



**Regular City Council Meeting Minutes
City Hall Council Chambers, 2660 Civic Center Drive
Monday, November 28, 2016**

1. Roll Call

Mayor Roe called the meeting to order at approximately 6:18 p.m. Voting and Seating Order: McGehee, Willmus, Laliberte, Etten and Roe. City Manager Patrick Trudgeon and City Attorney Erich Hartmann were also present.

2. Pledge of Allegiance

3. Approve Agenda

City Manager Trudgeon requested removal of Item 8.b and Councilmember Etten requested removal of Items 8.d and 8.k from the Consent Agenda, all for separate consideration.

Etten moved, McGehee 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. Mary Englund, 224 N McCarrons Boulevard

Ms. Englund spoke on the City Council's recent action to not exercise its first right of refusal purchase opportunity for the former National Guard Armory property. Ms. Englund, as a resident directly across the street from this parcel, noted her special interest in the future of this site. While being aware the building was vacant, Ms. Englund noted her surprise when initially seeing the building boarded up. Ms. Englund recognized that meetings had taken place hosted by the city to discuss potential rezoning and the preference of the neighborhood. However, even though there appeared to have been a good turnout, Ms. Englund noted her awareness of those not present but interested in the future of the parcel. Therefore, Ms. Englund reported to the City Council that she had taken it upon herself to perform a door-to-door canvass of the neighborhood with a survey after that community meeting to ensure their voices had been heard. Ms. Englund deferred to Tom Wiseski, an architect assisting the neighborhood on this nine acre parcel. Ms. Englund advised that she had taken the site plan showing the different possibilities for the parcel and, for the record, submitted it and a list of approximately 60 signatories in support of such a proposal, *attached hereto and made a part hereof.*

Mr. Wiseski displayed the informal site plan he had developed showing those different possibilities, including retaining the most historic former school building, and potential for a park/playground on the south side, an outside pool, parking areas, and potentially a community center. Mr. Wiseski noted the community center concept appeared to keep coming up; and further noted that the north side of the parcel was a wetland area that couldn't be developed.

Ms. Englund noted, as she went around the neighborhood seeking feedback, the prevailing thought seemed to be to consider the parcel as different zones versus one zone. Ms. Englund reported that only two of those residents were unwilling to sign the petition, and those signing were individuals in the immediately adjoining neighborhood to the subject parcel. Ms. Englund reported that in general, those residents didn't support any further encroachment for high-density residential uses; and were concerned that even if zoned low-density residential, there could be up to fifty new homes constructed on the parcel; while residents were not supportive of any more than six new homes.

Ms. Englund asked that the City Council return to the Department of the Military with a counter offer or negotiation of the price that would make it a possible acquisition for the community. Ms. Englund noted some communities were able to acquire a parcel for \$1.00; and asked that the city seek to negotiate the original price to preserve this parcel as more open space or even a wild area, whether or not the 1936 building was able to be salvaged. However, Ms. Englund stated that the prevailing thought was that residents did not want a ton of homes constructed on the site due to negative impacts on the immediate area, including but not limited to traffic congestion.

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

Mayor Roe announced upcoming events, including a Roseville Business Exchange; and the second of three community meetings scheduled in response to events over last summer, and entitled "Imagine Roseville – Community, Policing, and Race in Roseville." Mayor Roe noted the first meeting focused on "reaction" and to hear initial responses with approximately 200 attending. Mayor Roe reported that this second meeting was the next step to further expand on "ideas" on several topics identified from that first discussion and to synthesize ideas that the community could approach, including: state, county and local police accountability, traffic stops, profiling, living in a diverse community, and other areas of interest. Mayor Roe advised this was a free meeting and invited community attendance and participation; also noting a third community conversation was scheduled to consider "action."

Mayor Roe reported that earlier today, he, Councilmember McGehee, Community Development Director Collins and Jeanne Kelsey had performed their first ambassador visit as part of the city's Business Expansion and Retention Program. Mayor Roe noted the first visit was to J. R. Johnson, a wholesale floral distributor and spin-off industries involved with that operation. Mayor Roe noted it was a very impressive tour and discus-

Regular City Council Meeting

Monday, November 28, 2016

Page 3

sion; and publically thanked the company for their hospitality; and expressed his interest in future business tours.

Councilmember Laliberte announced the upcoming Friends of Roseville Parks holiday craft fair at City Hall, with proceeds going to Harriet Alexander Nature Center; and related bake sale by the Roseville Historical Society.

In conjunction with Mayor Roe's business tour comments, City Manager Trudgeon noted that the J. R. Johnson firm had located in their Roseville building in 1958; and had initially started their business in 1915 in the Village of St. Anthony, and recognized the company's great history in the Roseville area.

6. Recognitions, Donations and Communications

a. Human Rights Commission 2016 RV (HRC) Award Presentation

HRC Chair Wayne Groff briefly reviewed its creation and opportunity to recognize meritorious service in the pursuit of advocacy for human rights through nomination for this HRC annual award. Chair Groff introduced HRC Commissioners Nicole Dailey and Lauren Peterson for public presentation of this year's recipients.

Commissioner Dailey provided a brief biography of Ms. Angie McGaster-Woods, currently Assistant Principal at Roseville Area High School, nominated by RAHS Principal Jenny Loeck; and presented the award.

Ms. McGaster-Woods thanked the City Council and HRC for this honor.

Commissioner Peterson provided a brief biography of Ms. Sherry Sanders and her various roles in the community, nominated by Tammy McGehee, and presented the award.

Ms. Sanders also thanked the City Council and HRC for this honor.

Recess

Mayor Roe recessed the meeting at approximately 6:40 p.m. for a photo opportunity with the award recipients, and reconvened at approximately 6:43 p.m.

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 November 7, 2016 City Council Meeting Minutes

McGehee moved, Willmus seconded, approval of the November 7, 2016 City Council Meeting Minutes as amended.

Corrections:

- **Page 17, Lines 11 - 12 (McGehee)**
Correct to read: "... may not fit the goal [*making*] [*thus*] structuring a project [*for a special grant may not be worth it*] if the idea and ..."
- **Page 19, Line 11 (McGehee)**
Correct to read: "... it may not represent those now [*present*] having a role to play."

Roll Call

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

Nays: None.

b. Approve November 14, 2016 City Council Meeting Minutes

McGehee moved, Willmus seconded, approval of the November 14, 2016 City Council Meeting Minutes as amended.

Corrections:

- **Page 5, Line 31 (Roe)**
Correct to read: "...given [*the*] number of such uses..."
- **Page 22, Lines 39 – 40 (Roe)**
Staff verify and add Mr. Christianson's first name
- **Page 28, Lines 20-21 (McGehee/Roe)**
Mayor Roe called staff's attention for the need to change the November 14, 2016 meeting minutes in accordance with the directed statement related to references to bench handouts as noted.
- **Page 29, Line 12 (McGehee)**
Identify "her" as Councilmember McGehee for reference.

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) dated November 28, 2016 and related attachments.

a. Approve Payments

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

ACH Payments	\$989,490.80
83646 – 83869	1,016,608.04
TOTAL	\$2,006,098.84

Roll Call

Regular City Council Meeting

Monday, November 28, 2016

Page 5

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

Nays: None.

- c. **Approve General Purchases in Excess of \$5,000 and Sale of Surplus Items**
Willmus moved, Etten seconded, approval of general purchases and contracts for services as noted in the RCA, and Attachment A entitled, "2016 Summary of Scheduled CIP Items," updated October 31, 2016.

Roll Call

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

Nays: None.

Willmus moved, Etten seconded, approval of the trade-in/sale of surplus equipment as detailed in the RCA.

Roll Call

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

Nays: None.

- e. **Approve Resolution Awarding Bid for South Lake Owasso Drainage Improvement Project**
Willmus moved, Etten seconded, adoption of Resolution No. 11376 (Attachment A) entitled, "Resolution Awarding Bids for South Lake Owasso Drainage Improvement Project;" awarding the contract to the firm of Ramsey Excavating, Inc., in an amount not to exceed \$346,324.00.

Roll Call

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

Nays: None.

- f. **Approve Resolution Awarding Bid for 2017 Sanitary Sewer Main Lining**
Referencing Consent Items f and e, Councilmember McGehee observed that, when performing capital improvement projects, engineer's estimates seemed to be coming in low frequently, making it difficult to project costs for planning purposes.

Public Works Director Mark Culver agreed with Councilmember McGehee that it was true that some actual project costs were exceeding the initial engineer's estimates. However, Mr. Culver advised that frequently this was due to extenuating circumstances that made a given project more challenging for the contractor. In the case of the Cleveland Avenue lift station and South Lake Owasso Stormsewer projects, Mr. Culver reviewed specifics of those projects representing unknown risks for the contractor going into the project. Mr. Culver advised that staff would continue to refine estimates, and perhaps increase contingencies for projects to address those challenges.

While some estimates have not been accurate, Mayor Roe recognized the Public Works Department for their accuracies over the long term, opining those higher estimates more than balance out the lower estimates.

Willmus moved, Etten seconded, adoption of Resolution No. 11377 Attachment A) entitled, "Resolution Awarding Bids for 2017 Sanitary Sewer Main Lining;" awarding Bid Total B to the firm of Insituform Technologies USA, LLC, in an amount not to exceed \$759,641.00.

Roll Call

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

Nays: None.

g. Approve Resolution Awarding Contract for the Cleveland Avenue Sanitary Sewer Lift Station Project

Councilmember McGehee noted that in the overall final cost breakdown, Meyer Contracting had come out with the highest technical score even though their adjusted price was higher than Minger Construction, who was ultimately recommended for bid award.

Public Works Director Culver reviewed the Best Value Procurement Process used and how the technical scores were intentionally kept independent of the bid prices until subsequently combined at the end of the process. Mr. Culver noted that this was the benefit of this method to ensure the best project and contractor for the city by combining those two components.

Willmus moved, Etten seconded, adoption of Resolution No. 11378 (Attachment A) entitled, "Resolution Awarding Best Value Proposal for Project 16-14, Cleveland Avenue Sanitary Sewer Lift Station Project;" awarding a contract to the firm of Minger Construction, Inc. in an amount not to exceed \$515,000.00.

Roll Call

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

Nays: None.

h. Approve Railroad Agreement with Minnesota Commercial

Willmus moved, Etten seconded, approval of three (3) Crossing Surface Installation Agreements with Minnesota Commercial Railroad to replace three existing crossings at: Terminal Road near St. Croix Street (Attachment A – DOT No. 463568P; Terminal Road near Walnut Street (Attachment B – DOT No. 463560K); and Walnut Street (Attachment C – DOT No. 061338C).

Related to these types of projects, Councilmember Etten sought to raise the city's awareness when near railroad intersections, consideration be given to incorporating a bicycle amenity or safer connection in these industrial areas especially.

Councilmember Etten noted the Walnut Street area had been brought up by four to five bicyclists as an area needing a safer connection with the NW Diagonal route into Minneapolis between County Road C at that intersection.

Public Works Director Culver responded that Ramsey County continues to apply for federal funding to reconstruct County Road C in that area; and if awarded, would include a trail along I-35W where the existing trail ends and making the connection. Mr. Culver reported that it would not be easy, as there was a lack of right-of-way and it would require reconfiguring the roadway, perhaps with an on-road bike lane. Mr. Culver advised that all components of the area would be reviewed in more detail at that time.

Roll Call

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

Nays: None.

i. 2017 SCORE Grant Agreement

Willmus moved, Etten seconded, approval of a Grant Agreement between the City of Roseville and Ramsey County for a Governor's Select Committee on Recycling and the Environment (SCORE) in the amount of \$87,478.00; and authorizing the Mayor and City Manager to execute the agreement.

Roll Call

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

Nays: None.

j. Accept Donation from the Roseville Police Foundation

Willmus moved, Etten seconded, acceptance of a donation in the amount of \$2,000 from the Roseville Police Foundation for the Department's Overtime Fund to allow officers to interact and play with students during recess and activity breaks during school days at Central Park Elementary School, expanding positive connections with the community.

Councilmember Etten thanked the Police Department and Police Foundation for providing this exciting way for officers to interact with students; with Mayor Roe seconding those sentiments.

Roll Call

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

Nays: None.

9. Consider Items Removed from Consent

b. Approve Business and Other Licenses

Regular City Council Meeting

Monday, November 28, 2016

Page 8

City Manager Trudgeon noted staff's removal of this item to exclude the Gambling Premise Permit as addressed by city code. Mr. Trudgeon reported that all other permits and licenses as listed in the RCA were appropriate for approval tonight with this action.

Etten moved, Willmus seconded, approval of various licenses as detailed, dependent on completion of successful background checks for massage licenses; *and amended to exclude the Gambling Premise Permit.*

Roll Call

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

Nays: None.

d. Approve 2017 City Council Calendar

Councilmember Etten suggested several changes to facilitate school calendar and summer vacation schedules by eliminating the proposed August 21 Work Session, adding a December 11 Work Session, and balancing out meetings in December of 2017 and January of 2018 without such a large gap between meetings.

Councilmember McGehee spoke strongly against the changes in August and December from a personal perspective, noting this impacted her vacation timing in December, especially when December typically wasn't an active time in terms of city business due to holidays during that period and other events. Councilmember McGehee spoke in support of the schedule as presented by staff.

Mayor Roe and Councilmember Laliberte noted conflicts they had with June 12, suggesting changing from June 12 to June 5.

Councilmember Laliberte advised that, while she would potentially be unavailable during part of the month of March, she was not concerned with the schedule as presented by staff.

Councilmember Willmus opined that throughout the year, there may be meetings individual council members need to miss; but overall meeting agendas and schedules could be accommodated accordingly. If a particular item was anticipated to need a full council, Councilmember Willmus noted the schedule could be reviewed and adjusted at that time. However, in general, Councilmember Willmus stated he didn't like to see the annual schedule adjusted to any great degree. Councilmember Willmus conceded that he would be willing to consider Councilmember Etten's suggestion to move the August Work Session to December.

Etten moved, Willmus seconded, approval of the 2017 City Council Meeting Schedule as amended to move the proposed June 12 meeting to June 5; and moving the August 21 Work Session; to December 11, 2017; with Final 2018 Budget and Levy approval scheduled for action on December 4, 2017.

Discussion ensued regarding proposed levy adoption in December of 2017; and variables in whether or not a meeting is considered a regular business meeting or work session.

Councilmember McGehee opined that the City Council typically had more work during the summer than in December, and she saw no reason to drag out December meetings and if approved, she most likely wouldn't be in attendance. Since she felt the full City Council should be present and take action on setting the levy and budget, Councilmember McGehee suggested that remain on December 4, 2017. Councilmember McGehee noted historically the schedule had not been expanded in December, nor did she think it should be done in 2017; and expressed her personal frustration that the City Council appeared to be trying to accommodate Councilmember Etten's vacation schedule in August while impacting the on-time she had to travel in December.

With agreement by Councilmember Etten, Councilmember Laliberte spoke in support of the motion as stated, with the understanding that the 2018 final levy and budget adoption be done on December 4, 2017.

Mayor Roe noted this resulted in the city's budget hearing falling on the same day and conflicting with the Ramsey County budget hearing; and while cognizant of Councilmember McGehee's travel plans in December, stated he had no strong opinion on the proposed changes.

Roll Call

Ayes: Willmus, Laliberte and Etten.

Nays: McGehee and Roe.

Motion carried.

k. Enter into a Contract with WSB

At the request of Mayor Roe, City Manager Trudgeon briefly reviewed this item as detailed in the RCA dated November 28, 2016 and related attachments.

Councilmember Etten sought clarification from staff on Attachment A - Exhibit A for task detail, on who would act as the "steering committee," and whether that would include staff and the Planning Commission, with the Commission having a consistent role in the process.

Senior Planner Bryan Lloyd responded that the intent was that the main steering of the process and day-to-day work with the consultant would be handled by staff. As the process proceeded into engagement activities, Mr. Lloyd advised that staff and the consultant would be involved in synthesizing content for the Planning Commission's review to confirm public feedback and adjust goals and policies of the comprehensive plan accordingly, representing the first non-staff opportunity where that content and public input is brought into the public sphere.

Councilmember Etten noted he wasn't sure if the Planning Commission's monthly meetings would become onerous with their other land use cases.

Mr. Lloyd stated he anticipated scheduling additional Planning Commission meetings beyond their current monthly schedule, consistent with the last comprehensive plan and zoning code updates and work associated with them. Mr. Lloyd advised that staff anticipated plenty of work for the Commission beyond land use applications.

Councilmember Etten noted that one of the reasons he had liked the WSB proposal was their connection with and locations to seek out stakeholder groups. However, Councilmember Etten stated he wanted to ensure that minority groups, English as a second language residents, and apartment tenants were also included as stakeholders.

Specific to page 4 of Exhibit A, Councilmember Etten stated he didn't understand or necessarily agree with the 2nd paragraph under Task 3 "Task Detail" for land use mix and locations adjusted at each point in the process "...and constructed by developers..." rather than the community.

Mr. Lloyd advised that he understood that statement differently, as he viewed adjustments being a public process, but making sure plans were realistic and development of the community could occur in light of the comprehensive plan, but not developers driving what the comprehensive plan actually stated.

Mayor Roe recognized Mr. Lloyd's interpretation, noting the intent was that land use mixes and locations could be accomplished by developers rather than developers dictating the plan itself.

Councilmember McGehee concurred with Councilmember Etten, and suggested the intent and language should reflect that input from developers was welcome versus having them dictate where use mixes and locations should be or if they are not achievable at all.

Councilmember Etten noted the previous paragraph stated that intent.

Councilmember Willmus noted his preference for the steering committee to consist of the Planning Commission given its current makeup of individuals with strong technical expertise with land use and zoning. Councilmember Willmus clarified his expectation that the Commission would be very involved on the frontend and throughout the process and consulted on issues before they went too far down the road in one direction or the other.

Regarding stakeholder groups preliminarily identified, Councilmember Willmus suggested each and all of the city's advisory commissions be consulted as well without requiring a significant amount of time on their part, but providing their various perspectives for the process. Councilmember Willmus also noted that, while desiring the involvement of the School Districts serving Roseville, it be recognized that they also had a duty and obligation to serve communities beyond Roseville, and stated his interest in making sure this comprehensive plan process and update remained most reflective of Roseville and its citizens versus significantly focusing on the broader or regional approach.

On the last page of Exhibit B (Contingency – Future Items), Councilmember Eiten asked if those items would be enacted or require City Council vote on each or any.

Mr. Lloyd advised that the bulk would require City Council vote with the contingency based on other expenditures and approximately \$15,000 to \$20,000 set aside for possible additional public engagement activities as a first step after the contract and agreement, but refining the scope and action for the community engagement portion of the plan update. If that refining adds additional activities and costs, Mr. Lloyd noted the contingency funds could cover them. However, beyond that, Mr. Lloyd advised that the remainder of the funding would be available if needed for future consideration and discussions; but not necessary to identify specifically this evening.

Mayor Roe asked the body their feeling on the contingency items, whether approved by staff or by the City Council. Mayor Roe noted that, as currently written, staff would have approval rights, with the idea that the City Council approves the overall amount.

The city council decided City Council approval should be required and directed staff to revise the document accordingly for the last line of Exhibit B to read:

“Any use of the contingency budget will be scoped in more detail when additional services are requested and will require pre-approval of *[city staff] [the City Council]*”

While not having a conversation to define the steering committee beyond staff, Councilmember Laliberte stated her expectation that this would be taking place in the near future. However, Councilmember Laliberte noted the document made reference that the “steering committee” would be working in collaboration with the Planning Commission. Councilmember Laliberte suggested there be thought given to other groups being part of that committee and requiring additional conversation.

Mayor Roe clarified that the conversation did occur during the Request for Proposals (RFP) stage, indicating that the Planning Commission would play a key

role in the process. However, Mayor Roe stated he didn't know that precluded others from being involved, depending on the City Council's expectations of the steering committee.

Building on Councilmember Willmus' comments, Mayor Roe stated that he saw the Planning Commission involved early on in key decision-making versus simply having staff and/or the consultant run things by them after a preliminary decision had already been made. As the official planning entity for the City, Mayor Roe stated his expectations were that the Planning Commission be involved early in decision-making and not having things only run by them after the fact; but to receive their input and expertise versus a reactionary approach.

Councilmember Willmus concurred with Mayor Roe's expectations.

Councilmember McGehee stated that she was happy with the Planning Commission and staff doing the bulk of the update when asking for only a technical upgrade to the current comprehensive plan. Since the WSB proposal and outline seems more than sufficient in seeking community engagement with residents and various groups and commissions, Councilmember McGehee opined she didn't see any reason to make the process any more cumbersome.

Councilmember Laliberte stated that the Planning Commission had discussed the scope of the update and talked about the technical updates, as had the City Council. Then when proposals were received, Councilmember Laliberte noted they involved more than just the technical update. Therefore, Councilmember Laliberte agreed that it was important to keep the Planning Commission at the front end of the decision-making given their weigh in on that already. Councilmember Laliberte also agreed that all advisory commissions should be involved as part of stakeholder group.

Community Development Director Kari Collins interjected that, despite the language and scope, staff had been intentional in veering away from "steering committee" language as that appeared consistently as not the way to go. Therefore, Mr. Collins reported that staff had been leaning toward language indicating a "review body" that would include the Planning Commission and staff working together as that review body, with touches along the way for public input. Ms. Collins noted the stakeholder groups had been well-identified and everyone was in agreement that clarity was desired, and more focused on "review" versus "steering."

Without objection, Mayor Roe summarized comments and feedback to staff from the City Council emphasizing they wanted the Planning Commission to be involved in discussions and decision-making upfront and providing their direction as to which direction to go, and not simply reviewing things after those decisions had passed through staff and the consultants, but at the front end.

With additional review, the council directed to change Exhibit A, Task 3 (Land Use and Resilience), Task Detail, paragraph 2 for the last sentence to read as follows:

“The land use mix and land use locations can be adjusted at each point in the process to ensure that the plan [~~can, and will be constructed by developers, the cost of development is efficient and cost-effective, and that it~~] achieves the goals of the community.”

In Attachment A (Standard agreement for Professional Services), City Attorney Hartman referenced Section 18.D (Professional Liability Insurance – Lines 240-241), noting the blank aggregate limit, advising that the standard amount needed to cover the contract amount and conditional amounts at a minimum (e.g. \$165,600) and suggested using a standard \$500,000 aggregate limit. Also, under the next sentence, Mr. Hartman noted the sentence should instead read: “Said policy **SHALL** [~~not~~] name the City as an additional insured.”

Mayor Roe concurred, noting that was consistent with past contracts.

Willmus moved, Etten seconded, approving of a Standard Agreement for Professional Services between the City of Roseville and WSB & Associates (Attachments A and B), and authorizing the Mayor and City Manager to execute the agreement; *amended as follows:*

- *Attachment A (Standard Agreement for Professional Services), Section 18.D (Professional Liability Insurance – Lines 240-241), the standard amount needs to cover the contract amount and conditional amounts at a minimum (e.g. \$165,600) and should be revised to read: “Said policy shall provide an aggregate limit of \$500,000 (standard aggregate limit).” Also, under the next sentence, Mr. Hartman noted the sentence should instead read: “Said policy **SHALL** [~~not~~] name the City as an additional insured.”*
- *Exhibit A, Task 3 (Land Use and Resilience), Task Detail, paragraph 2 for the last sentence revised to read as follows:*

“The land use mix and land use locations can be adjusted at each point in the process to ensure that the plan [~~can, and will be constructed by developers, the cost of development is efficient and cost-effective, and that it~~] achieves the goals of the community.”
- *Exhibit B is revised to read:*

“Any use of the contingency budget will be scoped in more detail when additional services are requested and will require pre-approval of [~~city staff~~] [the City Council]”

Roll Call

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

Nays: None.

10. General Ordinances for Adoption

11. Presentations

a. Community Health Awareness Team (CHAT) Presentation

Sara Barsel and Bill Marsewski (retired attorney), Co-Founders of CHAT provided several handouts consisting of health literacy materials, and updated the City Council and listening audience on CHAT activities and resources.

Ms. Barsel formally and publically acknowledged those providing invaluable support as organizations and from city staff with this collaborative interaction. Ms. Barsel also announced upcoming programs and panel discussions coming in the spring of 2017.

Mr. Marsewski addressed involvement of the Minnesota Justice Foundation consisting of law students talking about issues they've dealt with and getting people involved with the legal system to help them resolve legal situations in which they may find themselves (e.g. medical legal issues) frequently done as a pro bono public service depending on financial resources available. Mr. Marsewski also announced a new program entitled "Wheels of Justice" that was basically a recreational vehicle with lawyers and private areas allowing them to work people, and seemed to be working especially well with advanced care planning efforts.

While City Manager Trudgeon had composed a cover letter to go with flyers provide to all senior housing complexes and churches in Roseville and promoting programs, Ms. Barsel sought additional assistance from the City Council, as they put together programs, in advertising those programs. Ms. Barsel noted limitations of current media opportunities; and lack of involvement from other area communities, with the exception of the cities of Lauderdale and Falcon Heights, that were partnered in this effort as part of the Ramsey County Library system and not only specific for Roseville residents. Ms. Barsel sought any additional ways the City Council was aware of to help get the information out to promote these expert presentations and the time and energy spent in addressing topics and resources. Ms. Barsel noted the challenges in senior living facilities not sharing the information with their residents; and sought ideas to improve this situation. Ms. Barsel also noted the difficulty in C-TV consistently filming these programs or seminars for future playback by residents unable to attend personally but interested and in need of the information. Ms. Barsel advised that the Library was also interested in getting this filming accomplished, beyond the Library systems' website and the city website, with cable television the next viable option, only if and when the sessions were initially recorded.

Ms. Barsel noted other things happening or being expanded and topics to be covered; as well as those programming efforts overlapping with the Roseville Alzheimer's/Dementia (RV A/D) group.

Councilmembers thanked CHAT for their great work to-date.

Councilmember Laliberte thanked everyone for their work, and announced current attempts to seek grant funds from the next legislative session through Honoring Choices MN, a partner of CHAT, with those funds intended for use by local entities for training, facilitation and support. Councilmember Laliberte noted that, since CHAT couldn't apply as a 501.C.3, they may seek interest from the city in applying if and when those funds become available; and asked that her colleagues give thought to how that could be facilitated.

City Manager Trudgeon duly noted that request.

Discussion ensued regarding making this vital information available for circulation by the Library at their branch locations, as well as publicizing the events.

Mr. Marsewski highlighted a new program through the Library where they have a community resource advocate available (e.g. social worker) come out to one of their branches for several hours each week for people to use as a resource, in a private room for consultation.

Ms. Barsel noted that community surveys continue to emphasize the social isolation issue, not necessarily senior-specific, and the need to address it through qualified working groups.

Mayor Roe reminded CHAT representatives of senior isolation and mental health issues being a new area of focus by the Northeast Youth and Family Services (NYFS) as they move forward with their strategic planning; and suggested them as a potential partner for CHAT.

12. Public Hearings and Action Consideration

a. Consider Modifying the Tax Increment Financing (TIF) Plan for Redevelopment TIF District #12 to Aid in the Revitalization of Rice Street and Larpenteur Avenue

Community Development Director Collins briefly reviewed this request to modify the TIF Plan for Redevelopment TIF District #12 for revitalization of the Rice Street and Larpenteur Avenue area, as detailed in the RCA, and related attachments. Ms. Collins advised that a representative of the city's Financial Consultant, Springsted, Ms. Mikaela Huot was available for questions.

Mayor Roe asked if this action created any difficulties in the allotment in the 2017 budget as outlined in the City Manager's Recommended Budget if the TIF District funds were not sent back to taxing authorities when decertified.

City Manager Trudgeon clarified that it would not as tonight's discussion was about TIF District #12, while the CIP funding involved decertification of TIF District #13, with \$500,000 allotted toward the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) and the remainder allotted to street infrastructure improvements.

Since initiatives for this area involve the Cities of Maplewood and St. Paul constituting the surrounding area and intersection, Mayor Roe clarified that these TIF funds would be Roseville-specific with the Development District only involving Roseville, and could not legally be spent outside city boundaries.

Ms. Collins concurred, advising that the city was currently working with those other jurisdictions on a joint powers agreement (JPA) to define a financial arrangement; and while this may represent all or a portion of Roseville's cost-share, it would only involve Roseville-proper redevelopment.

At the request of Mayor Roe, Ms. Collins confirmed that not all of the funds identified in TIF District #12 needed to be spend in this area, with the remaining funds available for other uses or returned to taxing authorities if not all used. Ms. Collins noted further amendments could be addressed at a later date, but the intent tonight was to dedicate funds for this area of Roseville and redevelopment efforts there to capture funds before expiration of the TIF District at year-end 2016.

At the request of Councilmember McGehee, Ms. Collins reviewed some potential uses for funds in the area, including but not limited to streetscaping, lighting, pathways and more aesthetics along the corridor up to Roseville boundaries and anticipating the adjacent municipalities would have similar interests and cost-participation funding available. Councilmember McGehee expressed some concern with the list of prohibitions for use of the funds.

Mikaela Huot, Springsted

Ms. Huot reviewed the purpose of this modification to provide the city with authority and flexibility to use the funds on eligible expenditures within the district. When the District was created, Ms. Huot noted it required 90% of revenues be spent on redevelopment-type expenditures but within that 90% there could be further discussions on specific costs that may include acquisition, public improvements, streets, sidewalks, utilities or other things that would enhance redevelopment within Roseville boundaries within Project District #1.

Mayor Roe opened and closed the public hearing at approximately 8:05 p.m.; with no one appearing for or against.

Etten moved, Laliberte seconded, adoption of Resolution No. 11379 (Attachment B) entitled, "Resolution Approving Modification to the Tax Increment Financing Plan for Tax Increment Financing District No. 12."

Councilmember Etten expressed appreciation to staff for seeking out ways to approach this area in order to make significant improvements; noting it served as one piece of the puzzle.

Councilmember Laliberte agreed, and suggested if prohibitions proved too limiting, the District could be dissolved at that time.

Councilmember Willmus stated his support for this request as an option on the table; but as the city proceeded, he noted the need to have a serious and more detailed discussion on how to utilize the dollars. Councilmember Willmus stated that he was very leery in not seeing a significant degree of initiative from partnering jurisdictions (e.g. City of Maplewood); and expressed his interest in seeing them more involved. If that involvement is not forthcoming, Councilmember Willmus noted the need to press forward and focus on the needs for the City of Roseville, with or without a collaborative effort.

Councilmember McGehee stated she was very supportive of work in this area, but noted her concern in finding a specific use for these TIF funds at this point. Also, since these funds were owed to residents and the county and school district, Councilmember McGehee noted her concern that the city not sit on the funds indefinitely and get them back to those taxing authorities if it was determined there was not viable use for them in SE Roseville's redevelopment.

At the request of Mayor Roe, Ms. Huot advised that as of December 31, 2016 the city could no longer collect the increment. However, Ms. Huot further advised that the city had the ability to spend funds in future years, even once it was officially decertified but depending on how long it remained open as a District. Ms. Huot advised that, per statutory requirements, the city files annual TIF reports even after it stops collecting increments and decertifies the District, but that didn't mean there was a time limit on city expenditures. If a significant balance remained in the TIF fund for a lengthy time period, Ms. Huot noted the State Auditor might question the city's intent at that point and require a more detailed report.

Councilmember Willmus suggested that the city move forward on planning efforts as the Roseville City Council and apply a self-imposed timeframe for accomplishing those efforts.

Mayor Roe noted that didn't necessarily need to be part of the TIF Plan itself.

Councilmember Willmus concurred, but suggested as a policy the city shouldn't carry the funds on the books forever, whether or not a plan was worked out with its partners, and not allowing it to stretch out indefinitely.

At the request of Mayor Roe, Finance Director Chris Miller clarified that the city had one more Redevelopment District that may allow for pooling funds accord-

ingly, but the remainder were now pretty much obsolete given the twenty-six year collection period.

Roll Call

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

Nays: None.

13. Budget Items

a. Hearing to Solicit Public Comment on the 2017 Budget & Tax Levy

Finance Director Chris Miller presented information for the benefit of the public for the City of Roseville proposed 2017 Budget, Tax Levy and Utility Rates as detailed in the RCA and attachments.

At the request of Councilmember Willmus, Finance Director Miller reported that the Cost of Living Adjustment (COLA) and Employee Wage Step Increase breakdown for non-union employees from 2016 to 2017 was proposed at 2.75% in an effort to provide internal equity among union and non-union staff.

Councilmember Willmus requested a better picture of carryover funds from 2016 into 2017; with Finance Director Miller advising a more comprehensive and accurate picture will be included in the December 5, 2016 meeting materials. While the recent third quarter financial report stopped short of providing an estimate for year-end carryover funds, Mr. Miller advised that he would provide the City Council with the latest assumptions to inform that discussion.

Councilmember McGehee stated her interested in understanding comparisons in Topic 4 of 5 in the slide presentation for comparable cities with populations greater than 10,000 in the graph versus those cities used for utility rate comparisons. Councilmember McGehee sought a similar comparison for tax rates used for Topics 4 and 5.

Finance Director Miller advised that he didn't have that information with him tonight, but could provide it.

Councilmember McGehee opined that these are not really particularly valid comparisons, since the City of Roseville had higher fees for utilities, but when adding in the tax component, it made a similar shift and caused some confusion making it appear that the city was low in one area and high in another. Councilmember McGehee admitted that while the city may not use assessments for capital improvements for its utilities and chooses to capture those in monies through fees, it still essentially had a monthly or quarterly assessment instead but only in a different format for residential properties.

At the request of Councilmember Laliberte, on Topic 4 of 5 for tax levy comparisons, Finance Director Miller clarified that they were based on sixty-two cities, all metropolitan cities with a greater than 10,000 population.

Mayor Roe opened and closed the public hearing at approximately 8:35 p.m.; with no one appearing for or against.

Mayor Roe alerted the public that this updated information would be available on the city's website, with action anticipated on December 5, 2016.

Discussion ensued regarding the next meeting of the City's Finance Commission that would occur after the December 5, 2016 City Council meeting; with a request made for their input if and as available or recommendations to the City Council to inform how they felt the city was doing relative to its fund balances and reserves going into 2017, or any other recommendations beyond the City Manager's recommended budget for future years.

14. Business Items (Action Items)

a. Review and Discuss Draft City of Roseville and Economic Development Authority (EDA) Acquisition Framework

Jason Aarsvold of Ehlers Inc. was available with the latest draft framework and to seek additional feedback or suggestions since the last iteration on November 7, 2016; with those revisions highlighted accordingly (Attachment A). An "Acquisition Review" form was provided as a bench handout, *and added to the packet materials*, providing a format for an example project presented as part of this discussion, and using four key questions on which the policy was based (page 1, lines 26 – 30).

Framework

Councilmember Laliberte referenced the grant language in blue (page 3, line 29) and the city's identification that it didn't want grants to drive pursuits, even though it was still listed as something likely to be included.

Mr. Aarsvold responded that revised language attempted to clarify that the goal was that a particular project was not intended to be shaped by the likelihood of grant funding, but if there was a realistic opportunity and gap financing needed, grant funding may be one of the tools or potential sources. However, Mr. Aarsvold noted this would intend that a site was identified for a potential project and that in itself would then define if or when grant resources may come into play.

While she understood that, Councilmember Laliberte suggested, with a section in the acquisition form available to fill out, it was important for future City Coun-

cil's to have an understanding of this discussion and intent, opining that she didn't see that clearly articulated beyond current presentations and discussion.

Mayor Roe referenced Section 4, Identification of Potential Benefits and Cost Recovery (page 3, lines 20-30), and Item 3 addressing "outside grant funding" suggesting that be at the bottom of the list and Item 4 estimating a change in market value and tax collections receive a higher priority in that section.

Councilmember Willmus concurred with Mayor Roe.

Mayor Roe further clarified that his recollection of the intent was that any change in market value and tax collections not only be specific to the parcel(s) being considered for acquisition, but also surrounding properties and the community as a whole. Mayor Roe asked that this be added to language as well.

Councilmember Laliberte suggested adding a "but" statement regarding outside grant funding when feasible, "but..."

Councilmember McGehee suggested language such as "Outside grant funding [for potential gap funding only] indicating that grant funding was not considered a driver.

Mayor Roe stated he wasn't sure he wanted to limit grant funds to gap financing only, since they may be gap plus other funding.

Councilmember McGehee pointed out that Items 6 and 8 on page 5 were duplicated; duly noted by Mr. Aarsvold.

Specific to #3 and outside grant funding, Councilmember Etten noted it didn't say there was any determinant factor in any way; but a series of ways to find money available and a list of costs and benefits. Councilmember Etten agreed to moving estimated changes in market value to the subject property and surrounding properties further up in the list. Councilmember Etten stated he wasn't sure changes in grant funding became cumbersome if they were available, but suggested no weightier language than that.

Ms. Collins and council members discussed other language options in various sections related to grant funds, but in conclusion and without objection, decided to leave "outside grant funding" in place in Section 4, and simply move Item 3 below Item 4 in that section.

Under Section 8, General Property Information, (Page 5, lines 7 – 25), Councilmember Etten referenced previous discussions and the importance placed on the proximity to transit and other amenities (Item #8, Lin 24), but now it had

dropped down to the end of the list. Councilmember Etten questioned what that said as far as the goal discussions in the past.

Mayor Roe noted that while it was listed last in the framework, as with typical administrative information appearing first on any form, it met the intended goals.

Councilmember McGehee, with concurrence by Mayor Roe, opined that in general the draft truly reflected what the city had talked about.

Case Study and “Acquisition Review” Document (Bench Handout)

At this point, Mr. Aarsvold led the City Council through a case study based on real information from a real project in another community, and using the draft framework document to proceed. While opining that this framework was a good start, Mr. Aarsvold pointed out some areas needing improvement and sought feedback going forward; and advising the form would naturally evolve with staff revisions once tested, with this example simply providing an idea of what to expect for a project.

Mayor Roe suggested changing the form to “assessed value change” rather than “property tax change” as it appeared misleading unless the city asked for a larger levy, and assuming the same tax rate it didn’t necessarily equate to more overall city taxes collected.

Mr. Aarsvold suggested a caveat at the bottom of the form to inform the process without completely removing that language if found too misleading.

Specific to the parcel itself, from his perspective Mayor Roe suggested valuation changes for surrounding properties and knowing the associated change around the property would serve similarly to the Chapter 429 process and impact/benefit assumptions and be more helpful than tax numbers. While those tax numbers may inform future TIF calculations, Mayor Roe questioned their inclusion in this decision-making.

Councilmember McGehee addressed her overall TIF concerns and her personal interpretation of using that type of tool, time period for increments, and negatives in withholding those funds from taxing jurisdictions for a period of up to 26 years; and impacts created across the city with increased service costs to taxpayers without sufficient taxes generated from new developments or projects by “locking up” that money.

Mayor Roe suggested “locking up” those funds for the purpose of filling a financing gap or other development costs was the purpose of TIF districts in general, and dependent on their decertification and how that timing works based on remaining funds if any and from a philosophical consideration.

Regular City Council Meeting

Monday, November 28, 2016

Page 22

Mr. Aarsvold advised that additional edits would be incorporated based on tonight's discussion and thanked the city for the feedback. Mr. Aarsvold reviewed next steps as follows:

- Finalize framework with feedback and direction from staff and cc
- Revise and improve implementation form
- Provide final version of both documents for consideration and use for future acquisition

Councilmember Willmus thanked Mr. Aarsvold for tonight's update; and referenced Attachment A, Section 3, asking if there was a threshold in terms of raw value that might be applied to a parcel. Councilmember Willmus stated his strong advocacy for appraisals and expressed his interest in continuing that to keep the city in a solid position and protective of its interests. Based on the November 7th discussion, Councilmember Willmus asked if Mr. Aarsvold had any thoughts related to county assessed values, broker opinions, comparable sales or other valuation tools.

While having heard the council's strong preference for appraisals, Mr. Aarsvold advised that the only reason he didn't include it as a hard and fast requirement was recognizing that all projects will be different. Based on those previous discussions, if the cost of an appraisal exceeds the cost of or represents a huge percentage of the entire development, Mr. Aarsvold questioned if there was a sure or hard threshold for an appraisal. Instead, Mr. Aarsvold suggested instead that it may be driven more by circumstances and/or negotiations; or that the price may just be the price due to the owner's offer of sale, also questioning if an appraisal to confirm that hard selling price is necessary. Mr. Aarsvold suggested a circumstantial test for staff to use, since they knew well the council's preference for appraisals.

Ms. Collins agreed, noting it was traditional and past practice to pursue an appraisal, and she saw no change in that practice.

Councilmember Willmus noted some day a different council would be seated; with Ms. Collins agreeing if the council wanted to require an appraisal for any potential acquisition; or identify to what degree that cost variable becomes an issue.

Mayor Roe suggested language on Item 2 could include, "other things may be used, subject to City Council approval," based on what the City Council wants. Then, Mayor Roe noted that any future City Council could state their preference, whether appraisal or not, but other things would be subject to their approval.

Councilmember McGehee agreed with that; but stated she didn't want to call that out, noting the city had spent considerable money on appraisals in the past on acquisitions that didn't move forward. Councilmember McGehee suggested the city

not be so tied into an appraisal early in the process until deciding how seriously the city was in acquisition it was.

Councilmember Etten stated he was comfortable with the current language, noting it was inherent for this city council to approve the whole process, therefore making no further changes in language necessary.

Mayor Roe agreed, opining any future city council was able to change or eliminate the policy.

Mayor Roe summarized the changes made tonight, including:

- Section 3, Items 3 and 4 switching in order of importance
- Regarding “estimated market value and tax collections” to express that intent somewhat better remove “and tax collections” entirely.

Mayor Roe noted that when increasing the tax base as the result of redevelopment it would be helpful to look at the project with and without the increment figured in to see the net cost to the city if using TIF financing.

In the benefits section, Mayor Roe, with input from Councilmember McGehee, suggested consideration of a net change to the city tax base with or without the increment and impact on the average taxpayer. Mayor Roe opined this was food for thought for staff and the consultant, clarifying that the intent to promote an idea for this or future councils that the city received more dollars by allowing redevelopment.

On the acquisition form, Councilmember Laliberte suggested for the “estimated timeline” instead adding “date available for market.”

On the form, Mayor Roe also noted that under “property information,” not all properties had an asking price and suggested adding a component, “is the property on or not on the market?”

When talking about tax capacity, Mr. Aarsvold noted one measure of growth was the tax base, which could be calculated. However, Mr. Aarsvold noted it may prove neutral with respect to whether it creates a tax break or not; and wouldn't be as clear to the general public. To be accurate, Mr. Aarsvold noted the reason for looking at tax capacity.

With the next revised draft from Mr. Aarsvold, Ms. Collins advised that both the City Council and REDA would need to approve the framework; and anticipated the January organizational meetings may be a good time to do so.

Mayor Roe thanked Mr. Aarsvold and city staff for their ongoing work on this policy.

15. Business Items – Presentations/Discussions

a. Park Capital Funding Policy Discussion

At the request of Mayor Roe, Parks & Recreation Director Lonnie Brokke led a discussion on a park capital funding policy as detailed in the RCA and related attachments as follows:

- Attachment A – Mayor Roe suggested park CIP Draft Policy
- Attachment B – Park & Recreation Commission’s recommended Park CIP draft policy
- Attachment C – Total strikeout of Mayor Roe’s draft policy
- Attachment D – Finance Commission recommended Park CIP draft policy
- Attachment E – Advisory Team Final Report Executive Summary provided as a bench handout, *and made part of the packet materials.*

Councilmember Positions

Councilmember Etten stated he didn’t support this policy change as it was premature to make changes to the park dedication fund in lieu of several major expenditures (e.g. golf course clubhouse and SE Roseville redevelopment and park amenities and the funds earmarked for a park in SW Roseville). Councilmember Etten emphasized the necessity of first honoring those commitments made as part of the Parks Renewal Program. With other park improvements planned for Cleveland Avenue, Marion Street, Autumn Grove Park and other major plans as part of recent land acquisitions, Councilmember Etten noted the need for dollars to pursue those park initiatives; reiterating that it was therefore premature to move any funds out of the Park Dedication Fund at this time.

Furthermore, Councilmember Etten noted that this had proven to be an uneven funding source over the last decade; and therefore, making it part of the annual CIP budget process didn’t seem responsible from his perspective. Councilmember Etten noted there were few properties left in Roseville and future thought was needed on how to provide an ongoing park dedication source.

If language of a proposed policy provided the city to reduce the tax levy, Councilmember Etten opined that the city would find itself in the same hole it was in five years ago before and necessitating the Park Renewal Program. Using bullet point 5 as an example in Attachment A, Councilmember Etten opined that was an inappropriate way to set a tax levy, causing him great concern for this or future council’s to stop needed CIP funding to make necessary investments. Councilmember Etten stated that he could see a one-time use, but could not support it as a reliable funding source to fund ongoing needs.

Councilmember Willmus agreed with the majority of Councilmember Etten's comments and concerns; however, he noted there were several sides to consider. Councilmember Willmus agreed with a need to get a better or more accurate guide in place for capital needs, whether through this policy or not. Councilmember Willmus noted the thing most concerning to him was the reliance on park dedication funds as a steady stream when it has historically been cyclical. Councilmember Willmus stated that another concern, as pointed out by Councilmember Etten, was knowledge of some major development and/or redevelopment projects the city was aware of coming forward in the near future, and if a policy was in place, what would those park dedication funds look like if the P & R or Finance Commission's draft policies were in place. Councilmember Willmus suggested some forecasting might help inform that consideration particularly with those sites or commitments as listed by Councilmember Etten. While curious to consider those ramifications, Councilmember Willmus stated he was not ready to determine a direction yet without considerably more information and how things would look with practical application.

Councilmember McGehee stated that she had a different view, and while being a strong advocate for capital funds, opined that it was important that it be part of the annual budget and responsibility of the city council. As the city council now sits, after having come off a large expenditure campaign with new buildings and playground equipment, Councilmember McGehee noted community surveys showing residents' continued support for ~~and use of~~ those amenities, there was the reality of staffing those new buildings and facilities. While funded by citizen levy dollars, Councilmember McGehee noted that ongoing and future funding was ~~some-what~~ shaky.

Therefore, Councilmember McGehee noted that she was unaware of anyone from the community having come forward asking for a new clubhouse, yet this was another major expenditure now being considered. Councilmember McGehee stated she was uncomfortable having residents serving on a committee and directing taxpayer expenditures. While having high regards for Mayor Roe and the Finance Commission's expertise in calculating figures, Councilmember McGehee stated her understanding was that the CIP was not properly funded in the past, including improper funding of the Park Improvement Program (PIP).

Councilmember McGehee opined that this was one way to get some control of capital needs and get things back into the capital budget, and stated that she didn't consider \$400,000 to be insufficient. Councilmember McGehee noted that one of the nice things about park land and those sites mentioned, if not developed Councilmember McGehee stated that the city still retained the land for future development. Councilmember McGehee opined the City of Roseville was built on a pay-as-you-go concept, and to build up a capital fund as proposed makes more sense from a proper economic balance standpoint.

Councilmember Laliberte thanked Mayor Roe and the two advisory commissions for spending a good amount of time on this policy, opining it was good for the city council to look at each of the ideas. As stated by Councilmember Willmus, Councilmember Laliberte stated she wasn't ready for a decision on one or the other version tonight; and also wondered how they'd play out with plans already proposed but not yet instituted. Counter to Councilmember Etten's concerns, Councilmember Laliberte asked at what point the city needed to have a discussion with pending things, which would always be in play, and how to balance that. However, at some point, Councilmember Laliberte noted the need to address a policy and this fund even without having all of those answers tonight.

In response to several comments said by his colleagues, **Mayor Roe** addressed several issues:

- Timing: Mayor Roe noted that this discussion came back to the city council sooner than he had initially anticipated, noting he thought the city would be farther along in consideration of the clubhouse. Therefore, Mayor Roe stated that he was willing to wait to make any policy decisions pending that additional information.
- Current or Pending Commitments: As noted by Councilmember Etten, Mayor Roe noted that some of those smaller things could still be funded out of the Park Dedication Fund balance since new site improvements are an acceptable use of the Fund beyond acquisition. Mayor Roe noted the big question at this time was clubhouse funding even though there were a number of potential sources, and how much of and whether or not to use each source. While there are no answers at this time, Mayor Roe noted if swapping funds initially set aside for SW Roseville parks, as an example, how would renewal funds be addressed and resolved. As noted by Councilmember Laliberte, Mayor Roe recognized that there will always be pending needs and projects to complete, and with funding probably coming out of the acquisition fund.
- Funding Source for CIP Needs: Mayor Roe agreed that there was a need to identify a dedicated funding source for CIP park needs; and he also agreed that this should not be considered as that steady source. Therefore, in his proposal, Mayor Roe noted he had proportions allocated to two different sub-funds, proposing not to spend down the improvement side first and then use tax levy supported funds for additional capital spending resulting in the fund being spent down every year. Instead, Mayor Roe suggested that to him it made more sense to be cognizant of that reality and his proposal versus the Finance Commission's approach to spend down the dedication fund first, one of his points of disagreement with their proposal.
- Development/Redevelopment Projects Anticipated: Noting it to be a variable source, but anticipating some fairly major projects that are known (e.g. Rosedale Center redevelopment), Mayor Roe suggested the ability to "bank" some of those funds and spend them down proportionally, but never zeroing out that fund in the lean years and keeping a balance for use in future years. Like other CIP timing, Mayor Roe opined that would work well as long as the

dedication portion was looked at first and recognizing that it wasn't an opportunity to under-levy but acknowledging this as another source and make sure to set the levy accordingly. Mayor Roe reiterated that it was never intended as a means to under-levy the CIP fund; and emphasized that the City Council would always have the capability to under-levy the CIP with or without this policy.

Since his initial draft of the policy, Mayor Roe advised that he was flexible on the \$400,000 initial deposit, and he was opposed to stipulating a \$1 million balance be retained at all time for park property acquisition. However, Mayor Roe agreed that he wasn't ready to make a decision tonight either; deferring to other pending and major decisions currently before the city.

Acknowledging the concerns raised and recognizing Councilmember McGehee's comments, Mayor Roe emphasized that the city had a serious and immediate issue with its park CIP, one of the things driving his attempt to get this resolved as soon as possible.

At the request of Councilmember Laliberte, Parks & Recreation Director Brokke advised that the anticipated status to receive a proposal for an outside consultant for clubhouse concept design work was scheduled for January 9, 2017.

Mayor Roe thanked the advisory commissions and staff for their work on this policy.

16. City Manager Future Agenda Review

Councilmember Laliberte asked for an update on the Garden Street Station, duly noted by City Manager Trudgeon.

17. Councilmember-Initiated Items for Future Meetings

Councilmember Willmus asked for a future agenda discussion, preferably coinciding with the annual organizational meeting in January of 2017, and staff suggestions that would direct future City Council meetings to be more efficient with their use of meeting time. In looking at the length of recent meetings in comparison to the number of agenda items, Councilmember Willmus noted the meetings often came up against the 10:00 hour or even beyond. Councilmember Willmus questioned the viability of discussing items at that late hour, not only with the public's ability to track City Council discussions that late; but also whether or not the body was at their best at that late hour in dealing with some of those complex and important issues. Councilmember Willmus asked for staff suggestions or ideas hopefully for discussion at the January 9, 2017 meeting.

Councilmember McGehee agreed that there were some things that came before the City Council that didn't need to.

18. Adjourn Meeting

Etten moved, Laliberte seconded, adjournment of the meeting at approximately 9:53 p.m.

Roll Call

Ayes: McGehee, Willmus, Laliberte, Etten and Roe.
Nays: None.

Daniel J. Roe, Mayor

ATTEST:

Patrick T. Trudgeon, City Manager