



**Planning Commission – Comprehensive Plan Update Meeting
City Council Chambers, 2660 Civic Center Drive
Minutes – Wednesday, January 25, 2017 – 6:30 p.m.**

- 1 **1. Call to Order**
2 Chair Boguszewski called to order a Special meeting of the Planning Commission at
3 approximately 6:30 p.m. for the purpose of updating the city’s comprehensive plan for
4 2040.
- 5 **2. Roll Call**
6 At the request of Chair Boguszewski, City Planner Thomas Paschke called the Roll.
- 7 **Members Present:** Chair Michael Boguszewski; Vice Chair Shannon Cunningham; and
8 Commissioners Robert Murphy, James Daire, Julie Kimble, James
9 Bull and Chuck Gitzen
- 10 **Staff / Consultants Present:** Community Development Director Kari Collins, City
11 Planner Thomas Paschke, and Senior Planner Bryan Lloyd;
12 Project Manager Erin Perdu, WSB & Associates, Inc.
- 13 **3. Communications and Recognitions:**
- 14 **a. From the Public (Public comment pertaining to general land use issues no on**
15 **this agenda)**
16 None.
- 17 **b. From the Commission or Staff (Information about assorted business not**
18 **already on this agenda including a brief update on the 2040 Comprehensive**
19 **Plan Update process)**
20 Mr. Lloyd displayed an updated calendar timeline of the process to inform
21 viewers of other events/meetings coming up in order for them to track the process.
- 22 Member Gitzen suggested having the timeline updates available as handouts and
23 as a reminder to the commission of meetings/events beyond regular Planning
24 Commission meetings.
- 25 **4. Project File 0037: 2040 Comprehensive Plan Update**
- 26 **a. Community Engagement Plan**
27 Mr. Lloyd advised that the City Council, at their January 23, 2017 meeting had
28 approved the community engagement plan; and noted that the plan currently
29 before the commission included additional City Council input. Mr. Lloyd advised
30 that the spreadsheet also included information previously provided by the
31 Community Engagement Commission (CEC) and their broader approach to
32 looking at materials beyond that of the Planning Commission. Mr. Lloyd
33 apologized that, due to an email glitch, the information had not been included in
34 previous iterations, but was now included and had been agreed to in-house for
35 inclusion.
- 36 Chair Boguszewski asked staff to get confirmation that the earlier questions of the
37 CEC had been adequately addressed; and with the Planning Commission serving

38 as the main lead in the process, asked that staff ensure its CEC colleagues
39 received answers to their questions.

40 Member Gitzen asked how the table fit into community engagement as approved
41 by the City Council.

42 Mr. Lloyd advised that, as in past iterations, the spreadsheet or table format
43 captured who was trying to be engaged throughout the process and the
44 information or feedback from those groups that would inform the remainder of the
45 community engagement plan.

46 Chair Boguszewski asked that staff include the dates of approval of the various
47 documents by the City Council for future reference and clarification; duly noted
48 by Mr. Lloyd. At the further request of Chair Boguszewski, Mr. Lloyd noted that
49 there weren't many substantial changes made by the City Council prior to their
50 approval, and advised that as part of tonight's review process, those details would
51 be clarified.

52 Ms. Perdu noted that, with City Council input, the tagline "Roseville 2040 – Our
53 Future Together" had been chosen.

54 Ms. Perdu further clarified that the types of meetings, their purpose, number of
55 that particular type of meeting, potential dates and locations,
56 notifications/invitations as applicable and other logistics and details had all been
57 reviewed as presented and revised. Ms. Perdu noted that all were open to the
58 public and would be publicly noticed as proposed.

59 Ms. Perdue announced the tentative date of March 7, 2017 at 6:00 p.m. for the
60 public kick-off visioning meeting as a workshop and open house entitled
61 "Exploring Directions;" and would be advertised as soon as a location was
62 confirmed.

63 Chair Boguszewski asked what constituted success at these engagements; how
64 open houses would be handled; and how demographics calculated.

65 Ms. Perdu responded that the metrics in the community engagement document
66 were mostly about how many people in general are being engaged; with notes
67 used for tracking those observable demographics. Ms. Perdu clarified that those
68 attending would not be asked for personal information beyond the sign-in sheet
69 for the number attending; but noted that whoever facilitated the meetings would
70 be responsible for making those observations.

71 Chair Boguszewski suggested that the sign-in sheet have a line to identify whether
72 or not someone in attendance was a Roseville resident or not; duly noted by Ms.
73 Perdu.

74 While this community engagement plan had been approved by the City Council,
75 Ms. Perdu encouraged further comments on detail from the Planning Commission
76 tonight or funneled through their liaisons.

77 As a vision-impaired person, Member Bull reiterated his frustration with the small
78 print on the table and asked that it be made more readable.

79 Mr. Lloyd apologized for his omission, and advised that he would correct that on
80 future iterations.

81 At the suggestion of Member Murphy to make it more readable electronically,
82 Mr. Lloyd advised that the document was already available on line.

83 Chair Boguszewski noted that, from his recollection, Member Bull had
84 specifically asked at the last meeting that the document be more readable,
85 pointing out his ocular difficulties, and asked that staff do so.

86 Ms. Perdu reviewed the updated community engagement plan, including various
87 topic-based focus groups, cluster meeting during and possibly after business hours
88 depending on participant availability with targeted invitations, even though all
89 were open to the public.

90 Chair Boguszewski asked that those specific meeting dates and times were
91 provided to Planning Commission liaisons: Member Kimble, Gitzen and Bull to
92 allow for their participation.

93 Member Bull asked for elaboration on the education component of the
94 comprehensive plan.

95 Ms. Perdu clarified that it wasn't a chapter of the comprehensive plan per se, but
96 instead targeted educational institutions to receive their input. Ms. Perdu noted
97 that this included school districts as well as post-secondary institutions.

98 Member Bull noted that while participants may be from that environment, the
99 topic may be something else.

100 Ms. Perdu agreed with that statement, advising it was intentional to see what their
101 issues were, and to find out any upcoming projects or plans that they have that
102 may influence the comprehensive plan; as well as their overall impressions of the
103 city. Ms. Perdu noted that many of these groups would be gathered by interest
104 with each of their foci different.

105 Member Bull opined that focus groups look more like topical groups versus
106 education and therefore, he didn't understand how education would fit in.

107 Chair Boguszewski clarified that it didn't fit in as a concept, but as an educational
108 community how the comprehensive plan could help.

109 Ms. Perdu agreed, noting they both informed the other.

110 Ms. Perdu reviewed the four interagency meetings and their topics (housing/land
111 use, economics, transportation/infrastructure, and water/open space) that included
112 watershed districts, the Metropolitan Council, Ramsey County, State of MN and
113 the consultant hired by the city that would be responsible for the
114 transportation/Public works scope and for discussion of specific areas of interest.

115 At the request of Chair Boguszewski, Ms. Perdu clarified that the agency
116 meetings would be geared more toward staff versus County Commissioners or
117 other surrounding units of government with the goal to determine how they
118 influenced the city's comprehensive plan from a local and regional perspective.

119 Member Bull suggested including health care needs if there wasn't something else
120 that addressed health care, including for younger people (e.g. hospitals or clinics)
121 and more neighborhood networks with businesses and neighborhood malls that
122 were conceptualized last time, including neighborhood clinics, education,
123 employment and walking/biking amenities.

124 Ms. Perdu noted that wasn't something they had contemplated, but agreed it was
125 worth considering, and thanked Member Bull for that suggestion.

126 Ms. Perdu continued with the four geography-based neighborhood "walkabout"
127 meetings.

128 Chair Boguszewski asked if staff would be on hand and asked how those wanting
129 to attend but perhaps mobility impaired would be accommodated.

130 Ms. Perdu agreed that was a good point to consider; and noted the actual area may
131 dictate whether or not it was a "walkabout" or simply a meeting in an open place.

132 Member Murphy noted the good attendance as the August "Night Out" events,
133 and suggested some be scheduled then or people trained to meet people in their
134 neighborhoods to update them on where the process was at; opining that may
135 provide a great opportunity to receive additional input.

136 Chair Boguszewski noted that many of those block parties for the "Night Out"
137 picked up information at City Hall as they scheduled their events and suggested
138 staff could be available for facilitators or to alert those picking up information
139 with additional information and alerting the leads of the city's interest in their
140 input.

141 Ms. Perdu agreed that was a good suggestion and noted the goal of this effort was
142 to reach under-represented populations by going to them. Ms. Perdu advised that
143 staff was assisting in choosing the locations most applicable to meet this goal;
144 with three locations tentatively mapped out at this point.

145 Mr. Lloyd noted that the City Council had been asked, and the Planning
146 Commission as well to email staff with their additional ideas including suggested
147 locations; outlining the three areas chosen to-date: SE Roseville beyond the
148 corridor visioning area done as a separate project; the NW corner of the city on
149 the other side of the commercial/industrial area; and the Snelling Avenue/County
150 Road B area (west of Snelling) and the residential area immediately behind the
151 commercial/retail area.

152 At the request of Member Bull related to "walkabouts," Ms. Perdu advised that
153 there may be some things to look out in the field if they appear to be areas of
154 concern; and if a walkabout was done, and then everyone could gather in one spot
155 to talk about the issues or areas of concern. Ms. Perdu clarified that this was not
156 intended to be a door-to-door canvas of individual people, in one geographic
157 grouping; but intended as dispersals of timeframes to get a true representation of
158 that particular area.

159 Member Daire noted that the three geographical areas designated were all within
160 commercial nodes, particularly with multi-family and single-family homes
161 adjacent to retail/commercial areas.

162 Chair Boguszewski noted the benefits outlined in the recent Urban Land Institute
163 (ULI) workshop and discussions to do something beyond pass-through and to
164 make Roseville a destination.

165 At the request of Chair Boguszewski, Ms. Perdu advised that the consultants and
166 staff would come prepared to each meeting with prompts and visuals; noting that
167 their experience had proven that specific questions/issues stimulated discussion
168 and would be tailored to each area.

169 Ms. Perdu noted three ECFE sessions to engage parents and children in the
170 discussion.

171 Chair Boguszewski noted that the very mission of the ECFE is at the heart of this
172 vehicle and supported correlating this group with their mission.

173 Ms. Perdu noted the two “Future City” sessions planned to engage middle-school
174 participants from the recent 2017 “Future City” competition in a dialogue about
175 public space that was this year’s theme in Roseville.

176 Chair Boguszewski noted his observation of the students’ excitement in
177 participating.

178 Member Bull stated one of his frustrations was that meeting scheduled for
179 tomorrow that had not been brought to the attention of the liaisons.

180 Ms. Perdu apologized for that omission; advising that the discussion would be
181 held at the Roseville Middle School with teachers and students from 7:20 to 8:10
182 p.m. in their classroom before the school day began.

183 Chair Boguszewski reviewed the logistics for any liaisons able to attend at the
184 school due to security.

185 For the purpose of managing expectations, Ms. Collins advised that many
186 opportunities may have unnecessarily quick turnarounds, especially when a
187 particular entity reaches out to the consultant. To the extent the liaisons could be
188 included, Ms. Collins assured the commission that staff would attempt to do so.

189 Chair Boguszewski stated that the subgroup or liaisons always needed to be kept
190 informed or any and all meetings; and if a note was immediately sent to the
191 subcommittee, if one or more could make it, at least they would have been
192 informed.

193 Ms. Collins reiterated that, to the extent possible, staff would do so.

194 Member Bull opined that if staff and the consultant could schedule themselves, it
195 was up to the liaisons to schedule themselves, depending on their flexibility.

196 Ms. Collins advised that staff would continue to coordinate with the City Manager
197 and Planning Commission Chair.

198 Chair Boguszewski suggested that for clarification, staff should notice the entire
199 Commission on ALL meetings to avoid any omissions.

200 Member Murphy suggested that the Planning Commission mailing list be
201 included on all meeting notices, allowing him to track the activities and ask

202 questions after they're held. Member Murphy noted that if he didn't know, he
203 wouldn't know what to ask; and suggested staff "bury them" in email notices.

204 Ms. Perdu advised that they would coordinate with staff accordingly.

205 Member Daire expressed appreciation to Chair Boguszewski for "hanging tough"
206 on that since the Planning Commission had been tasked to serve as the steering
207 committee for this plan update; he opined that the communication has to be very
208 clear.

209 With the remaining meetings scheduled, Ms. Perdu advised that she didn't
210 anticipate this short of a notice in the future; but assured the Commission that they
211 would get their act together in that regard.

212 Regarding the remainder of engagement options, Ms. Perdu advised that they
213 mostly consisted of online surveys for visioning and directions respectively; and
214 reviewed intended media notices and mailings, flyers at key locations, and social
215 media and website announcements.

216 Regarding intercept boards, Ms. Perdu noted that 10-12 locations were being
217 considered (e.g. schools, cafeterias, libraries, community centers, Nature Center,
218 malls, grocery stores, Target store, and various events at multi-family housing and
219 service sites).

220 Ms. Perdu advised that "meetings in a box" options would be prepared and
221 available for project teams to put together materials and a script for check-out of a
222 box for small gatherings wherever and whenever convenient and would be
223 advertised and scheduled as the process moves forward. If people from
224 community organizations took on such an option, Ms. Perdu noted that they often
225 had more success in reaching their group than a city official would.

226 Member Murphy sought clarification on the "meeting in a box" concept with
227 content and assembly done as needed, with Ms. Perdu noting one set of questions
228 would be provided and run as often as there appeared interest in doing so, and
229 replicated for check-out as needed. Regarding the need for training of a facilitator,
230 Ms. Perdu clarified that the script was designed with clear instructions for this
231 self-explanatory option and reactions then provided back to staff.

232 With several suggestions provided by individual commissioners, Ms. Perdu asked
233 that they submit ideas to staff for various groups to target from their perspective.

234 Ms. Perdu reviewed the "MySidewalk" online option with four major updates
235 planned as a platform for the city's website and coinciding with City Council
236 updates, linked to the city's comprehensive plan website.

237 With this plan just having been approved by the City Council earlier this week,
238 Ms. Perdu advised that as scheduling began, it would be coming back to the
239 commission for their review.

240 With the amount of information being gathered, Member Gitzen asked how the
241 results would be received.

242 Ms. Perdu responded that her intent was, once a particular group of meetings was
243 completed and after the initial public kick-off meeting; the results would be

244 compiled and brought back to the Planning Commission, again after each group
245 of events or activities.

246 Chair Boguszewski noted that one of the benefits of having three liaisons was for
247 them to help disseminate and have ears at the sessions on those things key to the
248 Planning Commission versus just the chatter. While realizing that the critical mass
249 of information or documentation would be forthcoming, Chair Boguszewski noted
250 that the liaisons could let the Commission know their general impression of what
251 was discussed.

252 Member Gitzen suggested that the information gathering would be pertinent to the
253 Special Planning Commission meetings and align monthly subjects with
254 information gathered to-date.

255 Ms. Perdu duly noted that suggestion.

256 At the request of Member Daire, Ms. Perdu advised that results and summaries
257 would first pass through staff from the consultant and then on to the Commission
258 with their meeting packets; and then published on the website so those attending
259 the meetings and events could know they had been heard and how their input
260 would be used and if any ideas came up that would not be incorporated into the
261 plan update and why they were or were not used and how and why that happened,
262 establishing a two-way communication effort.

263 Member Daire noted that he had no strong desire to receive the raw information,
264 opining that staff did a good job filtering information for the Commission.

265 When doing visioning and focus groups, Ms. Perdu advised that everything would
266 be documented and a summary published. If the Commission preferred to drill
267 down into those individual comments at any point, Ms. Perdu advised that a copy
268 would be retained.

269 Chair Boguszewski noted that, while most of the questions and thoughts identified
270 by the Commission seemed to be random thoughts and loose threads, the intent of
271 the table and how the engagement plan had now been formulated appeared to
272 reflect those priorities. Chair Boguszewski thanked the City Council for
273 approving it and allowing things to move forward.

274 Ms. Perdu advised that the timeline would continue to evolve as more detail for
275 community engagement was approved by the City Council, with an updated
276 version available at the next Planning Commission meeting. As Mr. Lloyd noted
277 earlier in his comments, Ms. Perdu advised that the plan was to provide a quick
278 snapshot of the current month and upcoming events, being constantly updated.
279 Ms. Perdu noted that the March Special Planning Commission meeting would
280 provide the results of the public kick-off meeting.

281 Further discussion included publishing the timeline on the website in the near
282 future; including a brief history and revisions dates available online for the public
283 to remain aware of the dynamics of the timeline; and delays in getting the
284 information online until it had been finalized earlier this week by the City
285 Council.

286 Member Bull noted that future communication between the consultant, staff and
287 the Planning Commission as steering committee needed to be updated for
288 schedules and any adjustments in order to provide guidance on where things are
289 and what’s happening.

290 **b. Task 1: Review of Vision and Goals**

291 Ms. Perdu noted the goals that had been identified by the homework assignment,
292 serving as a starting point to move forward with the focus; with staff having
293 collected and compiled individual responses, and the consultant having prepared a
294 discussion of those responses.

295 If tonight’s goal is not reflective of those comments, Member Murphy asked if
296 that was their last shot at input on the goals.

297 Ms. Perdu emphatically stated that it was not, and was intended only as the first
298 shot. Ms. Perdu advised that her goal for tonight was to get a general consensus of
299 any modifications the body saw in any set of goals. Ms. Perdu advised that she
300 would then take that information and return with them – as revised – for the next
301 meeting with vetting by city staff and the public in the meantime.

302 Mr. Lloyd referenced the cover memo provided with the homework (dated
303 January 13, 2017) defining the goals and not within any realm of editing the
304 Imagine Roseville 2025 community visioning process.

305 As requested by Member Daire, Mr. Lloyd clarified that the wording in the
306 second column of the spreadsheet provided as the homework assignment were
307 direct statements of the goals of the Imagine Roseville 2025 document. Mr. Lloyd
308 further clarified that the intent was to reconsider how those statements informed
309 the process of the comprehensive plan update going forward, but not the Imagine
310 Roseville 2025 document itself or any revisions to that document.

311 Mr. Paschke concurred, noting that consideration should be given to how those
312 goals are supported or not supported at this point and in the updated
313 comprehensive plan going forward. While those goals shaped the previous
314 comprehensive plan, Mr. Paschke noted the need to determine those that remained
315 pertinent or needing tweaked; with all the different chapters of the comprehensive
316 plan having goals addressed accordingly.

317 At the request of Member Daire, Ms. Perdu advised that an outline of the
318 comprehensive plan in draft form was not yet updated. Member Daire opined that
319 he would need to review that in order to do the job laid out before the
320 commission; opining that it was important to know what is or is not in the
321 comprehensive plan to judge whether or not it remained relative or had
322 implications.

323 Ms. Perdue noted that the outline as it currently exists for the 2040 plan is
324 outlined in the Table of Contents that had been distributed at the last Planning
325 Commission meeting and provided general goals and content.

326 Mr. Lloyd concurred, noting that the Table of Contents identified chapters of the
327 2040 comprehensive plan related to major topic areas, but at this point in the
328 process didn’t provide any content of those major topic areas.

329 Member Daire suggested that it was then conceivable that some of these
330 statements are general and can remain because they include things such as, “make
331 Roseville a livable community for all;” with everything in the comprehensive plan
332 devoted to that goal.

333 Mr. Lloyd stated that while the city and community in general had been working
334 toward that as a sample goal, opinions may vary as to how successful that effort
335 had been so far, even though it remains a goal. Mr. Lloyd suggested that may be
336 the type of statement or goal showing up in various chapters (e.g. land use, parks
337 & recreation, housing and neighborhoods).

338 Chair Boguszewski suggested that things such as “define livable” and associated
339 metrics, some attempt be made for a more measurable definition.

340 Mr. Paschke agreed that each of those respective chapters could define “livable”
341 in that specific realm.

342 Ms. Perdu agreed that was a good point, how to measure the goal and indicators
343 one way or the other. If looking at the goal of livability as an example, Ms. Perdu
344 suggested keeping it not only in the general goal category, but also in each
345 chapter, since each may mean something different, but would essentially tie into
346 the overall goal and which policies would support it.

347 To assist in the goal setting, Member Bull suggested a simple “yes” or “no” as to
348 whether this remained a pertinent goal for the 2040 comprehensive plan, and as
349 the Table of Contents and chapters were reviewed.

350 Chair Boguszewski, as an example, suggested exploring a new community center.
351 Chair Boguszewski advised that he had checked off “delete” as it was simply a
352 solution to achieve or contribute to the inclusive sense of community, but not an
353 actual goal itself, based on his thought processes.

354 Member Gitzen asked if there would be input from staff as well, based on their
355 knowledge base.

356 Ms. Perdu advised that their input would not be sought yet, but would include a
357 more detailed version of this for their input, including their knowledge and work
358 with policies and actions since implementation; and what had been accomplished
359 or what remained to be done.

360 As part of tonight’s presentation, Ms. Perdu reviewed the goals and general
361 comments, including any that needed clarification; with a copy of the presentation
362 provided as an attachment to these minutes, attached hereto and made a part
363 hereof. In general, Ms. Perdu reviewed measurable goals, defining terms that may
364 be hard to understand, such as “sustainable” or “neighborhood character.”

365 Diversity

366 Chair Boguszewski noted his interpretation of the terms “respect” and “reflect” as
367 two entirely different terms, thereby questioning the statement to “ensure” city
368 staff and elected/appointed officials reflect diversity.

369 In general, Member Cunningham agreed on most of the statements, but noted the
370 current Planning Commission itself didn't clearly reflect diversity, since it was
371 currently entirely Caucasian.

372 Chair Boguszewski noted that was a function of who applied for vacancies as
373 well; and the application process should promote that diversity, but as currently
374 worded, appeared only to address diversity among "elected officials."

375 Member Murphy suggested striking "elected" and would support diversity among
376 appointed officials and/or city staff. However, as noted by Chair Boguszewski,
377 you couldn't mandate elected officials necessarily reflecting diversity.

378 Member Bull agreed, suggesting wording such as "we welcome diversity, but
379 don't require it."

380 Desirability

381 Ms. Perdue noted the focus on areas for place-making; and asked what was meant
382 by "business diversity."

383 With the dominance of retail in Roseville, Member Kimble suggested the need for
384 different kinds of employers beyond those in retail.

385 For further elaboration, Member Cunningham suggested different types of
386 businesses beyond chains (e.g. restaurants and/or stores) allowing for more
387 diversity as the city encourages non-chain type businesses.

388 From the Planning Commission's perspective, related to policies and practices,
389 Chair Boguszewski noted the different customer segments (e.g. four star
390 restaurant versus a food truck).

391 Member Murphy noted his confusion as to what was meant by being a "regional
392 leader in creative and sustainable areas" or what "early adopter" meant and how
393 or where it was applicable.

394 Member Gitzen noted that the "regional" category was the only place it showed
395 up in the entire document; and if applied there, it could also be applied to other
396 spots as well; stating his agreement with Member Murphy.

397 Member Daire questioned if "regional leadership" was something Roseville
398 wanted to be or already is and wanted to maintain that status; or it wasn't but
399 sought to achieve it.

400 When the Imagine Roseville 2025 visioning process occurred, Mr. Lloyd
401 suggested that it was established as a goal; with some of those ideas felt strongly
402 about by residents that they felt had been achieved by Roseville, achieved well
403 and should remain as a goal. Mr. Lloyd suggested others may be perceived as not
404 yet accomplished or as newly-articulated goals. Mr. Lloyd clarified that the job of
405 the Commission at this point was how to interpret those goals (e.g. business
406 diversity) moving forward and how that informed the plan update.

407 Ms. Perdu suggested that the wording of the goal itself should provide some
408 indication as to what degree it has or has not been achieved, whether or not the
409 wording may need changed going forward; or what was needed to achieve the

410 goal and steps in the comprehensive plan or any other document to achieve the
411 goal.

412 Member Bull noted that as Mr. Lloyd alluded to “perceived” it could simply mean
413 as a goal that Roseville was “perceived” as a regional leader, a goal.

414 Member Bull asked what was intended by “quality of life.”

415 Ms. Perdu agreed that there were many measurable ways to define that, and threw
416 the question back to the Commission for how they would measure whether the
417 city was moving in that direction or not.

418 Chair Boguszewski opined that, with implementation of the community vision,
419 Roseville had done a lot in achieving its goals over the last ten years.

420 By consensus, Commissioners agreed, noting that while in process, it also
421 remained a goal.

422 Ms. Perdu asked if the Commission wanted to be more detailed in its goals or
423 when getting into specific implementation of them.

424 Member Bull suggested qualifying goals with elements of the topic (e.g. where
425 we live, work and play) and what is the quality of life in each of those three
426 aspects.

427 Chair Boguszewski noted there were a lot of tools that could be adjunct to this
428 (e.g. community survey) and some ready-made metrics that prove achievement of
429 some of those former goals.

430 Member Gitzen suggested then, at that point, the goals be retained or serve as
431 suggested by Member Daire as a continued goal.

432 Sense of Community

433 Ms. Perdu noted many comments were received one way or the other on a
434 community center.

435 Chair Boguszewski suggested it wasn’t stating that a community center was
436 needed, but as a means to achieve a quality of life.

437 Mr. Lloyd concurred, or as a way to facilitate quality of life.

438 Resident Investment

439 Ms. Perdu noted not many comments were made on this topic; opining that
440 community survey data could inform community engagement and city
441 responsiveness.

442 Strong Sense of Community

443 Member Bull noted the pros and cons of neighborhood identifiers, opining that he
444 was seeing that throughout the city today, whether it was a goal or not. Member
445 Bull suggested thinking more about that and potentially revising it, opining that
446 sometimes neighborhood identification created stovepipes when the city was
447 attempt into build a sense of community rather than disparate groups.

448 Member Kimble opined that they were more organic and assets to a community;
449 noting that some cities around Roseville had developed communities through
450 those neighborhoods.

451 Chair Boguszewski suggested “enable” versus “promote;” with Member Kimble
452 suggesting language such as “tolerate” versus “promote”

453 Member Bull suggested more thought be put into it and how to build
454 neighborhoods into the sense of the total community instead of either/or.

455 With this goal, Member Daire stated that he felt strongly about neighborhood
456 organizations as a response mechanism and that they should be encouraged.
457 However, Member Daire stated that it struck him that a reason for people to give
458 of their time to organize or accomplish something may vary and may be without
459 any sense of competitiveness from one neighborhood or another. Member Daire
460 opined that it took art and skill to do, and while he remained in favor of it, it
461 provided for no immediate appearance of what it takes to develop an organization.
462 Using the McCarron’s Lake Neighborhood Association as an example, Member
463 Daire noted how it had been knit into the fabric of Roseville over the years; and
464 expressed his interest in seeing more of that in the community; but also noted that
465 in order to generate those types of groups, they needed to have a reason.

466 Mr. Lloyd asked how much of that the NextDoor.com platform provided for;
467 noting that it wasn’t available in 2027 when the Imagine Roseville 2025
468 document was put together. While some neighborhood groups had already formed
469 organically, Mr. Lloyd pointed out that the city had not been involved in any
470 formative way, but suggested a community based on real geography versus digital
471 geography provided by NextDoor.com.

472 Ms. Perdu suggested that would be a good topic to pursue in more detail.

473 Chair Boguszewski opined that it was an important question and suggested the
474 Commission needed to be intentional about it in a way that made sense.

475 Community Safety

476 Ms. Perdu suggested interest in making those goals stronger and sought comment
477 from the Planning Commission.

478 Member Murphy opined that the need was to consider the community’s strong
479 police, fire and emergency presence, not only for visitors but also for its residents
480 and business community.

481 Ms. Perdu agreed that was a fair point.

482 Housing

483 Ms. Perdu reviewed comments noted on the homework sheet, such as partnering
484 with the private sector; and noted questions about “funding” and whether that was
485 the right word or not when those partnerships could be beyond our outside the
486 funding realm.

487 Chair Boguszewski stated that the key nuance for him personally had been the
488 definition of “affordability.” As worded, Chair Boguszewski questioned the actual
489 metric meant by the word “sufficient” when keyed to population and whether that

490 meant a certain percentage of income earners falling into multiple income levels.
491 Chair Boguszewski questioned if that was the housing units being sought after for
492 affordable housing units, and beyond what simply made it “affordable.”

493 Ms. Perdu suggested her firm provide the Metropolitan Council’s targets for the
494 Commission’s examination and decision.

495 Chair Boguszewski questioned if they should be examined for possible adoption
496 or to inform the city’s goal, noting that the Metropolitan Council had its own
497 vision and from his personal opinion, it wasn’t always aligned with Roseville’s
498 vision. Therefore, Chair Boguszewski suggested that the information provided
499 should inform the city and this process, but not serve to define Roseville and its
500 goals.

501 Member Cunningham addressed “life cycle housing” opining that this was one
502 area specifically identified already that is lacking in Roseville (e.g. step-up
503 housing). Member Cunningham suggested one way to address that more
504 specifically would be to break it out into its own category similar to that of the
505 “affordable” category, bringing more awareness to it.

506 Member Bull admitted he didn’t understand how “revise” or “delete” fit into the
507 comprehensive plan (e.g. maintain properties).

508 Ms. Perdu clarified that if the city envisions being devoted to building
509 maintenance programs, code enforcement, loans to maintain properties, etc. it
510 depended on the direction the city wanted to go.

511 Chair Boguszewski noted that some of those programs were already in place.

512 Member Murphy stated he had included “partially” in his notes because of those
513 initial steps to achieve safe and well-maintained properties, many already in
514 place.

515 Mr. Lloyd noted the city’s current dual approach for cycling through residential
516 and commercial areas of the city, from the boulevard, to determine if there were
517 issues in evidence to identify for correction or enforcement. While that inspection
518 cycle continues, Mr. Lloyd advised it responded to that initial goal.

519 Member Bull questioned how that fit into the comprehensive plan, with Mr. Lloyd
520 responding that it was addressed in the “neighborhoods” or “housing” chapters
521 with goals or policies revolving around that very action. As these goals are
522 determined and what they mean is fleshed out in detail, Mr. Lloyd noted that they
523 would in turn result in policies set forth by the City Council to achieve or
524 maintain those goals. In other words, ensuring the community continued to
525 comply with city code.

526 Member Murphy advised that he had been the one commenting on funding,
527 recognizing the desire to ensure affordable housing and funding; but also
528 maintaining housing programs that captured funding as only one particular
529 solution but part of many other components.

530 Ms. Perdu duly noted that consideration, suggesting it be reworded as with several
531 other categories based on tonight’s comments.

532 Chair Boguszewski stated that the word “character” set him off when used as a
533 term, supporting the Roseville line that “you don’t know what it is, but you know
534 it when you hear it.” Chair Boguszewski stated his preference for clear definitions
535 versus tolerance for terms not easily definable, such as “sustainability” to provide
536 a measurement, or strip them out of the goals if subjective or only guiding the
537 desired goals.

538 Ms. Perdu suggested that was a good topic for future discussion.

539 Environmental Health

540 Ms. Perdu noted the few comments provided by individual commissioners on
541 measurable and splitting up energy conservation and pollution reduction as
542 separate topics with different implementation strategies. Ms. Perdu suggested that
543 the “resilience” chapter look at that.

544 Chair Boguszewski reiterated the need for easy to measure goals.

545 Parks, Open Space and Recreation

546 Ms. Perdu advised that there would be more discussion on this area when getting
547 to a discussion of objectives.

548 Chair Boguszewski noted the success of Roseville’s park system, and his
549 numerous notations in the “implemented” category given recent improvements
550 and funding of that system.

551 Health and Wellness

552 With the agreement of Chair Boguszewski, Ms. Perdu suggested the need to look
553 at metrics and the city’s role in supporting it and whether “enable” was the correct
554 term.

555 Lifelong Learning

556 Ms. Perdu noted lots of support for the existing status, while many were not
557 directly under the city’s control; but involved more partnering and city-support of
558 area educational institutions when and if indicated.

559 Member Murphy noted that his comment to “sustain cutting-edge technology” be
560 deleted, since it wasn’t in the city’s backyard when there were now so many
561 commercial alternatives, including the county library and school system reaching
562 out. Therefore, Member Murphy opined that it wasn’t his job to know how to rate
563 or assign goals; and asked if there was any support among his colleagues as to
564 whether or not this should remain as a goal.

565 Member Bull suggested it could mean the city supporting high density wi-fi or
566 cable television capabilities and providing access through its public utilities.

567 Member Murphy opined that he could see support, but continued to be concerned
568 with the language “provide.”

569 Member Bull agreed that it needed rewording.

570 Ms. Perdue duly noted that suggestion.

571 Transportation

572 Member Bull opined that transportation needs may change dramatically by 2040.

573 Mr. Lloyd suggested looking at this from two sides: the network on which people
574 moved around and how those same people got around on it.

575 Member Murphy questioned the goal for “publicly funded transportation;”
576 questioning how the city accomplished that, considering how to write individual
577 performance goals or a year-end review of that aspect. Other than something like
578 the Roseville Circulator, Member Murphy questioned how to address the broader
579 transit system beyond ensuring potholes were fixed on city roadways.

580 Member Gitzen suggested this took into consideration partnering opportunities
581 with Ramsey County and the State and alternate funding; recognizing that those
582 roads were maintained via a partnership and were not the city’s sole
583 responsibility.

584 Member Murphy stated that he thought that had been included in the “public
585 transit system” goal; with Chair Boguszewski agreeing with that interpretation as
586 well.

587 From that perspective, Chair Boguszewski suggested not having a goal to “fund”
588 through the city’s tax base but to clarify above that and allow access but not
589 ensuring it, but only enabling it, especially those areas beyond the city’s
590 jurisdiction.

591 Based on the Roseville Facebook page, and Roseville being equidistant from both
592 downtowns, Member Daire suggested encouraging the Metropolitan Council’s
593 extension of public traffic connections, including feeder bus systems that in turn
594 fed employment centers and encouraged people working there to consider
595 Roseville as their home. Member Daire opined that this may provide a significant
596 and attractive feature especially given the high cost of parking in either
597 downtown; if public transit such as the signature light rail – could be made
598 attractive. Member Daire opined that the city would then have a significant role in
599 encouraging those types of facilities, whether or not they required city funding
600 participation or not.

601 Member Kimble suggested “advocating” as the term versus “funding (e.g. BRT
602 and Park & Ride facilities).

603 Mr. Paschke noted they could be accomplished through different means of
604 taxation outside the city’s tax base.

605 Chair Boguszewski noted the Roseville City Council’s lobbying efforts to
606 facilitate doing the BRT in the right way; suggesting that type of activity could be
607 encouraged on the part of staff, the City Council, and its advisory commissions;
608 with funding often being the hardest part.

609 Member Bull noted the MnDOT survey on biking released last week; and asked
610 that staff make sure the commission received a copy of that.

611 Mr. Paschke advised that he would alert the Public Works Director and City
612 Engineer to provide a copy.

613 Infrastructure

614 Ms. Perdu noted the consensus of comments to reword this section regarding

615 funding and whether it should be part of the actual goal or simply an
616 implementation strategy; and recognizing that “environmentally sensitive” was
617 too vague of a term to define. Ms. Perdu further noted the resiliency portion in
618 this infrastructure category and as a separate chapter suggested for the 2040 plan
619 update moving forward, and including a resiliency concept there.

620 Ms. Perdu opined those were good suggestions to lead into the future, particularly
621 regarding the utility chapter.

622 Technology

623 Ms. Perdu stated that the main comment she observed was rewording of
624 public/private partnerships so it was clearly not the city’s responsibility to
625 provide, but a partnership with other entities.

626 Member Murphy stated that if the intent was for development of long-term
627 technology infrastructure, if for city staff or for the city as a whole, he stated first
628 he would consider it to conduct Roseville operations; and if applying to the whole
629 city if applicable.

630 While unsure how it was originally intended, Mr. Lloyd suggested that some
631 years back there were a number of new installations for wireless and cellular
632 infrastructure, and the city’s Information Technology, Inspections, and Police
633 staff were jointly interested in that network and advocating for its completion. Mr.
634 Lloyd noted that this provided for wireless access to office files for them in when
635 out in the field; and suggested that may have led to the city services side versus
636 that of the broader community.

637 Specific to the broader community, Mr. Paschke noted that the city controlled
638 many of the rights-of-way where that infrastructure was located (e.g. fiber optic
639 systems) that may be a public/private partnership; but still needed a plan to
640 determine where it made sense to initially install them. Mr. Paschke opined it was
641 more holistic for the city to continue to move down that road as technology
642 continued to evolve. Mr. Paschke noted that most towers were owned by the city
643 or were on city-owned property; and noted the need to tie that all in when
644 considering the benefit to the broader community.

645 Chair Boguszewski stated that had been how he interpreted this category, using
646 the City of Minneapolis and their maintenance of the public wi-fi system as an
647 example, which he considered a good thing. Since this had now become a basic
648 expectation of life, Chair Boguszewski opined that he saw nothing wrong with
649 retaining it as a goal.

650 Mr. Paschke noted that the city held franchise agreements with Comcast, with all
651 that also tied to this goal and negotiations handled by the city on behalf of the
652 community.

653 Member Bull noted that future technology could include drones reading water
654 meters; garbage cans connected to wi-fi to know when they should be emptied,
655 etc.

656 Tax Base

657 In the category of “encouraging renovation and redevelopment,” Member Kimble

658 referenced the previous discussion about encouraging diversity of business types
659 that the city was trying to attract, and establishing a diverse tax base beyond retail
660 and encompassing a whole complement of types.

661 Member Bull stated that he didn't like how that motivation sounded: that the city
662 wanted diversity so it could increase its tax base.

663 Member Kimble clarified that she wasn't aware of a category talking about jobs;
664 but noted the need to include jobs as a goal.

665 Mr. Lloyd suggested incorporating "jobs" into the "Making Roseville a good
666 place to live, work and play" category.

667 Ms. Perdu agreed this was not specific to a separate "job" category.

668 Ms. Collins noted that some of that was articulated within the objectives of the
669 recently City Council adopted Public Financing Policy, defining when the city
670 was going to provide a subsidy and financing. Ms. Collins advised that she would
671 provide a copy of that to Ms. Perdu for incorporation in the comprehensive plan if
672 and as applicable.

673 Chair Boguszewski noted that "job growth" was the key phrase; with Member
674 Kimble adding "quality" as another key.

675 Specific to the business diversity question, Chair Boguszewski noted the need to
676 consider whether or not to enable someone at either end of the job spectrum to
677 make Roseville their home; and the kinds of jobs that needed to develop to suit
678 either of those levels of profession, indicating multiple levels of job types to
679 support.

680 Ms. Collins responded that the city could easily promote diverse jobs in the
681 community while encouraging high wage jobs as well; opining it involved two
682 separate priorities. As an example, Ms. Collins noted the large amount of retail
683 and low wage jobs while seeking higher wage jobs and having those two
684 components work together across a broad spectrum.

685 Member Daire suggested language such as "to encourage diverse, high wage
686 jobs."

687 Ms. Collins disagreed with that language, opining the two were not the same, and
688 that both goals could be accomplished: enabling a diverse array of jobs while also
689 encouraging livable wage jobs.

690 Ms. Perdu thanked the commission and staff for their comments, and agreed to
691 work on that language.

692 In an effort to think outside the box, Member Gitzen suggested another question
693 for tomorrow's meeting with middle school students to determine what those
694 students envisioned twenty years down the road and outside preconceived
695 notions.

696 Ms. Perdu duly noted that suggestion; and opined that as the public engagement
697 process proceeded, it would further inform this area.

698 In conclusion, Ms. Perdu thanked the commission for their comments; and
699 advised that she would be rewriting the goals per those written comments and
700 tonight’s discussion to provide the public something to react to.

701 Next Steps

702 After tomorrow morning’s meeting with “Future City” students, Ms. Perdu
703 advised that their firm would be providing an update to staff to disseminate to the
704 commission for their February work session; including a first draft of these
705 updated visioning goals.

706 Ms. Perdu reiterated the anticipated public kick-off on March 7, 2017, with
707 additional details to follow once finalized; and followed by the launching of the
708 public website.

709 At the request of Member Bull, Mr. Lloyd reiterated that the intent was for regular
710 updates from staff at each regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting
711 with information on accomplishments since the last meeting and brief overview of
712 upcoming events and activities. However, given regular land-use issues and
713 ongoing workload for the Commission, Mr. Lloyd clarified that no detailed
714 content about the comprehensive plan update was intended at those regular
715 meetings, but would take place at the second special meeting of the Commission
716 scheduled for the fourth Wednesday of each month.

717 **5. Adjourn**

718 Chair Boguszewski adjourned the meeting at approximately 8:32 p.m.

719