



Community Engagement Commission Agenda

Thursday, February 9, 2017

6:30 p.m.

City Council Chambers

- 6:30 p.m. **1. Roll Call**
- 2. Approve Agenda**
- 3. Public Comment on Items Not on Agenda**
- 4. Approval of January 12 meeting minutes**
- 5. Old Business**
 - a. Priority Projects Updates
 - 6:40 p.m. i. Assist in the formulation of the 2017 Comprehensive Plan update process
 - 6:50 p.m. ii. Update on Underrepresented Communities Initiative
 - 7:00 p.m. iii. Update on CEC documentation Initiative
- 6. New Business**
- 7:10 p.m. **7. Chair, Committee, and Staff Reports**
 - a. Chair's report
 - b. Staff report
 - i. Upcoming items on future council agendas
 - ii. Other items
- 7:20 p.m. **8. Commission Communications, Reports, and Announcements**
- 9. Commissioner-Initiated Items for Future Meetings**
- 10. Recap of Commission Actions This Meeting**
- 7:25 p.m. **11. Adjournment**

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

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



Minutes

Roseville Community Engagement Commission (CEC)

Thursday, January 12, 2017 - 6:30 p.m.

1. Roll Call

Chair Scot Becker called the meeting to order at approximately 6:30 p.m. and City Manager Trudgeon called the roll.

Commissioners Present: Chair Scot Becker; Vice Chair Chelsea Holub, and Commissioners Peter Sparby, Erik Tomlinson, Amber Sattler, and Michelle Manke

Staff Present: Staff Liaison/City Manager Patrick Trudgeon

2. Approve Agenda

Commissioner Tomlinson moved, Commissioner Sattler seconded, approval of the agenda as presented.

Ayes: 6

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

3. Public Comment on Items Not on Agenda

4. Approval of December 8, 2016 Meeting Minutes

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

Commissioner Sattler moved, Commissioner Holub seconded, approval of December 8, 2016 meeting minutes as amended.

Corrections:

- Page 10, Lines 443 – 450 (Sparby/Holub)

Commissioner Sparby questioned if he was the speaker regarding this department review of ongoing initiatives, and based on his recollection, suggested it may have been Commissioner Holub speaking. After some discussion and without resolution, City Manager Trudgeon stated that he would review the meeting tape and determine the speaker and change the paragraph accordingly.

Ayes: 6

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

45 **5. Old Business**

46

47 **a. 2017 Work Plan / Priority Projects Update**48 Commissioner Sattler stated her recollection that creating a toolbox was part
49 of the under-represented communities' priority.

50

51 Chair Becker advised that creation of a toolbox had been a recommendation
52 of the CEC to the City Council for community engagement options.

53

54 **Under-represented Communities**

55 (Commissioners Holub, Manke, Sattler)

56 Commissioner Sattler referenced the written report (Attachment 5A)
57 entitled "Under-represented Populations Subgroup...Goals..." Ms. Sattler
58 noted the revised definition of "under-represented populations" based on
59 feedback from the December meeting; with no additional comments on the
60 definition offered from the CEC at tonight's meeting.

61

62 Commissioner Sattler noted the next step would be to determine a toolbox
63 and address other goals for recommendation on ways to increase diversity
64 within city leadership.

65

66 Commissioner Manke noted that the intent was for a phased approach.

67

68 **CEC Documentation**

69 (Chair Becker and Commissioners Tomlinson and Sparby)

70 From a meeting of the subgroup several weeks ago, Commissioner Sparby
71 referenced Attachment 5A entitled, "Roseville Community Engagement
72 Commission Definition of Terms" for consideration by the CEC.
73 Commissioner Sparby noted that this was a result of reviewing city code,
74 previous definitions of civic and community engagements, and minor
75 updates for use by the CEC and city going forward, as well as recommended
76 policies and strategies previously developed by the CEC in 2014, -In lieu of
77 revising the 2014 document, Commissioner Sparby -suggested retaining the
78 document for a historical perspective, with updated 2017 policies and
79 strategies.

80

81 Commissioner Sparby referenced his two related documents he'd prepared:
82 "2017 CEC Recommended Policies & Strategies" consisting of five
83 recommendations, and then a more detailed list of initiatives,
84 purpose/rationale, and recommendation as part of those five
85 recommendations to the City Council. Commissioner Sparby sought CEC
86 comment.

87

88 Commissioner Holub thanked Commissioner Sparby for compiling these
89 five recommendations, opining it was a good way to set them up and
90 reference city code accordingly to help keep that in mind and the CEC's

91 specific charge. Regarding the formatting, Commissioner Holub made
92 several suggestions for the title and subtitles to avoid redundancy and
93 questioned what was intended by “goals.”
94

95 Commissioner Sparby clarified that “goals” was intended to indicate
96 “objectives.”
97

98 Chair Becker suggested perhaps “priorities” may be a better term; and with
99 no objection from his colleagues, asked Commissioner Sparby to update the
100 draft document accordingly.
101

102 Beyond the definition of “under-represented groups,” Commissioner Holub
103 suggested the subgroup rewrite that for more specificity.
104

105 Chair Becker noted that this document was intended to cross-reference with
106 past priority lists as well; along with updated direction from the City
107 Council to be included if and when provided. Therefore, Chair Becker
108 suggested not taking any further action on the draft document, pending
109 further refinement.
110

111 Referencing his attachment 5A entitled “2017 CEC Priority Projects”
112 developed from the flip chart as discussed and categorized by the CEC at
113 the December 2016 meeting, City Manager Trudgeon asked if the intent of
114 this report was to encompass all of those 2017 priorities in a different format
115 to provide a template going forward, or if it was specific only to the
116 documentation task list identified two pages earlier as a priority.
117

118 Commissioner Sparby stated that the first document was intended to lay out
119 those 2017 priorities, but the goal of the more detailed document was to
120 provide a dynamic, day-to-day document at a higher level and needing
121 updating less frequently.
122

123 If so, City Manager Trudgeon suggested reconciling what he’d heard with
124 this document moving forward.
125

126 Commissioner Sparby stated that when he took his first look, it included his
127 recollection of priorities; but agreed that it needed refinement and cross-
128 referencing and reconciliation before any formal action was taken.
129

130 Commissioner Tomlinson also asked if this more detailed document was
131 based on the list prepared by City Manager Trudgeon from that December
132 2016 CEC meeting, and was intended to provide further organizational
133 documentation, outlining recommended strategies and documents, going
134 into 2017 and beyond.
135

136 Commissioner Sparby clarified that both documents would need to be
137 matched up; and offered to work with City Manager Trudgeon off line to
138 make sure that ultimately occurred.

139
140 City Manager Trudgeon noted that this document could be referred to for
141 monthly updates, as laid out if that was the understanding by the entire CEC
142 once reconciled. However, since he saw some differences in the two
143 documents, Mr. Trudgeon suggested further discussion may required by the
144 CEC before that occurred.

145
146 Based on his perspective, Commissioner Sparby stated that he saw the list
147 provided by City Manager Trudgeon as a list; with his draft document
148 expanding on that list and identifying what the CEC was doing going
149 forward. Having not seen it when initially putting together his list,
150 Commissioner Sparby offered to take City Manager Trudgeon's list and use
151 those categories to expand upon, but use that to list out projects.

152
153 Commissioner Holub volunteered to assist Commissioner Sparby with Item
154 3 on the list; and cross-reference it accordingly (under-represented groups).

155
156 b. **Comprehensive Plan Community Engagement Plan**
157 (Commissioners Tomlinson and Sparby)

158
159 As a bench handout, *attached hereto and made a part hereof*, City Manager
160 Trudgeon provided an updated spreadsheet from the most recent meeting of
161 the Planning Commission with the consultant team and staff (dated
162 12/08/16) incorporating feedback to-date. Mr. Trudgeon advised that the
163 red print indicated feedback received to-date from a variety of
164 commissioners, and had yet to be vetted by the City Council. Mr. Trudgeon
165 noted that a draft community engagement plan was in process by the
166 consultant at this time and was scheduled for presentation to the City
167 Council at their January 23, 2017 meeting. Upon receipt, Mr. Trudgeon
168 advised that he would forward a copy to the CEC; and upon approval of the
169 plan by the City Council, the process would move forward.

170
171 Commissioner Holub noted that the feedback provided to City Manager
172 Trudgeon via email from her and Commissioners Sattler and Manke
173 specific to their priority project didn't appear to be included in this latest
174 iteration of the spreadsheet, and asked if there had been any comment on
175 that feedback.

176
177 City Manager Trudgeon advised that he was not sure how the specific
178 feedback was incorporated but said he will follow-up to ensure the
179 subcommittee's feedback had been received by the consultant and Planning
180 Commission.

181

182 **6. New Business**

183
184 **a. Welcome Packet Discussion**

185 As previously requested by the CEC, City Manager Trudgeon provided
186 several past welcome packets for review, and summarized a history of the
187 packet, initially developed in 2007/2008 as a housing promotion effort, and
188 later updated as a welcome packet as part of the “Living Smarter” marketing
189 campaign, initiated by the city’s former Housing & Redevelopment
190 Authority (HRA). Mr. Trudgeon reported that, with the mailing list
191 developed through the city’s utility department for new customers,
192 documents included were a letter from the mayor and HRA Chair and
193 resources on housing loan programs and resources that would assist
194 residents in maintaining Roseville’s current housing stock.

195
196 Mr. Trudgeon reported that approximately 200 welcome packets were
197 distributed annually; but once the supply of the latest version had been
198 exhausted, no new printing was done, pending a revamp of the packet or its
199 discontinuation. However, Mr. Trudgeon further reported that a new mini-
200 version had been developed by staff for new utility customers providing a
201 brief summary of those specific resources still available (Attachment 6A)
202 but clarified that the brochure was not intended to be the “Welcome Wagon”
203 approach.

204
205 Chair Becker noted, with agreement by City Manager Trudgeon, that the
206 brochure was distributed to new homeowners, usually not renters unless
207 they were responsible for their own utilities versus the landlord.

208
209 Commissioner Manke noted that, when this had first been presented to the
210 CEC, the idea was to move away from printing with an online version, while
211 still able to print a PDF copy if so desired. Commissioner Manke also noted
212 her ongoing interest in including local businesses into the welcome packet
213 for reference by residents. While recognizing that may be a time-
214 consuming effort at the front end, Commissioner Manke opined that once
215 notices went out that the city was looking at businesses to participate, it
216 shouldn’t require too much additional work, and suggested it would
217 encourage residents to start with their hometown businesses first before
218 going elsewhere.

219
220 City Manager Trudgeon cautioned that the city needed to maintain the
221 stance that they were not recommending one business over another, thus
222 their hesitancy to involve business listings in the brochure to avoid steering
223 business in a certain way. While having seen that practice in other
224 communities, Mr. Trudgeon also noted private businesses that may create
225 catalogs or resources, even though he wasn’t aware of any such practice
226 specific to Roseville. Mr. Trudgeon noted that this could be an option, but

227 expressed concern with the time-intensive aspect of keeping the information
228 updated and how and when to do those updates.

229
230 Commissioner Sattler stated that she liked the “help page” on the back of
231 the mini brochure now being used, since it provided more general and
232 helpful information and contact numbers to Roseville residents without
233 advertising particular businesses and opined the brochure should continue
234 to be used rather than eliminated.

235
236 Commissioner Holub asked if Ramsey County provided similar information
237 about their services.

238
239 City Manager Trudgeon reported that he was aware of some information on
240 seniors or health care services, but since many organizations relied on the
241 web for posting resources, he wasn’t personally aware of a hard copy
242 version of Ramsey County resource information.

243
244 Commissioner Holub suggested, if one is not already available, a one-stop
245 shop type of resource for children, veterans and other residents coordinated
246 by the city and county.

247
248 Commissioner Sattler reiterated her appreciation of the mini booklet,
249 opining it seemed efficient; and suggested it could be expanded to serve as
250 a resource for many government resources, whether city, county, state or
251 federal, and serve those new to the Roseville community and/or State of
252 MN.

253
254 To the extent the tool could be used, Chair Becker suggested the
255 information, recommendations and referrals from a city perspective be
256 outsourced to NextDoor.com, as long as it didn’t require city staff to update
257 or populate the site.

258
259 Commissioner Manke reiterated her interest in retaining the focus more
260 online, with printable PDF copies available from that source as needed; as
261 well as links that could provide more elaborate information (e.g. housing,
262 Roseville history, senior services, etc.)

263
264 City Manager Trudgeon noted this discussion was to focus on the welcome
265 packet; while the discussion was moving toward a resource guide. While
266 there may be some overlap in providing community or city services, Mr.
267 Trudgeon noted this indicated including broader information for the county
268 and state – some of that information that was private and some city-
269 generated.

270
271 Commissioner Manke agreed she was interested in providing resources
272 beyond utilities and trash haulers, in an effort to provide residents with a

273 better understanding of what Roseville was about and how new residents
274 could get involved in their community in various aspects, whether through
275 civic aspects with advisory commissions, information on the local election
276 process and ways to get involved, or volunteering in other ways. Again,
277 Commissioner Manke noted the online version could be more expansive
278 than print versions.

279
280 Commissioner Sattler stated her appreciation for receiving a welcome from
281 the city welcoming new residents to the community, what Roseville offered
282 them, and how they could become involved in their new community.
283 Commissioner Sattler noted her receipt of a number of brochures upon
284 moving to Roseville, but opined they may have been privately sent from
285 local businesses as advertisements for them.

286
287 Commissioner Manke agreed that information was probably prompted
288 through the change of address process.

289
290 Commissioners shared their personal experiences in receiving welcome
291 packets from the cities in its various iterations and their appreciation of that
292 city effort.

293
294 Commissioner Manke referenced a link she had sent to City Manager
295 Trudgeon previously with an online packet from another community that
296 she found well done.

297
298 Commissioner Sattler opined that the city's website was welcoming and had
299 useful information available, but also spoke of the value of a mailing to
300 residents directing them to that information available on the website.
301 Commissioner Sattler suggested including a City of Roseville pin or magnet
302 in that welcome mailing as well as a positive approach.

303
304 Commissioner Manke noted the advantage of the online piece was for cross-
305 linking a number of things, and getting information out in more than one
306 way to make it easier for residents to access.

307
308 Noting the many creative ideas provided tonight, Chair Becker noted it
309 could serve as good background information for the CEC's future reference
310 moving into 2017.

311
312 City Manager Trudgeon advised that he'd bring the information from
313 tonight's discussion back to the city's Community Development and
314 Communications staff to further vet those ideas.

315
316 Commissioner Holub opined that it would be awesome to provide residents
317 with access to cultural resources, noting surveys of people of color moving
318 to the Twin Cities indicating that they had not felt welcome or not having

319 access to those resources. While understanding that may not be within the
320 purview of the city, Commissioner Holub noted that the city could still
321 provide information about organizations, agencies and resources that are
322 available to those residents.

323

324

b. Discuss Renewing Gavel Club Membership

325

326

327

328

329

330

331

332

333

334

335

336 City Manager Trudgeon was asked to review if past meeting minutes of the
337 association were available for review by the current CEC; with Mr.
338 Trudgeon advising that the minutes appeared to be available for anyone,
339 whether or not members, on the association's website.

340

341

342

343

344

345

346

347

Discussion ensued on the availability of individual commissioners for this

348

349

Without objection, commissioners decided to let the membership lapse.

350

351

7. Chair, Committee and Staff Reports

352

353

a. Chair Report

354

355

b. Staff Report

356

357

ii. Open House

358

359

360

361

362

363

364

With the position approved by the City Council as part of their 2017
budget, City Manager Trudgeon noted advertising would occur in

365 the near future for an Assistant City Manager. Mr. Trudgeon
366 advised that the intent was to involve that position more in these
367 types of issues.

368

369

i. Upcoming Items on Future Council Agendas

370

City Manager Trudgeon reported that the “Speak Up! Roseville”
371 website would be revisited by the City Council soon (February
372 2017).

373

374

At the last City Council meeting, City Manager Trudgeon noted
375 reappointments and authorization by the City Council for staff to
376 advertise advisory commission vacancies was discussed and
377 approved as presented, with the exception of the CEC. Mr.
378 Trudgeon advised that the CEC reappointments of Commissioners
379 Holub and Manke were not acted upon, nor was staff authorized to
380 advertise for vacancies pending review by the City Council of their
381 direction to and intended role for the CEC. Given the high turnover
382 on the CEC since its inception, Mr. Trudgeon reported that the City
383 Council wanted to look at whether or not to recalibrate the CEC in
384 this format or to clarify its charge to the CEC.

385

386

City Manager Trudgeon advised that he could provide no further
387 answers to the CEC at this point; but noted a City Council
388 subcommittee of Mayor Roe and City Councilmember Laliberte
389 were tasked for an immediate review, including having
390 conversations with past and existing commissioners, at which time
391 they would report back to the full City Council for further
392 discussion. Mr. Trudgeon reported that he had pointed out to the
393 City Council how quick March would be coming around for filling
394 vacancies; as well as the CEC’s 2017 priority work plan underway.
395 Mr. Trudgeon advised that this work was fully recognized by the
396 City Council and urged the CEC to continue their efforts. However,
397 Mr. Trudgeon also advised that the City Council suggested that the
398 CEC think about what things they could provide to the city in the
399 very near future, as well as things that could be wrapped up by April
400 (e.g. best practices, tool boxes, previous document updates for best
401 practices such as for under-represented communities) and other
402 ideas they could bring forward to the City Council from the CEC
403 based on their work to-date.

404

405

For those commissioners interested in getting a better perspective
406 from individual council members, City Manager Trudgeon urged
407 commissioners to reach out to them. Mr. Trudgeon advised that he
408 had provided a link to the meeting video in his recent email to the
409 CEC. Mr. Trudgeon stated that he hoped to have more information
410 available before the CEC’s February 2017 meeting; and recognized

406

407

408

409

410

411 that this placed the CEC and him in a rather awkward place in
412 outlining efforts for the remainder of 2017. Mr. Trudgeon advised
413 that he was happy to attempt to answer any of the commission's
414 questions or hear their comments at this point.

415
416 Commissioner Holub recognized the bumps in the road historically
417 by this commission, but asked City Manager Trudgeon if there had
418 been anything in particular that sparked the City Council to come to
419 this decision at their last meeting. Commissioner Holub opined that
420 it seemed rather sudden from her perspective, especially when
421 remembering the City Council's positive feedback heard at the last
422 joint meeting of the CEC and them, particularly about the CEC's
423 objective and role. If the feedback from that meeting had indicated
424 their dissatisfaction, Commissioner Holub opined that the CEC
425 would have been more than happy to address any areas of concern.

426
427 Based on his personal observations, City Manager Trudgeon
428 suggested that when observing the past turmoil and turnover on the
429 CEC, it may have caused the City Council to question if the advisory
430 commission was working as intended, noting as an example how
431 contentious and big of an issue the whole neighborhood association
432 discussion had become. Mr. Trudgeon noted that the City Council's
433 intent in considering neighborhood groups or associations had been
434 an attempt to bring people together, but instead it had become
435 confrontational.

436
437 City Manager Trudgeon reported that the City Council, on more
438 than one occasion, had questioned if they had given sufficient or
439 good direction to the CEC. Mr. Trudgeon referenced the limited
440 dialogue when the CEC was initially created in 2014; and suggested
441 that limited direction may have lead to some of the issues not having
442 been thought out sufficiently by the City Council or directing the
443 proper role of the CEC and what they were charged to do and not to
444 do.

445
446 City Manager Trudgeon reiterated his statement that commissioners
447 contact council members individually if interested to hear their
448 perspectives.

449
450 Commissioner Sattler stated that she had enjoyed her service on the
451 CEC, and noted that while her term was ending this year, clarified
452 that her reason for not reapplying was due to her work schedule not
453 being as flexible as she anticipated, causing her to use her vacation
454 time to attend CEC meetings.

455

456 Chair Becker thanked Commissioner Sattler for her service and
457 commitment to the CEC.

458
459 Chair Becker noted that he had committed to serve out the remainder
460 of his term as Chair of the CEC when submitting his resignation, to
461 ensure continuity with a number of new commissioners coming on
462 board. From that “lame duck” perspective, Chair Becker offered his
463 personal thoughts on the situation. With three vacancies on the
464 CEC, two positions up for reappointment, and unless action was
465 taken by the City Council by April 1, 2017, Chair Becker noted that
466 the CEC would be down to only two members.

467
468 Given that scenario, Chair Becker asked his colleagues if they
469 wanted to continue working on projects in a vacuum without City
470 Council feedback in the meantime in case they chose to change
471 directions for or with the CEC. While commissions typically
472 regenerate themselves from year to year, Chair Becker questioned if
473 the City Council was running away from something they had asked
474 the CEC to do, and therefore questioned the amount of time
475 commissioners were willing to commit to continue those efforts.
476 Chair Becker opined that “community engagement” sounded great
477 and everyone was interested in it; but noted other things happened
478 beyond what was trying to be accomplished.

479
480 **Becker moved, Manke seconded, canceling the February 9 and**
481 **March 9, 2017 CEC meetings until the City Council resolved if**
482 **the CEC was to continue until April; whereupon vacancies**
483 **could be filled and the CEC could move forward with a new**
484 **mission and priorities accordingly.**

485
486 Commissioner Manke suggested a friendly amendment to the
487 motion to “pending decision of the City Council” should the City
488 Council decide in February to reappoint commissioners and/or
489 provide better direction to the CEC. Commissioner Manke opined
490 that, should there be new direction or a City Council decision for
491 this CEC to move forward, the loss of Chair Becker’s experience
492 would prove valuable to the new commission as well.

493
494 Chair Becker stated his preference for leaving the motion as stated,
495 in part due to the situation if the City Council came back with a
496 resolution or more information between the February and March
497 2017 CEC meetings, with three remaining commissioners at the
498 table, if a new mission and priority was determined, that should be
499 handled by the new CEC. Chair Becker expressed appreciation for
500 Commissioner Manke’s thoughts, but given the timing and current
501 turnover, opined that it made sense not to pursue her suggested

502 amendment. Chair Becker offered his availability and assistance to
503 the CEC at their request.

504
505 Commissioner Sattler spoke in opposition to the motion, opining
506 that she'd support the CEC trying to accomplish as much as possible
507 in and between the next two CEC meetings to prove their value to
508 the City Council. Rather than wasting two of the twelve available
509 meetings in 2017, Commissioner Sattler suggested a lot could be
510 accomplished versus not accomplishing anything; and offered her
511 commitment to that work for her last two meetings serving on the
512 CEC. Commissioner Sattler opined that if the current
513 commissioners wanted to keep the CEC going, she anticipated they
514 would share in wanting to see what they could accomplish; and if
515 they believed in community engagement, they should make the most
516 of those next two meetings whether or not they were the last two
517 meetings of the CEC in order to prove their value to the city.

518
519 Commissioner Manke stated that she could see both sides, and by
520 having served for three years and making herself available for
521 reappointment, admitted there was a bit of disappointment from her
522 perspective. Commissioner Manke opined that this could have been
523 a better discussion by the City Council rather than leaving the CEC
524 in limbo; making her question the CEC's value to them.

525
526 Recognizing that the CEC only made recommendations to the City
527 Council, any or all of which they may reject, Commissioner Sattler
528 noted the need to be open to that rejection. While admitting wasn't
529 as emotionally tied to the CEC as longer-term commissioners may
530 be, Commissioner Sattler suggested making the most of the time left
531 to get their ideas before the City Council, especially for those
532 remaining on the CEC and potential route they may go in the future.

533
534 Commissioner Holub stated her agreement with Commissioner
535 Sattler's position, noting the discussion at the last CEC meeting had
536 been for the 2017 work plan intended for first quarter projects.
537 Commissioner Holub stated that her values would indicate to stick
538 with it, and while respecting differing opinions, her position would
539 be to continue meeting as a CEC in February and March and provide
540 tools to the City Council as per their charge, whether or not they
541 chose to use them or not.

542
543 Commissioner Sparby agreed that he'd like the CEC to stick with
544 their agreed-upon schedule and commitment and wrap up anything
545 pending over the next two meetings, no matter what the City Council
546 subcommittee decided to recommend to the full Council.

547

548 When Chair Becker initially put his motion on the table,
549 Commissioner Tomlinson admitted he was ready to second it,
550 especially given his surprise by the City Council’s decision at their
551 last meeting and his confusion as to where that had come from.
552 Commissioner Tomlinson opined that the City Council’s decision to
553 not reappoint Commissioners Holub and Manke at a minimum
554 spoke volumes to him and created his frustration, whether or not the
555 Council’s intent was to re-evaluate the CEC or whether or not it
556 lived on moving forward. However, Commissioner Tomlinson
557 agreed that the CEC should leave good tools for decision-makers as
558 its legacy or as a foundation moving forward.

559
560 Chair Becker agreed that the City Council’s decision to not make
561 CEC reappointments at this time spoke volumes that it intended to
562 disband the CEC or move in a different direction.

563
564 **Ayes: 1 (Becker)**
565 **Nays: 5 (Tomlinson, Sparby, Sattler, Holub, Manke)**
566 **Motion failed.**

567
568 **iii. Other Items**

569
570 **8. Commission Communications, Reports, and Announcements**

571
572 **9. Commissioner-Initiated Items for Future Meetings**

573
574 **10. Recap of Commission Actions This Meeting**

575 Vice Chair Holub briefly highlighted actions and follow-up for tonight’s meeting,
576 including:

- 577 ▪ City Manager Trudgeon’s research on the CEC’s discussion and feedback to
- 578 the comprehensive plan consultant and relationship of the CEC in the process;
- 579 ▪ Further staff discussion of the welcome packet using CEC feedback and for
- 580 revisiting later this year;
- 581 ▪ City Manager Trudgeon’s review of the video tape of the previous CEC meeting
- 582 to clarify the speaker as noted in meeting minute discussions; and
- 583 ▪ City Manager Trudgeon providing a link to the CEC for the North Suburban
- 584 Gavel Association (done during tonight’s meeting).

585
586 **11. Adjournment**

587 Commissioner Sattler moved, Commissioner Sparby seconded, adjournment of the
588 meeting at approximately 7:40 p.m.

589
590 **Ayes: 6**
591 **Nays: 0**
592 **Motion carried.**

593

ROSEVILLE
REQUEST FOR COUNCIL ACTION

Agenda Date: 1/23/2017

Agenda Item: 14.a

Department Approval



City Manager Approval



Item Description: Discuss the revised draft community engagement plan and adopt a final community engagement plan for the 2040 Comprehensive Plan Update process (**PROJ-0037**)

1 **BACKGROUND**

2 On November 28, 2016, the City Council authorized staff to enter into a Professional
 3 Services Agreement (PSA) with the consultants from WSB and LHB who will be leading the
 4 effort to update Roseville's comprehensive plan. The scope of work approved with the PSA
 5 included a draft community engagement plan. Beginning with the issuance of a request for
 6 proposals in July 2016, Roseville's intention has been to fine-tune a consultant's proposed
 7 engagement strategy through collaboration by Planning Commissioners, Community
 8 Engagement Commissioners and, ultimately, the City Council.

9 Discussion of the proposed community engagement plan (CEP) began on December 7, 2016,
 10 with the Planning Commission and members of the Community Engagement Commission.
 11 The broader membership of the Community Engagement Commission then discussed the
 12 draft CEP at its meeting on December 8, and each member of both commissions were invited
 13 to provide their comments, questions, suggestions, and other feedback on the draft CEP. This
 14 feedback was incorporated into an expanded draft CEP that was discussed by the Planning
 15 Commission on January 4, 2017. The outcome of this discussion was consensus around
 16 which engagement tools were likely to be more appropriate or effective than others and what
 17 kind of input—and from whom—the engagement tools should gather. Minutes from
 18 December and January meetings of the Planning Commission are included with this RCA as
 19 Exhibit A.

20 **COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT PLAN**

21 The consultants, Lydia Major and Erin Perdu, used this detailed feedback to prepare a revised
 22 draft CEP for discussion and approval by the City Council; the revised draft CEP is included
 23 with this RCA as Exhibit B. Notable changes to the draft CEP based on the Commissioners'
 24 feedback are:

- 25 • 6 Intercepts were included in the original scope. The proposal now includes fewer
 26 runs in more locations to gather input in more places, likely without increasing cost.
- 27 • 2 Listening Sessions were included in the original scope. These have been modified to
 28 become 4 Walkabouts, which can be thought of as mobile listening sessions relating
 29 to specific locations or areas in the community. This change would add \$3,600 to the
 30 cost of the CEP.

- 31 • 1 Survey was included in the original scope. A second survey is proposed as an
32 additional way to gather input on materials developed for the draft comprehensive
33 plan update. The additional survey would add \$3,000 to the cost.
- 34 • 0 Interagency Meetings were included in the original scope. 4 topic-based Interagency
35 Meetings are suggested, pertaining to housing, economic
36 development/redevelopment, transportation/infrastructure, and water/open space.
37 Interagency Meetings will ensure that the efforts of various entities contributing to
38 different parts of the comprehensive plan update are more coordinated with each other
39 and that Roseville’s plans are consistent with the expectations of other regulatory
40 agencies. Recognizing that WSB/LHB would be merely coordinating with the team
41 responsible for updating the transportation plan, and not developing content regarding
42 transportation-related infrastructure, the added cost of these four meetings would be
43 \$4,000.
- 44 • The Planning Commission identified the students on Roseville’s team in the ongoing
45 Future City competition as young people who are already engaged in thinking about
46 the future of the urban environment. A meeting or two with the teachers and students
47 on Roseville’s Future City team would add about \$600 to the cost.

48 The above changes would add approximately \$11,200 to the cost of the original budget CEP.
49 This is within the roughly \$19,000 contingency earmarked among in the approved
50 compensation schedule for additional community engagement costs.

- 51 • A potential cost savings would be to eliminate the proposed Real Estate/Developer
52 focused meeting if the City Council believes the January 17, 2017, *Navigating Your*
53 *Competitive Future* panel discussion presented by ULI Minnesota serves the purpose
54 of that proposed meeting.

55 PLANNING DIVISION COMMENTS

56 It is important to note that a final, approved CEP will include greater detail about the number
57 and nature of meetings and other engagement activities, and about who is responsible for
58 them, in order to determine the overall cost of the CEP, but it will have less detail about
59 exactly when and where the engagement activities will occur. These and other specifics must
60 be developed as the comprehensive planning effort progresses. For instance, the revised CEP
61 suggests four mobile listening sessions (i.e., Walkabouts), based on the positive feedback
62 received about that engagement tool. In order to gauge an appropriate number of Walkabouts,
63 Planning Division staff has identified some possible locations/areas that may be well served
64 by such an activity, but the actual locations must still be identified and prioritized by the
65 Planning Commission once a quantity of Walkabouts is set.

66 Similarly, the CEP identifies a “tag line” among the important Key Messages in the process.
67 A well-crafted tag line will help community members identify materials they encounter as
68 being part of the comprehensive plan update and, ideally, it will inspire them to engage with
69 the process. But a particular tag line has not yet been selected. The tag line options included
70 in the CEP are the product of collaboration between the consultants and City Planning and
71 Communications staff, but the Planning Commission will have to adopt a tag line at one of
72 its upcoming meetings.



Memorandum

DATE: January 18, 2017

TO: Roseville City Staff, Planning Commission, City Council

FROM: Lydia Major, LHB, and Erin Perdu, WSB

RE: Roseville Comprehensive Plan Community Engagement Plan

Purpose of this Plan

This plan is intended to shape the overall approach to conducting the community engagement process for the Roseville Comprehensive Plan Update. It also describes our method for communicating key milestones, documents, and outcomes to the public. The Roseville Comprehensive Plan Update project team will provide schedule updates and PDFs of outreach tools, such as intercept materials, focus group questions, meeting-in-a-box kits, and meeting materials. The City of Roseville staff will be responsible for advertising, coordinating and facilitating meetings, updating the project website, posting on social media, developing press releases, and delivering communications.

Key Messages

- Project Description
 - The primary purpose of this project is to update the City of Roseville Comprehensive Plan.
 - The update process will:
 - build upon past efforts while avoiding “planning and meeting fatigue” among residents
 - continue the energetic dialogues that have already been sparked, as well as find opportunities for new ideas and energy
 - build consensus and momentum for progress, leading to long term relationships that support ongoing efforts
 - The City of Roseville Comprehensive Plan update will:
 - focus on creative and sustainable redevelopment of underutilized sites
 - ensure that new development enhances the existing City character and quality of life
 - foster an environment for growth
 - preserve the amenities that make Roseville a great place to live, work, play and study
 - be forward thinking and implementable
 - provide balanced strategies for growth, development, and connections in response to changing demographics
 - “Elevator speech” describing the Roseville Comprehensive Plan Update project
 - “Roseville’s comprehensive plan update will strive to realize the community’s goals for equity, public safety, livability, resilience, and other key values by framing smart approaches land use, housing, and economic development. Our decisions today to support quality residential renovation, creative infill projects, and innovative commercial and industrial redevelopment will allow the community to prosper and thrive into the future.”

- Tag line (two options):
 - “Roseville 2040 – guiding our future together” (Roseville staff thought this gives a good sense of the collective effort and purpose of the planning process without jargon.)
 - “Focus 2040” (While this one is more oblique, Roseville staff liked its subtle linguistic connection to the community vision that is IR2025, and we liked the “punch” of its brevity.)

Role of the Planning Commission

This group will act as a Steering Committee for the Comprehensive Plan. As such, your responsibilities in the community engagement plan are:

- To plan the process by contributing to this plan and to updating it as needed.
- To review documents and materials (such as survey questions, meeting agendas, intercept boards, meetings-in-a-box content, summary memos, etc.) and respond with comments in a timely fashion to a central point of contact who will collate comments.
- To attend and sometimes participate in or lead key events and meetings, as identified by staff and consultants.
- To spread the word about key meetings and events and to suggest ways of reaching more people throughout the process.
- To occasionally provide content for the website.
- To allocate a specific portion (agenda item) of each PC meeting from February to October to allow public input on the update process and to encourage participation by posing a question or other prompt to increase interest.
- To conduct joint work sessions or periodic and timely updates to City Council throughout the process.
- To compose a preface for the Comp Plan document and/or provide a short (up to four pages) written report to accompany the draft Comp Plan when presented to the City Council for formal acceptance.

Other ongoing engagement efforts:

- Southeast Roseville
 - 211 N. McCarrons
 - Rice/Larpenteur Visioning Process
 - Karen Interagency Work Group
- Imagine Roseville Community Discussions

Potential event locations:

- Public Open House
 - Roseville City Hall
- Focus group
 - Roseville City Hall
- Stakeholder Interview
 - Roseville City Hall
- Intercepts
 - Roseville City Hall
 - Libraries (County, K-12, post-secondary, etc.)
 - School cafeteria (K-12, post-secondary, etc.)
 - Malls (Rosedale, HarMar, etc.)

- Fairview Community Center
- Geographic-specific meetings/walkabouts
 - Identified by Roseville staff

Notifications and announcements:

Media Relations

- Roles and responsibilities
 - City of Roseville communications staff is primarily responsible for orchestrating media relations for this process.
 - Consultant team will provide current content and updates at key milestones.
 - Team will jointly develop a common brand for all communications, materials, and events.
 - The media strategy should:
 - create community awareness of process and outcomes
 - ensure transparency of process and outcomes
 - increase public participation
- Media partners and key publications
 - Local newspapers
 - LillieNews.com (Roseville-Little Canada Review)
 - Star Tribune
 - Pioneer Press
 - Government newsletters
 - Other
 - Smack Dab blog
- Suggested release moments in the project:
 - Project initiation
 - Requests for resident input – times and locations for events
 - Final document for public comment

Digital Communications

- Website
 - URL: www.cityofroseville.com/CompPlan
 - Key updates to web page at important milestones or events during the project process (at the conclusion of each phase, before/after public meetings, etc.)
 - Key documents (Summaries of public meetings, major deliverables)
 - Process pictures
 - Include a function to sign-up for project updates
 - “What’s Next” section
- Comprehensive Plan Update announcements on the City of Roseville home page
 - URL: www.cityofroseville.com/
 - Postings before each public meeting to encourage participation and involvement
 - Links to 2040 Comprehensive Plan Update page on the City of Roseville website at important project milestones
- Comprehensive Plan Update announcements on the City of Roseville Facebook page
 - Postings before each public meeting week to encourage participation and involvement
 - Links Comprehensive Plan Update page on the City of Roseville website at important project milestones
 - Consider boosted posts if needed
- Twitter updates focused on Comprehensive Plan Update
 - Postings on the City of Roseville twitter account advertising community events
- Mass Emails
 - Use City mailing lists to distribute notifications before major events or at key points for community input.
 - Use contact database (developed for project) to request that contacts forward information to their members or constituents.

- Allow sign-ups via website
- Major event announcements on Nextdoor or other neighborhood networks.
 - Public meetings/workshops

Hard-Copy Announcements

- Postcard
 - A postcard announcement can be mailed, handed out at the front desk of community facilities or by staff during programs and events. Mailings should occur shortly before public meetings.
- Poster/flyer
 - An 11 x 17 poster announcing major events should be posted at locations throughout the city (and in nearby facilities and businesses) shortly before the events. It should also be displayed at other City meetings held in the appropriate timeframe.

Events and Meeting Announcements

- Digital and Hardcopy materials (as noted above) will be used to advertise events proposed for the Study community engagement process:
 - Public meetings/open houses
 - Intercept events
- The City of Roseville will send meeting invitations and collect RSVPs (or recruit participants by other means) for the following proposed events:
 - Public meetings

Engagement Metrics

Monitoring

The goal is to engage the full range of Roseville constituencies in defining the future of the City. To ensure the goal is being achieved, participation in the public engagement program should be monitored on at least a biweekly basis against the following objectives. If the objectives aren't being met, the engagement program should be adjusted.

1. Grow the contact list to the degree appropriate to each phase of the project.
2. Achieve at least one dialogue regarding the Comprehensive Plan process on the My Sidewalk or Facebook pages each month.
3. Attract meaningful participation in each of the engagement target groups.
4. Achieve 3,500 unique visits (approximately 10% of population) to www.cityofroseville.com/CompPlan over the course of the process.

Demographic Data Collection

Data on who is participating should be collected. Ease of data collection varies by tool. The following approach to data collection will be followed for all engagement activities associated with the Comprehensive Plan Update process.

1. Collect data on residency (Roseville, Twin Cities Metro, elsewhere), worker/student, or visitor status in as many engagement formats as possible, including focus groups, public meetings, intercepts, online questionnaires, etc.
2. For online questionnaires, collect data on age, race/ethnicity, and gender as well as residency and worker/student, or visitor status.
3. Instruct the facilitator/host to fill out a brief qualitative assessment on who participated at intercepts events, Meetings-in-a-Box, and other meetings and activities where demographic data is difficult to collect. Proposed questions are:
 - a. Where were you?
 - b. What time were you there?
 - c. Who did you interact with?
 - i. Gender: Mostly males, about even males and females, mostly females
 - ii. Under-represented populations:

1. Youth (none, a few - less than 5, some - more than 5, a lot – mostly interacted with youth)
2. Seniors (none, a few –less than 5, some – more than 5, a lot –mostly interacted with seniors)
3. People of color (none, a few –less than 5, some – more than 5, a lot – mostly interacted with people of color)
- d. Please write in any additional notes on who you interacted with that warrants recording.

Proposed process

- Ten (10) Planning Commission meetings
 - Purpose: Monthly progress update and input
 - Date(s): fourth Wednesday of each month, January through October 2017, 6:30pm
 - Location(s): City Hall, Council Chambers
 - Notifications/invitations: Meetings are open to the public (publicly noticed) and participation will be encouraged by including a topical question or other prompt in the agenda for each meeting
 - Targets: all
- Four (4) City Council meetings
 - Purpose: Check-ins at progress points
 - Date(s): January 23, April 17, August 14, November 13, 6:00pm
 - Location(s): City Hall, Council Chambers
 - Notifications/invitations: Meetings are open to the public (publicly noticed)
 - Targets: all
- Two (2) community-wide public meetings
 - Purpose: Meeting One: Kick-off visioning workshop (early March); Exploring Directions open house (Sept or Oct)
 - Date(s): March 7, 6:00pm; September/October TBD
 - Location(s): Fairview Community Center?
 - Notifications/invitations: Meetings are open to the public (publicly noticed), press release to local papers, postcard mailing, flyers at key locations, social media, website
 - Targets: all
- Six (6) focus groups meetings: Housing, Economic Development, Land Use, Education, Opportunity, Diversity
 - Purpose: see detailed descriptions, below
 - Dates: cluster meetings in one or two days in March, exact date TBD
 - Economic Development, Education, and Land Use can be held as breakfast, lunch, or business-hours meetings depending on participant availability
 - Housing, Opportunity, and Diversity can be held in evening hours
 - Locations: all meetings at Roseville City Hall large conference rooms
 - Notifications/invitations: Primarily by email/phone invitation
 - Targets: see detailed descriptions, below
 - Housing
 - Purpose: Desired input described in spreadsheet (experience of living in Roseville, issues/opportunities, etc.)
 - Targets: Residents
 - Invite neighborhood, homeowner, and rental association reps

- Economic Development
 - Purpose: Desired input described in spreadsheet (effects of city policies/zoning, ways to improve, labor, etc.)
 - Targets: Residents, Business Community, Visitors
 - Invite Roseville Visitors Association, Business Council, Malls, and Chamber reps
- Land Use
 - Purpose: Desired input described in spreadsheet (experience of developing/selling/renting/leasing in Roseville, issues/opportunities, effects of city zoning, etc.)
 - Targets: Residents, Business Community
 - Invite Developers/Brokers/Real Estate folks
 - Could be eliminated if the ULI panel is a good substitute
- Education
 - Purpose: Desired input described in spreadsheet (existing issues, upcoming projects/plans, overall impression, etc.)
 - Targets: Residents, Educational Entities
 - Invite K-12 (Roseville, Mounds View, Fairview), post-secondary (Northwestern), and maybe preschool reps
- Opportunity
 - Purpose: Desired input described in spreadsheet (focus on economic equity; ie. experience in Roseville, sense of welcome, needs/support, issues/opportunities, etc.)
 - Targets: Residents, Non-profit/Philanthropic/Community Orgs, Under-represented Populations
 - Invite Keystone (food shelf), churches, Human Rights Commission, Schools Equity Office, Police and Community Service Officer reps
- Diversity
 - Purpose: Desired input described in spreadsheet (focus on diversity; ie. experience in Roseville, sense of welcome, needs/support, issues/opportunities, etc.)
 - Targets: Residents, Under-represented Populations
 - Invite ECFE, Human Rights Commission, Schools Equity Office, Police and Community Service Officers, Community reps
- Four (4) topic-based interagency meetings: Housing/Land Use, Economics, Transportation/Infrastructure, Water/Open Space
 - Purpose: gather representatives from adjacent communities, county, state, watersheds, Met Council (and consultant responsible for the transportation/public works scope) to discuss specific areas of interest
 - Dates: cluster meetings in one or two days in March, exact date TBD
 - Locations: all meetings at Roseville City Hall large conference rooms
 - Notifications/invitations: Primarily by email/phone invitation
 - Targets: Government Entities
- Four (4) geography-based neighborhood “walkabout” meetings
 - Purpose: meet people where they are to see the neighborhood and discuss issues together
 - Dates: April, exact times and dates TBD

- Locations: TBD, but could include locations like the area in the southeast corner of Roseville beyond the Rice/Larpenteur visioning corridor area
- Notifications/invitations: Email/phone invitation to area contacts, flyers in targeted locations, postcard mailings, social media, website
- Targets: Residents, Under-represented populations
 - Invite local residents
- Three (3) ECFE Sessions
 - Purpose: engage parents and children in a discussion of Roseville issues/opportunities and experience
 - Dates: April, exact times and dates TBD (work with ECFE staff)
 - Locations: TBD (work with ECFE staff)
 - Notifications/invitations: Email via ECFE contacts, flyers in ECFE locations, social media, website
 - Targets: Residents, Under-represented populations
 - Invite ECFE participants
- Two (2) Future City sessions
 - Purpose: engage middle-school participants in the 2017 Future City competition in a dialogue about public space (this year's FC theme) in Roseville
 - Dates: January/February TBD with teacher before and after competition on Jan. 21
 - Locations: TBD with teacher
 - Notifications/invitations: invite teacher and students
 - Targets: Residents
 - Invite teacher and students
- Two (2) Online surveys (visioning, directions)
 - Purpose: provide opportunities for those who cannot attend a public meeting, intercept, meeting-in-a-box or other event to provide basic input on issues/opportunities
 - Dates:
 - "Visioning" survey running in March
 - "Exploring Directions" survey running in September or October
 - Locations: website
 - Notifications/invitations: include in public meeting press release to local papers, postcard mailing, flyers at key locations, social media, website
 - Targets: all
- Two (2) intercept run (10-12 locations each)
 - Purpose: provide opportunities for those who cannot attend a public meeting or other event to provide basic input on issues/opportunities
 - "Visioning" intercepts
 - Dates: all of March
 - Long-run intercepts at schools, cafeterias, libraries, community center, nature center, malls, grocery stores, Target
 - One event at Arts @ the Oval, March 25
 - Targets: Residents (primary), all others
 - "Exploring Directions" intercepts
 - Dates: either all of September or October
 - Long-run intercepts at schools, cafeterias, libraries, community center, nature center, malls, grocery stores, Target

- Events: Farmer's Market is Tuesdays, May 3-Oct 25, 8-noon; Wild Rice Festival, Sept TBD; Rosefest Party in the Park, July 4
 - Targets: Residents (primary), all others
 - Notifications/invitations: include in public meeting press release to local papers, postcard mailing, flyers at key locations, social media, website
- One (1) meetings-in-a-box run (unknown locations)
 - Purpose: provide opportunities for those who cannot attend a public meeting or other event to provide basic input on issues/opportunities
 - Dates: all of March
 - Locations: unknown (TBD by volunteers to conduct meetings)
 - Notifications/invitations: include in public meeting press release to local papers, postcard mailing, flyers at key locations, social media, website
 - Targets: Residents (primary), all others
- 1 mySidewalk (but maybe four major updates)
 - Purpose: provide a central location for project information, calendars, links to surveys, updates on progress, etc.
 - Dates: Ongoing
 - Coordinate with city website
 - Four major updates coinciding with City Council updates and major milestones?
 - Targets: all

c: LHB File

O:\16Proj\160669\300 Communication\304 Minutes\160669 Community Engagement Plan.docx

Roseville Comprehensive Plan Community Engagement Plan
 Engagement Targets and Tools
 Draft 1/05/2017

Engagement Targets	Desired Input	Existing Organizations or Events	Selected Tools	Participation process (voluntary, invited, other)	Notification methods	Best days and times	Appropriate Goals for Participation	Other Notes
Residents	Information about why they live here (i.e. what we should preserve) What needs to change Issues surrounding housing (type, affordability, availability, size) Issues surrounding connectivity (can people get where they want to go safely and conveniently) Experiential approach questions Safety Amenities (public realm, gathering, etc.) Thoughts on growth Jobs (desire to work near home?)	Neighborhood orgs Rental property associations Homeowners associations Roseville Area Schools Events at the Adult Learning Center Events at the Fairview Community Center Tuesday Farmer's Market Rosefest in late June Nature Center Open House in late January Arts at the Oval in late March Wild Rice Festival in September	Public meetings (two phase: vision workshop, directions open house) Housing Focus Group meeting (rental property reps, Home homeowners association reps, neighborhood reps) Long-run Intercepts at: schools, cafeterias, libraries, community center, nature center, malls, grocery stores, Target Event intercepts at: Farmer's Market, Rosefest, Arts at the Oval, Wild Rice Festival Meetings-in-a-box Online survey (visioning to begin, options feedback later) Engage Future City group (4) targeted geography meetings PC and CC meetings open to the public for formal review and comment	Mix Invited Open Open Open Invited Mix Open	Mailing, email contact list, press release, website, flyers, social media, etc. Email/call Email contact list, press release, website, flyers, social media, etc. Email contact list, press release, website, flyers, social media, etc. Email/call Mailing, email contact list, website, flyers, social media, etc.	Weekends or Evenings; Avoid holidays (consider various religions) Weekends or Evenings; Avoid holidays (consider various religions) N/A Events N/A N/A Weekends or Evenings; Avoid holidays (consider various religions)		Offer child care or have child appropriate activities to keep little ones occupied while parents participate. Mailed postcard invitation should have something to motivate them to participate Email notice sent to neighborhood associations. Sticky post/advertisement explaining what it is/what its for and how to get one on City website, Facebook page, NextDoor (if possible) Farmer's Market is Tuesdays, May 3-Oct 25, 8-noon Rosefest June 22-25, parade June 26, Party in the Park July 4 Arts @ the Oval, March 25, 10-5 Wild Rice Festival, Sept TBD
Business Community	How city policies/zoning effects their business What would help their business Anything hindering your growth/expansion Labor availability Amenities, transportation, parking	Roseville Business Council Developer, real estate broker, appraiser group (both existing and not currently present) Rosedale and HarMar Malls Rotary Twin Cities North Chamber of commerce	(2) Focus Groups: Economic Development (Business council/malls/CoC/visitors association); Land Use (Developers/brokers/etc) (if needed, pending the ULI process)	Invited	Email/call	RBC and CoC meet March 22, April 26, etc. CoC Public Policy committee meets Mar 2, April 6, etc.	75% attendance of invitees	
Visitors	What draws you to Roseville Overall impression/description of the City	Roseville Visitors Association Hotel owner (believe this is covered by RVA-confirm)	Long-run Intercepts at: schools, cafeterias, libraries, community center, nature center, malls Event intercepts at: Farmer's Market, Rosefest, Arts at the Oval, Wild Rice Festival Meetings-in-a-box Online survey (visioning to begin, options feedback later) Economic Development Focus Groups: Business council/malls/CoC/visitors association;	Open Open Open Open Invited	Email contact list, press release, website, flyers, social media, etc. Email contact list, press release, website, flyers, social media, etc. Steering committee and other willing volunteers take these to standing meetings, neighborhood gatherings, etc. Email contact list, press release, website, flyers, social media, etc. Email/call	N/A Events N/A N/A See possible dates in Business Community	75% attendance of invitees	Note: not suggesting a targeted meeting for non-residents
Residents, businesses from adjacent communities	Overall impression/description of Roseville	Arden Hills St. Anthony Lauderdale Falcon Heights Little Canada Minneapolis Shoreview St. Paul New Brighton	Long-run Intercepts at: schools, cafeterias, libraries, community center, nature center, malls Event intercepts at: Farmer's Market, Rosefest, Arts at the Oval, Wild Rice Festival Meetings-in-a-box Online survey (visioning to begin, options feedback later)	Open Open Open Open	Email contact list, press release, website, flyers, social media, etc. Email contact list, press release, website, flyers, social media, etc. Steering committee and other willing volunteers take these to standing meetings, neighborhood gatherings, etc. Email contact list, press release, website, flyers, social media, etc.	N/A Events N/A N/A		Note: not suggesting a targeted meeting for non-residents
Area interest groups								Not included at this time due to lack of identified group; consider adding events or adding groups to existing events if groups are identified later
Nonprofit, Philanthropic, and Community Orgs	Upcoming projects/processes Planning frames Existing issues Overall impression/description of Roseville	Churches Keystone Community services (Roseville Food Shelf)	Opportunity Focus Group: Keystone and up to five churches serving under-represented populations, poverty, homelessness, hunger, etc.	Invited	Email/call			
Educational entities	Existing issues Upcoming projects/processes Planning frames Overall impression/description of Roseville	Colleges and Universities Roseville School District Mounds View School District Private K-12 schools Fairview Alternative High Preschools	Education Focus Group: Roseville/Fairview/Mounds View/Northwestern	Invited	Email/call			
Under-represented Populations	Do they feel included? Welcomed? Specific needs that should be addressed in the Plan	Four previously-identified primary non-English language groups: Karen, Somali, Hmong, Hispanic Diverse groups by geography Early Childhood and Family Education (ECFE) City's Human Right's Commission Roseville Area School's Office of Equity and Integration Karen Interagency Work Group Police and Community Service Officers	(4) targeted geography meetings Focus group on diversity: ECPE, Human Rights Commission, Roseville Schools Equity Office, Police and Community Service Officers, other Three ECPE Sessions	Mix	Mailing, email contact list, press release, website, flyers, social media, etc.			
Government Entities	Existing issues Upcoming projects/processes Planning frames Changes to regulations or processes	Adjacent communities Ramsey County MetCouncil Watershed Districts (Capitol Region, Rice Creek, etc.) State (MnDOT, MnDNR, etc.)	Four interagency, topic-based discussions	Invited	Email/call			Housing/Land Use, Economics, Transportation/Infrastructure, Water/Open space

Engagement Strategies for Underrepresented Populations

2017 Agenda - Draft

Phase 1: Finalize a working definition. (COMPLETE)

Underrepresented populations: Populations who, relative to their composition in the City, are:

- Provided with insufficient information about events/topics of interest.
- Engaging in events/topics of interest at relatively low rates.
- Proactively contacting the City with inquiries/ideas at relatively low rates.
- Not reflected in City leadership. (City leadership is defined for our purposes as Roseville's City Council, commissions, staff, and members of any task forces/advisory groups.)

Who is underrepresented will differ depending on the City's effort. For any effort, Roseville should strive to have representation based on the City's population. Consider the following demographics (not an exhaustive list):

- Race/ethnicity
- Economic status
- Immigrant/refugee background
- Age
- Gender identity
- Sexual orientation
- Disability
- Rental/homeowner status
- Student (temporary resident) status

Phase 2: Create a graph or visual showing barriers to engagement for underrepresented communities and tools to overcome these barriers. (IN PROGRESS)

Population	Possible Barriers (work in progress)
Race/ethnicity	Language
Economic status	Access to newspaper/internet
Immigrant/refugee background	Language
Age	Access to internet or in person events
Gender identity	
Sexual orientation	
Disability	Access to internet or in person events
Rental/homeowner	Access to newspaper
Student	

There is no one method of communication which will overcome all barriers and be easily accessible for everyone. The most effective engagement comes from building relationships.

Discussion topic: Is it possible to create relationships with groups already in existence and use those to increase communication with underrepresented populations?

- Community groups:
 - Karen Organization of Minnesota (KOM) – located on Rice Street
 - Alzheimer's support group – Roseville library
- Who would be responsible for creating/maintaining relationships?
 - Community Engagement Coordinator (hired by City of Roseville)

Engagement Strategies for Underrepresented Populations

2017 Agenda - Draft

- Volunteer Coordinator (role expanded)
- Community Engagement Commission
- Community Engagement Team or Council consisting of current staff, council members, and commissioners

Phase 3: Evaluate current methods of communication used by the City. (PENDING)

- What tools does the city currently use for communicating with residents?
- What tools are being underused:
 - City of Roseville has many face-to-face options with residence, but they are in a more formal setting, we have been discussing the benefits of using less formal meet ups as a way to make people more comfortable. Example: City Council, staff, or representatives attending “Get to Know Your Parks” events.

Phase 4: Recommend changes. (PENDING)

- Increased diversity on city councils and commissions
- Increased diversity of city volunteers (Talk to Kelly about who is volunteering)
- Training/updates to city staff and commissioners