice to have that old planning, it may not represent those now present having a role to play. Councilmember McGehee agreed with Mayor Roe that community engagement was relevant to the size or type of project, whether single-family or a larger project. Councilmember McGehee opined this included other criteria such as tax implications city wide, not just for the immediate neighbors, and if a larger project would require more community engagement to the greatest extent possible, and beyond the 500' notice area for land use items, but to allow a broader slice of the public to be aware of it and provide feedback.

Mayor Roe suggested the City Council provide direction and use its discretion in determining the engagement process upfront, not in the middle of a project.

Councilmember Etten stated he would double down on that with it being a citywide issue, not only local, and to allow time to step back and gather that feedback on the bigger picture. Councilmember Etten questioned whether the Dale Street project and HRA acquiring land to assemble served the community well in engaging them in that part of the process. In that case, however, Councilmember Etten opined that once the development was proposed, the community was engaged and perhaps that was more appropriate rather than prior to acquisition. Councilmember Etten suggested that may be part of the City Council's decision-making and discretion as a development is put together with the goal to include the community upfront, while also being mindful of the guidance of the comprehensive plan, redevelopment goals and other city goal documents as adopted versus making those decisions at the community level.

In the case of the Dale Street project, Mayor Roe noted the ownership of a significant portion of that land by the city and not requiring all parcels to be acquired.

Specific to apartment construction and deciding on a location and amenities to entice a younger segment in the community, with a defined area close to transit, Councilmember McGehee suggested that could be a specific goal as well.

Mayor Roe suggested that the bigger the plan, the earlier community engagement.

Timeline

Mr. Aarsvold highlighted “when future use would be implemented;” and “what was a realistic timeline.”

Consensus was that this would be determined to the best of staff's ability; and reiterating that the larger the investment the shorter the timeframe.

General property information assembled for potential acquisition? (Best Practices)

Mayor Roe opined that the entire list made sense, and suggested adding under "other," the "adjacency to current or future transit and pedestrian amenities,".

Councilmember Laliberte stated it was important from her perspective to realize what was currently on the property and any demolition or other costs related to or subsequent to the acquisition (also noted under Item #3).

Next Steps

Mr. Aarsvold thanked the City Council for this informative feedback, advising that it would be incorporated into the next draft iteration and to reflect any remaining questions for further review and consideration at a future meeting. Mr. Aarsvold noted this next discussion was scheduled for the November 28, 2016 City Council meeting to address any remaining questions and to finalize the document prior to adoption.

As part of that next presentation, Councilmember McGehee asked staff to put together a fake first pass or example of a fictitious or past project that the criteria could be applied to as part of the review process and to determine if anything was missing in the initial analysis of a property's acquisition.

Community Development Director Collins duly noted that request for additional information.

Recess

Mayor Roe recessed the meeting at approximately 8:16 p.m., and reconvened at approximately 8:23 p.m.

12. Public Hearings and Action Consideration

a. Request for Approval of a Minor Subdivision of Commercial Property (PF16-030)

Senior Planner Bryan Lloyd briefly summarized the RCA of today's date and a sketch plan of existing and proposed easement perimeters identified in accordance with current subdivision code language. Mr. Lloyd advised that staff recommended approval subject to those conditions as listed in lines 68 – 79 of the RCA.

Discussion included the sufficiency of the proposed easement area; clarification that there were no drainage concerns in this area; setback provisions; and reciprocal shared parking arrangements in the future upon redevelopment of both sites.

Further discussion included current and projected parking stalls as they related to city code requirements to avoid parking elsewhere and creating a nuisance or inconvenience to neighboring properties; and viability of periodic evaluation of the city's minimum parking standards and current ratios; and parking specific to this site and general site access to address traffic flow on the site.

Specific to shared parking, City Manager Trudgeon noted there had been a parking study conducted; and also addressed the difference in city code's minimum standards and a particular use on the site. In this case, Mr. Trudgeon noted that if it was determined there was insufficient parking, it would limit development of the northern property unless parking was facilitated through shared parking if and when it reached a maximum and depending on uses for the site.

Applicant Representative Curtis Martinson, Business Solutions Consulting, 724 Associates, LLC

Mr. Martinson noted his involvement in purchasing this tract over the past summer for the LLC. Having worked with many cities over the years, Mr. Martinson publically thanked city staff throughout the process for their efforts, mentioning Mr. Lloyd, Mr. Brokke and City Manager Trudgeon for being on top of the game and staying in touch. Mr. Martinson respectfully sought City Council approval of this request at tonight's meeting.

In light of the discussion earlier tonight with Ramsey County Assessor Baker and the Ehlers, Inc. discussion, Mr. Martinson asked that the City Council consider their particular situation and the current park dedication and trail fee set at fair market value. Mr. Martinson stated they were more than willing to adhere to the City Council's discretion, but reviewed their concerns with this property's valuation and consensus with an outside appraiser for their financier. Mr. Martinson reviewed the property valuation at this point and their intent to appeal to Ramsey County based on survey information even though it was a lengthy process beyond and not available as part of tonight's action. Therefore, Mr. Martinson asked if the City Council would consider delaying their assessment of the park dedication fee until resolution of the property value, since the current square footage price was not deemed accurate by several parties.

At the request of Councilmember McGehee, Mr. Martinson advised that once this subdivision was approved, the purchase would continue and appeal process initiated. However, Mr. Martinson noted it was a months-long process to resolve. Mr. Martinson opined it was more important to them to get the subdivision approved, and simply asked the City Council to consider that the \$15/square foot value may be overinflated, but reiterated they would abide by their decision.

Mayor Roe noted that city code required that park dedication fees be based on the assessor's value, not on any appraisal.

City Attorney Gaughan concurred with Mayor Roe's interpretation of current city code.

While appreciating the approach outlined by Mr. Martinson, Councilmember Willmus agreed with the reliance on current policy in place. Councilmember Willmus also noted that the Parks & Recreation Commission periodically reviewed the park dedication issue, as they had done earlier this month in reviewing residential and commercial rates; advising that they were actually going to recommend an increase in the current rates for future City Council consideration.

Mayor Roe opened and closed the public hearing at approximately 8:36 p.m.; with no one appearing to speak for or against.

Willmus moved, Etten seconded, approval of a MINOR SUBDIVISION of the property at 1935 County Road B-2 into two parcels; based on the comments and findings of the RCA dated November 67, 2106; and input received during the public hearing; and subject to the conditions as detailed in the RCA, lines 68 – 79.

Councilmember McGehee agreed the City Council could not deviate from its current policy. However, for future reference, Councilmember McGehee suggested it may be worthwhile for city staff to look into when we actually looked into assessing the park dedication fee: whether on the sale price or appraisal price. While recognizing that many property owners may not want to take that risk, Councilmember McGehee suggested it may be an option that could prove beneficial for the city at times.

Mayor Roe noted that this had come up early in his tenure on the City Council, and noted code language had been adjusted at that point, with the policy established for when value is determined and how it was based.

Councilmember Etten opined there was a value to leave this as an assessed benefit, with no costs going into the development versus doing so on the back side. Councilmember Etten noted that upfront everyone had a firm understanding of the value, and without benefit of past rationale, stated his support for leaving the practice and policy as is based on market value of the total subject property land area and prorated on the lot split size. Councilmember Etten opined it would be more challenging if based on the sale of the property and potentially change several aspects of city code.

Mayor Roe further clarified that Ramsey County's current year estimates for fair market value were based on analysis of past years' sales and values. Given that this data is fairly old, Mayor Roe opined that may benefit property owners with respect to park dedication amounts. Generally speaking, Mayor Roe reiterated his support of the current policy, while sympathizing with the applicant's situation.

Roll Call

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

Nays: None.

b. Public Hearing to Consider Approving the 2017 Liquor License Renewals

Finance Director Chris Miller briefly reviewed this portion of liquor license renewals for 2017 processed by staff to-date and as detailed in the RCA and Attachment A.

Mayor Roe opened and closed the public hearing at approximately 8:43 p.m., with no one appearing to speak for or against.

McGehee moved, Laliberte seconded, approval of liquor license renewals for 2017 as presented and as detailed in the RCA (Attachment A).

Roll Call

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

Nays: None.

13. Budget Items

14. Business Items (Action Items)

a. Select a Consulting Firm to Lead the 2040 Comprehensive Plan Update, authorize staff to negotiate a consulting services contract with the selected firm, and establish a Not-To-Exceed Budget for Overall Services (PROJ-0037)

Senior Planner Bryan Lloyd briefly summarized the RCA and community survey responses to-date, along with staff's preference indicating the Cuningham Group. Mr. Lloyd advised that staff's preference was based on their firm's diversity of final product offerings, and different formats and plan information in reaching people at different points and enhanced engagement for future comprehensive plan updates and in reaching the goals of this update.

At the request of Councilmember Willmus, Mr. Lloyd reviewed variables in the two proposals and their components and contingencies.

Discussion ensued regarding the two proposals, the comparable base rates and additional cost breakouts; and staff's identification of the not-to-exceed amount of \$175,000 as the contribution amount most comfortable and available in Community Development funds.

Community Development Director Collins clarified that the department had identified \$170,000 as the base amount of funds available before ala carte choices and multi-formatting options; with a remaining \$5,000 for those additional components. Ms. Collins further clarified that both firms had indicated they would work

with the city on costs and provide revised numbers on those components found most important to the city. By selecting a firm tonight, Ms. Collins advised that this would authorize staff to initiate those negotiations for a more refined scope of services, including how many workshops or sessions and their associated cost within that not-to-exceed number. Ms. Collins briefly reviewed some of the costs she thought were inflated with one proposal and those less than she anticipated with one proposal. Ms. Collins noted that a negotiated professional services contract for City Council consideration would be a direct result of those staff negotiations with whichever firm was chosen.

From her perspective, Councilmember McGehee stated her preference for the Cuningham Group based on community feedback and staff preference; as well as their broader approach for their presentation and work with other metropolitan communities. Councilmember McGehee stated that she found their presentation better and more forward thinking and what she was looking for.

McGehee moved, approval of the Cuningham Group as the consulting firm to lead the 2040 Comprehensive Plan Update; and authorizing staff to negotiate a consulting services contract with the selected firm established at a not-to-exceed budget of \$175,000 for overall services.

Mayor Roe declared the motion failed for lack of a second.

Willmus moved, Etten seconded, approving WSB & Associates as the consulting firm to lead the 2040 Comprehensive Plan Update; and authorizing staff to negotiate a consulting services contract with the selected firm at the best price possible.

Speaking in support of his motion, Councilmember Willmus stated that he liked the WSB approach, opining that it more closely aligned with the legal and technical document to lead the community. Councilmember Willmus also noted their strong presentation for economic development; as well as the strong membership available from within their group to achieve the civic engagement the city was looking for, including their experience in this community as a benchmark with the Parks Master Plan process through the involvement of LHB and part of the WSB team. While feeling confident with either firm, Councilmember Willmus stated he found value in the WSB as better serving the community.

Councilmember Etten agreed that either firm would do a good job, with the Cuningham group bringing good experience and data to the table. However, Councilmember Etten stated what stood out for him with WSB was their research of Roseville issues before making their proposal and referring to engagement processes already in place. Councilmember Etten stated this said WSB was paying attention to Roseville events and happenings, including their engagement process

using stakeholder interviews as they noted and delving into the community's full picture in updating the comprehensive plan.

Councilmember Laliberte stated that after the presentation and her review of materials, and talking to the Planning Commission and community members since then, she felt stronger about the WSB firm as well as from her personal perspective. Councilmember Laliberte stated that she found their engagement to be more authentic based on what was already being done in the community and what the community was used to and meeting them at a grass roots level to get their input where they were. Councilmember Laliberte also stated it struck her that WSB seemed very aware of the city's current priorities, including a stronger housing component that the City Council had been discussing. Councilmember Laliberte agreed with her colleagues that both presentations were great, but her thought was that the city would gain more value for its money with WSB. Councilmember Laliberte expressed concern with the Cuningham Group in the number of consultants involved versus a one-stop shop with WSB making it easier for the city to communicate with them throughout the process versus dealing with five different entities represented with the Cuningham Group.

Councilmember McGehee stated that she couldn't agree with any of the points made by her colleagues, but noted neither she nor the City Council had to work directly with the firm, but city staff would need to do so, and therefore she deferred to their preference. Councilmember McGehee further stated that she was looking for something more interesting than things already done such as presented by WSB with an "been there, done that" mentality for the process. Councilmember McGehee opined that she hadn't found the last comprehensive plan update that great, and with not doing visioning this time, stated she was looking for something more interesting and with more potential. Councilmember McGehee opined that the city had already spent a lot of time on housing and parks, but not much on economic development, and therefore stated she thought the Cuningham Group had good and creative ideas. If she compared and evaluated the presentations and the representatives at the table, Councilmember McGehee opined that she found very little comparison in the two firms.

Mayor Roe recognized that a lot had already been said in favor of WSB, and further recognized that people respond differently to things, but agreed that either firm would do a good job for the city. Mayor Roe stated that he had come down on the side of WSB based on their interview and things that stood out for him (e.g. setting goals and tracking progress with a dashboard approach, and adapting the process going forward). Mayor Roe opined that this was good to talk about upfront. Mayor Roe opined that he liked with the notion that WSB would not avoid the hard questions and would revisit and update the process if goals were not being met through the process. Mayor Roe stated the other thing that intrigued him with the WSB presentation was the funding analysis for those goals, especially for the economic development component. Mayor Roe agreed perhaps

Regular City Council Meeting

Monday, November 7, 2016

Page 26

their presentation hadn't been as impressive, but stated that he had found certain elements to stand out for him.

Councilmember Laliberte agreed with the funding analysis component as a second stage and outcome of the comprehensive plan to take the goals into reality, noting that she hadn't heard that as part of the Cuningham Group presentation.

Roll Call

Ayes: Laliberte, Willmus, Etten and Roe.

Nays: None.

Abstentions: McGehee.

Motion carried.

15. Business Items – Presentations/Discussions

16. City Manager Future Agenda Review

17. Councilmember-Initiated Items for Future Meetings

Mayor Roe noted the addition to the November 28, 2016 agenda presentation of the draft acquisition policy.

At the request of Councilmember Laliberte, Mayor Roe and City Manager Trudgeon clarified that further discussion on the level of deer management for Roseville was still pending and would be coming back to the City Council with more specifics.

Councilmember Laliberte asked staff to provide a project update on the Garden Street Station development, recognizing its completion in phases, but also expressing concern for those neighbors waiting for more progress for some time now.

Mayor Roe and Councilmembers McGehee, Willmus and Etten agreed; and City Manager Trudgeon duly noted their request for a status update.

18. Adjourn Meeting

Etten moved, Willmus seconded, adjournment of the meeting at approximately 9:06 p.m.

Roll Call

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

Nays: None.

Daniel J. Roe, Mayor

ATTEST:

Patrick T. Trudgeon, City Manager