



**Planning Commission – Comprehensive Plan Update Meeting
City Council Chambers, 2660 Civic Center Drive
Minutes – Wednesday, February 22, 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; and Commissioners James Daire,
8 Chuck Gitzen, James Bull, Julie Kimble and Robert Murphy
9 **Members Absent:** Vice Chair Shannon Cunningham (resigned)
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. Review of Minutes**
14 **a. January 25, 2016 Special Planning Commission Meeting - Comprehensive**
15 **Plan Update**
16 **MOTION**
17 **Member Bull moved, seconded by Member Gitzen to approve the January**
18 **25, 2017 meeting minutes as presented.**
19 **Ayes: 6**
20 **Nays: 0**
21 **Motion carried**
- 22 **4. Communications and Recognitions:**
23 **a. From the Public (Public comment pertaining to general land use issues no on**
24 **this agenda)**
25 None.
26 **b. From the Commission or Staff (Information about assorted business not**
27 **already on this agenda including a brief update on the 2040 Comprehensive**
28 **Plan Update process)**
29 Chair Boguszewski announced that he would be unavailable to attend the March
30 1, 2017 regular Planning Commission; and with the recent resignation of Vice
31 Chair Cunningham, a formal action was required at tonight’s meeting to fill the
32 role of Interim Vice Chair to facilitate that meeting and until elections were held
33 with City Council appointment of new commissioners in April. Even though his
34 term would expire March 31, 2017, Chair Boguszewski stated his intent to attend
35 the last meeting in March.
36 Chair Boguszewski further reported that, as Planning Commission Chair, he had
37 been invited and planned to attend upcoming interviews by the City Council of

38 applicants to the Commission and provide any input. Chair Boguszewski reported
39 that of a total of twenty-nine applicants for all commission vacancies, with two
40 vacancies (one partial term and one full term) on the Planning Commission and
41 eleven candidates total for this commission, eight indicated it as their first choice
42 and three as their second choice.

43 At the request of Chair Boguszewski, Community Development Director Collins
44 advised that applications would be posted for public viewing on the city’s website
45 tomorrow in preparation for the February 27, 2017 City Council meeting at which
46 time interviews would occur.

47 Senior Planner Bryan Lloyd provided a brief scheduling update for the
48 comprehensive plan update at this time since its last iteration; with the Planning
49 Commission’s fourth Wednesday in March special meeting intended for finalizing
50 the schedule. Mr. Lloyd advised that post card mailings had been sent to all
51 Roseville residents and tenants for announcing the public kick-off for the
52 comprehensive plan update for March 7, 2017 at 6:00 p.m. in the Roseville
53 Skating Center – Rosewood Room. Mr. Lloyd further advised that additional
54 information was available on the city’s website and web page dedicated to the
55 comprehensive plan, as well as an online survey to gather public comment.

56 As noted in meeting minutes from the last meeting (line 609), Member Bull noted
57 that he had requested staff provide a copy of the MnDOT survey on Viking to
58 Planning Commissioners, which he hadn’t seen yet.

59 Mr. Lloyd apologized for the delay, explaining that staff was in the middle of
60 performing a website update and the intent was to distribute it electronically for
61 the Commission at that point. However, if the Commission preferred a hard copy
62 as an ancillary version, Mr. Lloyd offered to provide it.

63 Member Bull, and his colleagues, expressed their preference for an electronic
64 version; duly noted by staff.

65 **5. Project File 0037: 2040 Comprehensive Plan Update**

66 While Mr. Lloyd clarified that this was intended as a public discussion and not a formal
67 public hearing that would have been duly noticed as such, Chair Boguszewski opened
68 discussions at approximately 6:40 p.m.

69 **b. Public Kick-Off**

70 Ms. Perdu noted that draft materials prepared for the public kick-off meeting were
71 provided in tonight’s meeting packet for commission review; and advised that
72 tonight’s focus would be a walk through of revisions to the value and goal review
73 portion of the comprehensive plan update based on input from previous meetings.
74 Depending on available time tonight, Ms. Perdu further advised that next steps
75 would be addressed at the end of the discussion.

76 As part of the public kick-off, Ms. Perdu noted that various interactive and
77 educational pieces would be involved, including small group visioning exercises
78 as per provided instructions and exercise sheets used by note takers in collecting
79 information during the exercises and used afterward for the broader group of
80 attendees to share.

81 Exercise One: Things to change...things to retain
82 At the request of Member Gitzen, Ms. Perdu advised that this idea had been
83 framed by Ms. Major and each group small group would decide which of the
84 three or more exercises to discuss. As noted by Member Gitzen, Ms. Perdu noted
85 the possibility that some may not be interested in the topic chosen by their
86 particular small group, and a way should be provided for them to join other
87 groups where they found the discussion more relevant to their interests. Ms. Perdu
88 suggested perhaps another way would be to allow participants to gather by topic
89 and then rotate groups, depending on how Ms. Major decided to facilitate the
90 process.

91 Member Kimble stated her support for the simplicity of the packet materials,
92 opining that she found them to be straightforward and providing an easy way to
93 get started. Specific to exercise two, Member Kimble suggested defining the term
94 “public facilities, since that may mean different things to different people; and
95 didn’t fully address the concept of “social spaces” as part of that definition and
96 not exclusive to housing. Otherwise, Member Kimble opined that she found the
97 other exercises to be solid.

98 Ms. Perdu agreed that a broader term should be applied to the term “public
99 facilities” versus something more specific.

100 Chair Boguszewski suggested having larger map print outs available on each table
101 for participants to view more easily as well as mark up during their discussions;
102 duly noted by Ms. Perdu.

103 Member Murphy agreed, noting having larger maps available in past Twin Lakes
104 Redevelopment Area discussions had been helpful; and suggested not only having
105 them on the tables, but also displayed or available around the room as well.

106 Ms. Perdu noted that the intent was to have context boards and maps located
107 around the room.

108 Specific to facilitators and note takers for the event, Ms. Perdu clarified that they
109 would rotate around the room so as not to intimidate the discussion.

110 Exercise Two: Ideas for Roseville
111 Ms. Perdu noted the notes included to provide prompts if needed for possible
112 ideas or focus areas to initiate discussion.

113 Exercise Three: Draw connections, barriers, special places, or unique possibilities
114 on the map and with comments as preferred
115 While he considered facilitators to be a key component of the process, specific to
116 mapping, Chair Boguszewski reiterated his interest in having a pile of maps at
117 each table for individual input plus larger ones.

118 As noted by Member Kimble, Ms. Perdu explained that often at the start of the
119 event, a speaker would use a highlighter to provide examples to get conversations
120 started.

121 In seeking to finalize this, Ms. Perdu noted the intent for response sheet available
122 at each table that would be collated, as well as information gathered from
123 intercept boards displayed in public places to allow for quick input from those

Planning Commission – Comprehensive Plan Update

Minutes – Wednesday, January 25, 2017

Page 4

124 walking by versus in-depth conversations with different colored dots for various
125 questions. At the request of Member Kimble, Ms. Perdu confirmed that a different
126 color dot could be provided for those not living in Roseville. Ms. Perdu clarified
127 that the intercept boards were not intended to be at the kick-off meeting, but
128 placed at various locations around town and at different community activities to
129 catch people shopping or at those events, and then providing a composite of those
130 responses; with print out versions for each site used for intercept boards, and then
131 combined with the information gathered from the kick-off meeting and other
132 sources during the community engagement opportunities.

133 At the request of Member Gitzen, Ms. Perdu advised that the length of time
134 intercept boards would be left out would vary depending on the event, meeting or
135 activity and that particular group, as well as determined in some cases by how
136 long the boards would be allowed (e.g. multi-family buildings).

137 At the request of Member Bull for quantitative information would be determined,
138 Ms. Perdu clarified that most of the information gathered would be qualitative in
139 nature and all comments consolidated and grouped by category for common
140 themes to develop relative priorities depending on the number of times
141 mentioned. Ms. Perdu noted that sometimes useful information is received that
142 may need further discussion by the Commission; but the themes identified would
143 then move forward to the applicable chapter for the plan.

144 Chair Boguszewski opined that some ideas heard at the kick-off could be used as
145 seed thoughts for future meetings (e.g. meetings in a box) in neighborhoods and
146 tested from a small group to a broader group to help determine priorities.

147 Ms. Perdu concurred, noting that while there was a sense of city priorities, there
148 were also priorities of the community that would help set the stage for the
149 remainder of the work and frame discussion questions for the website and moving
150 forward at focus groups.

151 Member Gitzen asked if intercept board input was weighted by location that could
152 change overall results.

153 Ms. Perdu stated that it was clearly recognized beforehand that results may
154 change depending on where the questions were being asked and advised that that
155 locations of meetings or focus groups were taken into consideration and shaped
156 the information received. At the request of Member Gitzen, Ms. Perdu confirmed
157 that results by location were considered, and if something stood out it would be
158 correlated to that area if not showing up elsewhere.

159 Member Daire asked how divergent comments were balanced (e.g. sidewalks in
160 desired for an urban community versus residents preferring a more rural feel) and
161 how those interests were addressed whether related to safety concerns for
162 pedestrian, vehicular or bike traffic or financial or assessments concerns of
163 citizens.

164 Ms. Perdu agreed that it was difficult to find that balance and advised that those
165 issues would need discussion and recommendation by the commission to the City
166 Council if city policy needed adopted or revised. Using the sidewalk example as
167 one that may be controversial, Ms. Perdu noted that this may be where a location-

168 specific or neighborhood/street character discussion would occur, and using
169 information gathered specific to those areas.

170 With this process, Chair Boguszewski clarified that ultimately the Planning
171 Commission and City Council served as decision-making bodies, and noted that
172 part of leadership may not necessarily result in what the public wanted since
173 things were decided from a broader, community-wide perspective and decided
174 using various aspects. When a solution was presented, Chair Boguszewski noted
175 that those underlying issues could be identified and impacts and ramifications
176 determined through those various methods. Chair Boguszewski opined that the
177 ultimate goal was to encourage any solutions suggested be further researched to
178 find a viable way to achieve the same goal(s).

179 Ms. Perdu advised that she would consult with Ms. Major and incorporate
180 suggestions made tonight for the public engagement sessions to follow, beginning
181 with the March 7th kick-off and encouraged commissioners to attend as residents
182 as well as in their commission roles.

183 **a. Task 1: Review of Vision and Goals**

184 *Continue the discussion of the vision and goal statements of Imagine Roseville*
185 *2025, the foundation for the current comprehensive planning process*

186 In reviewing this current draft of visions and goals, Ms. Perdu noted they had
187 been made more detailed and measurable based on previous discussions with the
188 commission. Ms. Perdu advised that these modifications would subsequently
189 continue to evolve based on what was heard from the public, with this first draft
190 based on staff and commission feedback to-date.

191 Once these draft goals and objectives were finalized tonight, Chair Boguszewski
192 suggested that they be reformatted, based on the draft Table of Contents, in order
193 that metric measurements could be applied, similar to the example provided as a
194 model rubric provided from the City of Ypsilanti.

195 Member Kimble sought confirmation that they would again be revised after
196 public comment, using the desire for a “community center” as an example that
197 may be heard from the public. Ms. Perdu confirmed that public engagement
198 comments were not yet reflected. Ms. Perdu noted that existing comprehensive
199 plan goals and policies may also inform this updated plan.

200 Roseville is a welcoming community...

201 Member Bull stated his disagreement with using “high quality communication” as
202 that didn’t make a community livable, and from his perspective didn’t define
203 livability.

204 Specific to the diversity goal, Member Kimble suggested “embracing cultural
205 differences,” with Member Bull in agreement, stating that “communication” was
206 too limiting.

207 Ms. Perdu clarified that the intent when originally written was to tie “welcoming”
208 with “diversity” and offered to include that intent to be welcoming beyond simply
209 communication.

Planning Commission – Comprehensive Plan Update

Minutes – Wednesday, January 25, 2017

Page 6

210 Chair Boguszewski agreed with his colleagues, opining that there were more ways
211 to describe the intent than three specific ways as currently written, with agreement
212 from Members Bull and Kimble. However, Chair Boguszewski questioned if
213 “livable” was the right word or if “welcoming” was more appropriate.

214 Member Kimble stated that from her perspective, “livable” had a different
215 definition than “diverse” and she considered them separate topics even though
216 they overlapped to some degree.

217 Mr. Lloyd noted that, as the core comment, he saw it being more about the “all”
218 portion of the statement versus the “livable” portion. Mr. Lloyd noted that there
219 were a number of goals to improve the livability of the community, and this
220 worked for him by keeping “all” in mind.

221 Using that thought, Chair Boguszewski suggested revised language to “make
222 Roseville a community for “ALL.”

223 Ms. Perdu advised that that was the previous language before the commission
224 expanded it.

225 Member Murphy questioned what the intended focus of “all” was.

226 Ms. Perdu responded that the intent was to apply “all” goals and objectives that
227 would make the community livable for “all” populations. Ms. Perdu advised that
228 she would approach the language differently in a revised iteration.

229 Roseville is a desirable place to live, work and play

230 Ms. Perdu again noted that this draft included suggestions made by the
231 commission at their previous meetings.

232 Member Bull suggested, in the statement about place-making principles in the
233 public realm that the language be made more colloquial to include all, questioning
234 if and how the general public would understand the intent.

235 At the request of Chair Boguszewski as to the intent for that language, Ms. Perdu
236 responded that she thought of urban planning, or complete streets as an example,
237 in using place-making principles in the “public realm” such as on rights-of-ways
238 and streets. However, Ms. Perdu recognized the need to clarify any such jargon
239 for the general public to understand.

240 Speaking of the diversity of the community, Chair Boguszewski asked if the
241 intent for the kick-off and other events was to have language translators available
242 or some nuance for those non English-speaking members of the community.

243 Mr. Lloyd advised that staff had not yet conferred with Ms. Major and the typical
244 process followed. Mr. Lloyd reiterated that all residents, including all known
245 property owners and renters, had been mailed a post card
246 invitation/announcement, but without knowing who may show up it was difficult
247 to determine what language services should be made available.

248 Chair Boguszewski stated that if all documents were published in English and
249 used architectural jargon at a Ninth grade level, it would be unwise to have people
250 show up and then feel marginalized.

251 Mr. Lloyd advised that further consideration would be given to facilitate smaller
252 groups and which may need translation services.

253 Whether those translators were paid or volunteers, Chair Boguszewski opined that
254 their services wouldn't be wasted. Chair Boguszewski suggested that those
255 translators could even take meeting results or summaries outside the meeting and
256 communicate them with the diverse community outside the kick-off meeting,
257 and/or publish them in various languages.

258 Community Development Director Collins reported that the city had a
259 Community Service Officer who spoke Karen; and also noted that Executive
260 Directors of the Karen Organization of Minnesota (KOM) had received
261 invitations, with the intent that they would take information back to that
262 community for their after-the-fact feedback versus immediate feedback. However,
263 Ms. Collins advised that she would also consult with the KOM to see if they've
264 heard of interest from that community in attending or if they suggested having a
265 translator available that night.

266 Member Gitzen stated his appreciation for the word "create" as being attractive
267 and vibrant, indicating that while it may not be something the community yet had,
268 it could actually also be a continuation of something already in place. Member
269 Bull suggested the word "continue," while Member Kimble suggested "foster"
270 and Chair Boguszewski suggested using "maintain" or "strengthen."

271 Member Kimble advised that she had inked up her copy and did considerable
272 wordsmithing before tonight's meeting, but didn't know if her colleagues would
273 be comfortable with any or all of her suggested language style changes. Member
274 Kimble stated that her intent was to focus on "inviting social spaces" and
275 "effective city..." to foster connections.

276 Ms. Perdu stated that specific wordsmithing ideas should be funneled through Mr.
277 Lloyd for forwarding to her and Ms. Major.

278 Member Gitzen noted that this wasn't the final document and as Ms. Perdu stated
279 it would continue to evolve.

280 Member Daire noted that the bottom line was to at all costs avoid using
281 professional jargon that may intimidate people or not seem to talk down to them,
282 but instead communicate with them in their comfort vernacular.

283 Ms. Perdu stated that point was well-taken and offered to personally review the
284 document again with that in mind.

285 In the "business diversity" section, Ms. Perdu sought additional feedback from the
286 commission beyond their last discussion.

287 Member Kimble noted her perspective of "diversifying beyond chains," using
288 restaurants as an example of chains such as if there was a similar one in a
289 neighboring community or if it was family-owned versus being a chain. Member
290 Kimble noted that at this time, Roseville didn't have that diversity in many
291 businesses and the intent was to avoid Roseville being just a destination for
292 national chains; perhaps addressing ownership versus franchises.

Planning Commission – Comprehensive Plan Update

Minutes – Wednesday, January 25, 2017

Page 8

293 Member Murphy stated his satisfaction with “type” to capture the spirit of the
294 intent.

295 Ms. Collins advised that in conversations with the Julie Wearn, Director of the
296 Roseville Visitors Association (RVA), the RVA supported more destination
297 places or defining them as Mom/Pop or ethnic restaurants; thereby encouraging
298 more “destination locations or businesses” to get at the heart of it.

299 Chair Boguszewski suggested adding an additional bullet point to capture that
300 idea to “encourage unique businesses serving as destination points for business.”
301 Chair Boguszewski questioned if the goal was to increase or inspire diversity and
302 what would be measurable beyond market forces that were beyond the city’s
303 control. Chair Boguszewski suggested that may be to remove barriers, and
304 suggested the next iteration include “encourage” as the objective; duly noted by
305 Ms. Perdu.

306 Roseville has a strong and inclusive sense of community
307 Specific to large and small gathering places, Member Murphy opined that
308 Member Kimble’s previous comment on “social spaces” captured that intent.

309 Member Kimble opined that whether large or small, the idea of “place-making”
310 was to create the ability for people to connect and use the city’s infrastructure for
311 social activities versus just being there; and to draw people into those interactions,
312 making them a “place.”

313 In his related summarization of the letter received from the instructor for the
314 “Future Cities” students, Member Daire opined that things like block parties and
315 “National Night Out” where a street was blocked out for gathering a
316 neighborhood together created a social space. Member Daire spoke in support of
317 encouraging those types of activities and events to address this objective, and not
318 just focus on a facility, noting his preference for multi-use spaces.

319 At the request of Member Kimble, Member Daire concurred that he was thinking
320 to replace “community” with “social” to consider outdoor events and activities
321 that weren’t necessarily tied to a physical structure, but possibly a street.

322 Mr. Lloyd suggested removing that from this particular list, as well as removing
323 “community center,” clarifying that he wasn’t against a community center, but
324 clarified that it was intended as a solution, not a goal; with Chair Boguszewski
325 concurring with that revision.

326 Member Daire noted the intent was to foster and support large and small
327 gathering place, with a community center serving as just one example.

328 Chair Boguszewski and Member Gitzen expressed their interest in keeping any
329 reference to a community center out of this document, even if used as an example,
330 in order to determine if it comes back up as a result of this process. With the
331 exclusion of Member Daire, all members concurred to remove reference to a
332 community center from this document.

333 With concurrence by Ms. Perdu, Chair Boguszewski directed that it be left out of
334 the document for now, and while this wasn’t intended to shut anyone down if that
335 topic came up, it would allow active tracking of those mentions.

336
337

338
339
340
341
342

343
344

345
346
347
348

349

350
351

352
353
354

355
356
357
358

359
360
361
362

363
364

365
366

367
368
369

370
371
372

373
374
375
376
377

Roseville residents are invested in their community
Ms. Perdu advised that no changes were made to this section.

Roseville is a safe community
With a few changes highlighted by Ms. Perdu, Member Kimble suggested changing language in the first line in consideration of the world we now live in to state, "...continue to provide efficient and effective..." versus using the word "trusted."

However, Member Bull opined the possible difficulty in creating a measurable goal.

Chair Boguszewski opined that "trusted" is a key attribute desired in municipal responders (e.g. trustworthiness by the Police Department) and questioned if that was a role of the comprehensive plan, or if that was specific to trying to achieve more efficiency by design, etc.

Member Kimble suggested that may be a result.

Member Gitzen suggested changing language to "... so ALL RESIDENTS..." that was approved by consensus.

At the question by Chair Boguszewski as to whether that indicated urban design, Ms. Perdu responded that it should simply be "design" without any further designation.

To address Member Daire's previous suggestion about "urban" versus "suburban" preferences and achieving a balance, Chair Boguszewski suggested that this statement therefore not make presumptions; with Ms. Perdu advising that she would make sure more generic language was used.

Roseville housing meets community needs
Ms. Perdu highlighted several changes, including public/private partnerships and removal of specific references to funding as previously suggested by the commission.

Member Bull suggested that with "public/private" the goal was to "attract and retain" versus simply attracting.

Member Kimble questioned if this was specific to housing or in reference to economic development in general.

Ms. Perdu responded that there was another set of goals for economic development, and while some of the goals may overlap, language to "attract and retain" was generally used for economic development.

Based on Member Bull's comment, Chair Boguszewski suggested – with agreement from Member Bull – to revise language such as "...to be attractive to a diverse mix of people;" duly noted by Ms. Perdu.

As to Chair Boguszewski's concern as to whether that revision might side-step the economic development issue, Ms. Perdu advised that it was covered later in the last page of the document in the economic development section. Ms. Perdu advised that in the housing goal, she had added an objective specific to employment that wasn't only specific to economic development.

Planning Commission – Comprehensive Plan Update

Minutes – Wednesday, January 25, 2017

Page 10

378 Ms. Collins agreed, noting that it was touched on in the “Roseville is a desirable
379 place to live work and play,” as well as in the business diversity and sustainable
380 development sections.

381 Member Gitzen suggested another inclusive statement such as whether or not the
382 city was meeting affordable housing standards for “all.”

383 In the third bullet point specific to implementing programs resulting in safe and
384 well-maintained properties, Member Kimble suggested some programs and
385 policies may be missing as a result. While understanding that references to
386 “funding” had intentionally been removed understanding that it was considered a
387 solution not a goal, Member Kimble stated that it was hard for her to consider
388 public/private partnerships as being effective without the city developing,
389 researching and/or addressing new financing tools. At a minimum, Member
390 Kimble opined that it was important for the city to consider looking at financial
391 tools it could develop.

392 Ms. Perdu clarified that the housing chapter of the comprehensive plan would get
393 into that in more detail specific to the tools the city has available to use.

394 Chair Boguszewski suggested that language be revised such as “...explore
395 innovative financing models or tools” as well.

396 Roseville is an environmentally healthy community

397 Specific to “reducing or incenting the reduction of non-renewable energy,” Chair
398 Boguszewski noted that the city may not in reality have that authority or ability
399 and therefore questioned how it could put policies in place to incent that
400 reduction.

401 Mr. Lloyd responded that he wasn’t sure how it applied to this section, but
402 admitted that he had a similar thought along the lines of whether this was the
403 appropriate place to state the city’s goals, while recognizing that the goal was to
404 reduce or encourage a reduction in consumption.

405 With several suggestions offered from individual commissioners, Ms. Perdu
406 cautioned the need for having measurable goals and objectives; with Member
407 Kimble agreeing that base lines were needed to facilitate that measurement.

408 Member Daire asked how the city could compel reduction of non-renewable
409 energy or if the city was in a position to do so and if so, what instruments it had
410 available toward that required reduction or how it could directly incent others.

411 Mr. Lloyd clarified that it wasn’t a requirement, but as an example noted the
412 city’s implementation of geothermal at City Hall and encouraged solar energy
413 production for residential and commercial properties in the community, all
414 leading to that goal of reduction.

415 Member Murphy stated that he took it not as compelling, but perhaps through
416 ordinance revisions that address solar panels on a roof without objection by a
417 neighbor. In other words, Member Murphy noted his focus on removing obstacles
418 versus providing financial incentives.

419 To Chair Boguszewski’s point to create an incentive, Member Daire noted it
420 would benefit residents if the city took actions to reduce property taxes for its
421 taxpayers.

422 Ms. Perdu stated that there was a combination of things available for a city to do
423 directly to reduce its consumption as well as that of the entire community
424 represented by a number that could be used to reduce consumption.

425 Member Kimble suggested removing “the” from the statement to that it read
426 “...reducing consumption of non-renewable energy...” and having a goal to
427 encourage the rest of the community to follow the city’s lead.

428 With the word “encourage” used repeatedly, Chair Boguszewski suggested using
429 “incent” instead as a form of encouragement.

430 Member Kimble opined that “incent” jumped to a conclusion of financial gain.

431 Ms. Perdu clarified that the intent was to address public objectives for the city to
432 directly pursue and accomplish, as well as considering private incentives.

433 Roseville has world-renowned parks, open space...

434 Ms. Perdu advised that no changes had been made to this section.

435 Roseville supports health and wellness...

436 At the suggestion that infrastructure could encourage wellness (e.g. walking and
437 biking), by consensus, Chair Boguszewski directed that be included in the
438 language; and was duly noted by Ms. Perdu.

439 Roseville supports high quality, lifelong learning

440 As per previous discussions with the commission, Ms. Perdu noted that this
441 addressed the city’s role versus that of the school districts, and wording had been
442 changed accordingly to address collaboration toward that goal.

443 Chair Boguszewski agreed, noting the Harriet Alexander Nature Center (HANC)
444 was also an educational opportunity.

445 Member Daire asked if the statement should be that the city encouraged school
446 districts to increase the standing of local schools in the region or if it was better to
447 remain silent on that issue. If the city was to endorse quality, life-long learning,
448 Member Daire suggested specific ideas.

449 While recusing himself from the discussion due to his role as a Board Member of
450 School District 623, Chair Boguszewski personally opined that this would be
451 overstepping the role of the city.

452 Member Bull opined that specific ideas were provided and included HANC, the
453 Ramsey County Library-Roseville branch and other opportunities.

454 Chair Boguszewski noted that City Manager Trudgeon was currently meeting
455 with School District 621 representatives to gather ways in which to work
456 collaboratively. However, Chair Boguszewski personally opined that this
457 language as written supported such collaboration without any further detail or
458 weight given to it.

Planning Commission – Comprehensive Plan Update

Minutes – Wednesday, January 25, 2017

Page 12

459 Mr. Lloyd also noted that Community Development staff provided periodic
460 education programming series using library space on various general topics that
461 were sponsored by the city to some degree and in partnership with other agencies.

462 At the request of Member Daire, Chair Boguszewski clarified that community
463 education was essentially a function of the School Districts. From a practical
464 standpoint, Member Daire suggested that a statement could be made that the city
465 could suggest some areas for that continuing education based on public hearing
466 comments heard at Planning Commission meetings to inform residents, or help
467 fund programs. Chair Boguszewski noted current discussions and collaboration by
468 the school board and city with the school facility study was an example of just
469 one of the many areas they worked together; opining this goal simply set the stage
470 for that collaboration to occur.

471 Chair Boguszewski further opined that anywhere reference was made to making
472 Roseville a destination, as heard at the recent Urban Land Institute (ULI)
473 workshop was an educational opportunity, whether involving land use, art, music,
474 entertainment, dance, theater or other areas encouraging such venues.

475 Member Bull noted current efforts underway to resurrect the Roseville Arts
476 Council; with Member Kimble suggesting again using the language of “...live,
477 work and “PLAY”” in this section as well. Member Murphy also noted summer
478 band concerts as another example.

479 Ms. Perdu duly noted these suggestions, including the addition of “work” and
480 “play” in this section as well.

481 Roseville has a comprehensive, safe, efficient, and reliable transportation system
482 Ms. Perdu highlighted minor edits in this section; noting that she was still no
483 satisfied with language related to “multi-model transportation.”

484 Member Kimble suggested identifying that versus using such jargon as previously
485 discussed (e.g. bikes, pedestrians, etc.).

486 Member Gitzen cautioned that this is also an area where in Roseville the state and
487 county had considerable say in what the city did; with Mr. Lloyd acknowledging
488 that point as well.

489 At the request of Member Daire, City Planner Paschke reviewed the turnback
490 process for county roads to the city; confirming that the practice still occurred;
491 most recently with County Road B where it cul-de-sacs on the west side of the
492 city at Highway 280.

493 Member Murphy stated that the third bullet point caught his eye, opining that the
494 city’s share of funding public transportation and transit systems seemed minimal
495 from his perspective. Member Murphy suggested revised language that language
496 be changed to indicate that the city “planned for and supported” it versus any
497 funding beyond the taxes all residents paid toward Metro Mobility.

498 Member Kimble suggested language such as “...properly fund its share of public
499 transportation and transit system.”

500 Member Murphy asked how much of that the city actually did today.

501 In reality and as noted by Member Murphy, Mr. Paschke clarified that all
502 taxpayers paid into the state and federal tax system to fund transit; noting that the
503 intent of this section and statement was not to indicate that the city would come
504 up with any additional funding.

505 Therefore, Member Murphy reiterated his suggested language revision, using
506 another example of the Metro Transit’s Park and Ride facility in Roseville and the
507 city’s and commission’s support in planning and facilitating development of it
508 versus simply using the term “fund.”

509 Ms. Perdu agreed with Member Murphy’s suggestion, opining it made sense and
510 was consistent with language changes in other area made as part of tonight’s
511 discussion.

512 Roseville has technology that gives us a competitive advantage
513 After conferring with staff, Ms. Perdu noted the clarification made on the city’s
514 role as noted, specifically related to wireless and high speed connections going
515 into the future and many possible unknowns.

516 Specific to the heading, Chair Boguszewski questioned “competitive advantages,”
517 opined that read to him that the city could be investing in the newest thing out of
518 the gate prior to it being proven. Instead, Chair Boguszewski suggested language
519 such as “stay competitive,” to state that the city may not necessarily be the first
520 mover, but instead maybe one of the early adopters of new technology.

521 Ms. Perdu duly noted that language revision suggestion.

522 Roseville has a growing, diverse, and stable revenue base
523 Member Kimble opined that in the second bullet point, language encouraging
524 “new development” seemed to be missing from her perspective.

525 In the third bullet point, Chair Boguszewski suggested removing “develop” from
526 the language, and leaving “explore.”

527 Based on the service provided by the city to its residents as well as contracts with
528 other communities and agencies done on a cost basis as well as serving as a
529 source of revenue, Member Gitzen suggested rewording that as such.

530 Ms. Perdu duly noted each of these suggestions.

531 Roseville responsibly funds programs, services,...
532 At the request of Member Kimble, Ms. Perdu responded that the first bullet point
533 addressed the integrity of public accounting standards as well as financial
534 oversight and assumed more than just the city’s credit rating.

535 Chair Boguszewski questioned inclusion of this section in the comprehensive
536 plan, highlighting the fourth bullet point to “incorporate community priorities in
537 funding decision-making process,” and what that meant in reality.

538 Ms. Perdu suggested that it be kept together when considering overall city goals,
539 if this was eliminated it might create questions; and even though it may not be
540 used much in the comprehensive plan chapter, suggested it was beneficial to keep
541 it together for the City Council’s use and reference.

Planning Commission – Comprehensive Plan Update

Minutes – Wednesday, January 25, 2017

Page 14

542 Roseville has high quality employment opportunities...
543 Ms. Perdu noted her addition of this new goal for further discussion tonight and in
544 response to previous discussions and commission concerns that something was
545 missing as it related to employment.

546 Member Kimble questioned if the heading as written spoke more to economic
547 development resulting in an increased tax base and not just jobs. IN the second
548 bullet point, Member Kimble suggested revising “adequate jobs” to “quality jobs”
549 versus just sneaking by; as well as changing “meet service needs,” by providing
550 quality jobs that meet a broad range of residential and visitor needs. However,
551 Member Kimble admitted she was unsure of what was intended by “service
552 needs.” Specific to regulations, Member Kimble questioned if that was intended
553 to be policies and guidelines, and back to the idea of economic development
554 orientation, was that intended to encourage public/private relationships.

555 Specific to “development,” Member Bull admitted that the tag line gave him
556 pause and how to encourage future residents that jobs were available here.

557 With the goal to “do more,” Member Kimble questioned if that meant providing
558 more opportunities.

559 Member Bull responded that this statement as written was too overarching and his
560 intent would be to “explore” versus a having a goal to meet it, by improving
561 economic opportunities in the community.

562 Member Gitzen spoke in support of retaining that and then through the resulting
563 process determine if something was missing; but opined this was a good first
564 attempt.

565 Chair Boguszewski stated that his bias involved how “livable wage” could
566 possibly be defined, which was not possible in his opinion, as it changed and was
567 dependent on your personal viewpoint. Therefore, Chair Boguszewski suggested
568 language such as “...encourage/incentivize jobs that are regionally attractive and
569 competitive” or provide regionally attractive and competitive wages. Chair
570 Boguszewski opined that would be measurable and the results would be
571 attainable.

572 Member Gitzen questioned language as “livable” or “... encourage higher quality
573 jobs.”

574 Chair Boguszewski reiterated his dislike of the term “livable” noting the city
575 couldn’t mandate it, but only encourage and incent it.

576 As an example, Member Bull noted the comments heard often at the Planning
577 Commission related to land use issues that many travel outside Roseville for their
578 jobs.

579 Ms. Perdu noted the need to retain this as a goal, but agreed the language needed
580 further consideration.

581 In the second bullet point, Member Murphy questioned if there was something
582 missing in that statement.

583 In the fourth bullet point specific to creating regulations, Member Daire suggested
584 using “policy” versus “regulations.”

585 Member Bull questioned why the word “small” was included in the last bullet
586 point; with Member Kimble agreeing and instead suggesting saying “a variety of
587 businesses.”

588 Ms. Perdu noted that, advising that she had been focusing on “Mom/Pop
589 businesses in using “small.”

590 Referring to the recent ULI meeting, Member Kimble opined that if this evolves
591 into more economic development rather than just being about jobs, one goal
592 would be that the “city was easy to work with and developers liked to work with
593 the city” creating a qualitative goal to attract economic development if the city
594 was considered good and/or easy to work with.

595 Member Perdu thanked the commission for their comments and duly noted them
596 for the next iteration incorporating these suggestions and after the first round of
597 public engagement.

598 **c. “Future Cities” Recap**

599 *Receive summaries of the input offered by the students who participated on*
600 *Roseville Area Middle School’s “Future Cities” Team*

601 Ms. Perdu referenced this submission dated January 26, 2017 and its inclusion in
602 tonight’s meeting materials as previously referenced by Member Daire.

603 **d. Introduction to Land Use**

604 *If time allows, materials will be distributed to Commissioners to prompt some*
605 *advance thinking about land use topics that will be the focus of upcoming*
606 *meetings.*

607 Ms. Perdu provided a brief introduction to this topic and existing land use maps.

608 Given the current and ongoing initiative in the Rice Street/Larpenteur Avenue area, Chair
609 Boguszewski asked how this process would correlate with that one.

610 Community Development Director Collins provided an update on that planning group
611 consisting of staff and elected-official representatives of Ramsey County and the Cities of
612 Maplewood, St. Paul and Roseville. Ms. Collins advised that a consultant to assist in the
613 redevelopment effort had been selected, Perkins+Will, and would be working with the
614 group on a visioning plan for that corridor.

615 Chair Boguszewski asked for further detail on that collaboration.

616 Ms. Collins advised that the next meeting of the working group, scheduled for March 9th,
617 would determine the next steps and noted that a kick-off for that effort was also being
618 planned. Ms. Collins suggested that both the redevelopment of this area, and the
619 comprehensive plan update would be parallel processes and as redevelopment
620 opportunities occurred in that area, zoning and comprehensive plan guidelines for each
621 community and/or county would be examined and come into play. While this
622 redevelopment may become an implementation goal down the road, Ms. Collins clarified
623 that it wouldn’t be this year, and any parallels would interact with one another.

Planning Commission – Comprehensive Plan Update

Minutes – Wednesday, January 25, 2017

Page 16

624 Next Steps
625 Ms. Perdu highlighted the upcoming public kick-off on March 7th, intercept boards,
626 online visioning survey, meetings in a box, and the next work session planned on March
627 22nd at the Planning Commission with the topics of land use and finalizing goals.

628 Chair Boguszewski asked what the commission’s role would be at the March 7th public
629 kick-off: whether to facilitate or only observe.

630 Ms. Perdu advised that she would ask Ms. Major what she envisioned the Planning
631 Commission’s role to be and would report back through staff. Ms. Perdu suggested that
632 their most important role may be to circulate among tables of small groups in a listening
633 mode.

634 Specific to possibly providing technical advice to attendees, Ms. Perdu advised that the
635 attendance of Planning Commissioners would be recognized at the start of the kick-off
636 meeting allowing them to provide assistance if and as needed.

637 Given the limited time available in receiving Planning Commission meeting packets,
638 Member Gitzen asked if there was a way to get those materials earlier especially for this
639 second meeting of the month.

640 Mr. Lloyd responded that the goal was to have materials available in a timelier manner
641 going forward.

642 Ms. Perdu recognized that request as well, especially when asking the commission to do
643 homework.

644 Member Murphy suggested staff alert the commission via email ticklers to updates as
645 they were made on the website.

646 Ms. Perdu advised that she and Ms. Major would be working in March in setting up the
647 “meetings in a box” and asked commissioners to consider their individual interest in
648 hosting a group of people or serving as liaisons for that effort.

649 **6. Commission Business**

650 The recent resignation of Commissioner Cunningham has left the Planning Commission
651 without a Vice Chair, Select a temporary Vice Chair to cover the March 1 regular
652 meeting and the March 22 Comprehensive Plan Update meeting, if Chair Boguszewski is
653 unable to attend and potentially open the April 5, 2017 regular meeting before a new
654 Chair and Vice Chair are selected from the new membership, which will include
655 replacements for Chair Boguszewski and Member Cunningham.

656 **MOTION**

657 **Member Gitzen moved, seconded by Member Kimble to nominate Member Murphy**
658 **as Interim Vice Chair of the Planning Commission until elections scheduled for the**
659 **first April meeting.**

660 Member Murphy accepted the nomination.

661 Member Daire nominated Member Kimble to serve as Interim Vice Chair; with Member
662 Kimble declining the nominations, while appreciating Member Daire’s suggestion.

663 Chair Boguszewski closed nominations.

664 **Ayes: 6**

665 **Nays: 0**

666 **Motion carried.**

667 **7. Adjourn**

668 Chair Boguszewski adjourned the meeting at approximately 8:27 p.m.