



**Planning Commission – Comprehensive Plan Update Meeting
City Council Chambers, 2660 Civic Center Drive
Minutes – Wednesday, April 26, 2017 – 6:30 p.m.**

- 1 **1. Call to Order**
2 Chair Murphy 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 Murphy, City Planner Thomas Paschke called the Roll.
7 **Members Present:** Chair Robert Murphy; and Commissioners James Daire, James Bull,
8 and Pete Sparby
9 **Members Absent:** Commissioners Julie Kimble and Chuck Gitzen
10 **Staff/Consultants Present:** Community Development Director Kari Collins, City
11 Planner Thomas Paschke, and Senior Planner Bryan Lloyd;
12 Consultant Lydia Major, LBH
- 13 **3. Review of Minutes**
14 **a. March 22, 2016 Special Planning Commission Meeting - Comprehensive Plan**
15 **Update**
16 **MOTION**
17 **Member Daire moved, seconded by Member Sparby to approve the March**
18 **22, 2017 meeting minutes as presented.**
19 **Ayes: 4**
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 At the request of Chair Murphy, Community Development Director Collins
30 provided an update on filing applications and interviews scheduled to fill the
31 vacancy on the Planning Commission.
32 At the further request of Chair Murphy, Ms. Collins reviewed pending staff
33 considerations and scheduling for a potential joint meeting of the Planning and
34 Public Works, Environment and Transportation (PWETC) Commissions with the
35 Alliance for Sustainability (AFORS) in conjunction with consultants for the

36 Comprehensive Plan and Transportation Plan Updates related to resiliency
37 processes and those impacted chapters.

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

39 Referencing Ms. Major’s written summary of the public kick-off, Ms. Perdu provided a
40 brief verbal summary, noting approximately seventy attended the event; with good
41 comments received at that time as well as online before and after the event. As noted by
42 Mr. Lloyd, tonight’s meeting topic had been switched to allow more time to receive and
43 collate that community engagement for inclusion in the next discussion by the
44 Commission.

45 **a. Goals and Decision-Making Rubric**

46 Mr. Lloyd introduced tonight’s topics in general and then deferred to Ms. Major
47 to lead the discussion.

48 Ms. Major clarified that the goal for tonight’s discussion was to determine if the
49 overall purpose and direction for those goals and decision-making rubric were on
50 track rather than conducting a line-by-line edit of language. Ms. Major
51 respectfully asked that individual commissioners direct their specific edits, unless
52 content-related, to staff for forwarding onto consultants.

53 In general, Ms. Major advised that the rubric was aimed to help those executing
54 the comprehensive plan to make decisions about some of those things that they
55 were unable to predict at this time; and to make those decisions more accountable
56 by tracking measurables, with related items serving similar differences, but also
57 having some distinction as well.

58 While appreciating measurables, Member Bull opined that it seemed like a lot,
59 when typically the intent would be to know who was performing the
60 measurements and at what intervals it was being done; and asked if that would be
61 added to this and about the numbers being used to determine that measurement.

62 Ms. Major advised that she would speak with Ms. Purdu about adding that level
63 of detail; but clarified that while a lot of options were being thrown out for
64 consideration, it was up to the commission and city to prioritize those things that
65 they found most important to the community.

66 At the direction of Chair Murphy, and without objection, Ms. Major was asked to
67 lead the discussion to review each goal collectively and discuss the kinds of
68 measurables and action criteria and whether or not that was what the commission
69 would expect to see at which time it would then be further refined by the
70 consultants. Chair Murphy reiterated that individual thoughts on wording beyond
71 that broad review of each category should be emailed to staff to forward to the
72 consultant after tonight’s meeting.

73 Goal 1: Roseville is a welcoming community that appreciates differences and
74 fosters diversity

75 Member Daire questioned if the proposed action reached residents whose first
76 language was not English; opining that determining those particular populations
77 seemed to him a challenging objective.

78 Chair Murphy suggested that the communication component be addressed,
79 including additions or revisions, when at that particular goal.

80 Ms. Major advised that this is related to the goal for the community engagement
81 plan for overall comprehensive plan direction received from the Planning
82 Commission and City Council. As part of that process, Ms. Major suggested
83 having a good standard in place for decision-making impacts for each of those
84 diverse populations as well as the broader community. Ms. Major opined that this
85 would require thoughtful application for those involved in each step.

86 Member Bull stated that he was leery when seeing things directed toward one
87 class or another especially when English is not their first language; and asked for
88 something more inclusive for everyone and not specifically targeting one or a few
89 populations.

90 Ms. Major agreed with not targeting different audiences; but also noted that the
91 intent was to ensure equitable access and communication for all; requiring certain
92 services for some community members (e.g. translators).

93 Member Daire suggested that ESL class registrations may provide access to
94 individuals with limited English.

95 Chair Murphy noted that, when former Chair Boguszewski spoke to this issue at
96 last month's meeting, he noted the numerous languages and communities
97 recognized in Roseville and how to determine which are most prevalent or if each
98 and every language needed to be accommodated. Chair Murphy noted those
99 languages highlighted on signage for the Light Rail system; and asked if the city
100 had a citywide, Ramsey County or Twin Cities area process or how it would
101 address it. While sympathetic to the goal, Chair Murphy questioned if he was in
102 the best position to resolve this issue.

103 Ms. Collins responded that this was an ongoing struggle and became problematic
104 in multi-lingual communication efforts (e.g. rental tenants) with five languages
105 currently relied on as the dominant languages in Roseville. Ms. Collins noted
106 there was a difference in what was tangible, what was feasible, and what was
107 needed (e.g. Karen community and their interaction with the Roseville Police
108 Department) and how best to build relationships with cultural entities or
109 organizations to best reach diverse populations.

110 Member Sparby asked if applicable languages for those non-English participants
111 would be established to reach decision-makers in those communities in their
112 applicable languages to achieve outreach.

113 Member Bull noted the action for this goal included acknowledgment of
114 "residents," but noted that the city was also welcoming to visitors and that needed
115 to be made clear as well. While collecting statistics from visitors, Member Bull
116 questioned how receptive visitors would be to "big brother, a/k/a the city"
117 collecting that information for tertiary purposes.

118 In response, Ms. Major suggested more emphasis on qualitative versus
119 quantitative.

Planning Commission – Comprehensive Plan Update

Minutes – Wednesday, April 26, 2017

Page 4

120 As to whether quality was measurable as voiced by Member Daire, Member Bull
121 responded that it was and suggested that each category have some definition (e.g.
122 high/medium, low).

123 Specific to the “underserved population,” Member Daire asked whether there was
124 any indication that this need was not currently being met, documented or
125 expressed and how to determine that measurable.

126 Ms. Major advised that it would require a case-by-case judgment call; but
127 generally she defined “underserved” as a community with documented needs that
128 it was known were not being met. However, Ms. Major also noted that
129 sometimes that wasn’t documented until the need was expressed.

130 Specific to creating an opportunity for currently under-represented populations to
131 participate in city government, Member Daire asked if that measurable was a
132 certain percentage of populations represented on the City Council and/or advisory
133 commissions.

134 Ms. Major clarified that she saw it as a statistical parallel; with most
135 communication efforts not large enough to meet all representations, but intended
136 to provide a correlation between the population and those in leadership positions.

137 Chair Murphy noted the commission’s challenge was to come up with alternative
138 wording for those action items.

139 Goal 2: Roseville is a desirable place to live, work and play

140 With Member Daire questioning the action item and what was intended for
141 “creative redevelopment of a site,” Ms. Major advised that the intent was not to
142 define any concrete location(s), but instead to intentionally leave it in vague
143 terms.

144 For measurables (e.g. development), Member Bull opined that many residents,
145 whether pro or con, would measure that goal in the periodic community survey
146 and therefore suggested using that survey as the measurable.

147 Goal 3: Roseville has a strong and inclusive sense of community

148 Member Sparby suggested an added measurable about diversity when talking
149 about inclusivity with the measurable taken from the number of residents and
150 their particular demographic attending events and/or activities.

151 Member Daire suggested something similar, such as where there was evidence of
152 cross-neighborhood or enclave cooperation (e.g. Lake McCarrons Neighborhood
153 Association) that could be documented and would serve to be qualitative.

154 Chair Murphy, for a measurable, suggested also including the annual National
155 Night Out as an example of small neighborhood-based interaction(s). Chair
156 Murphy noted that this had proven a strong – and growing – cooperative effort
157 among city staff and departments with smaller neighborhoods and the community
158 at-large.

159 In the “actions” column, Member Bull specific to “creating a community
160 gathering space,” Member Bull asked that the “space” be changed to the plural as
161 a measurable when clarifying how many were available, how they were used and

162 where located. Member Bull opined that he didn't consider that there was a
163 sufficient number of such spaces at this time.

164 Chair Murphy asked if Member Bull considered the recently-improved and/or
165 constructed park structures shelters as a significant increase in spaces; opining
166 that from his perspective that was a quantitative step forward.

167 Goal 4: Roseville residents are invested in their community

168 Chair Murphy suggested that a significant measurable would be the number of
169 volunteers and volunteer hours expended in the community, tracked and
170 calculated by the city's volunteer coordinator.

171 Goal 5: Roseville is a safe community

172 Chair Murphy stated that he would lobby for changing the wording of the action
173 item related to "natural surveillance," citing an example of the beautiful OVAL
174 facility surrounded by a berm versus people using telescopes.

175 While an industry term, Ms. Major agreed that "natural surveillance" may be too
176 technical of a term in this context, but clarified that it was intended to create a
177 sense that personal eyes are on a place rather than drones (e.g. parents could
178 watch their children get to the library safely).

179 Specific to actions, related to "trends," Chair Murphy suggested using national
180 industry standards or guidelines (e.g. emergency response times) as a measurable.

181 Member Bull noted that the community survey also targeted those areas (e.g.
182 emergency response times); and when talking about resident safety, questioned
183 whether they would consider dangerous buildings as a measurable.

184 Member Sparby also noted that he was looking to community interactions related
185 to public safety (e.g. community policing) and how to get emergency responders
186 communicating with residents involved in the community. Noting that some of
187 that was already occurring, Member Sparby suggested adding that and using it as
188 a positive measurable for decision-makers when considering what made a safe
189 community.

190 In his read of online survey responses to-date, Member Daire advised that he
191 observed an ongoing theme from residents with safety or security or crime and
192 crime prevention. Personally, Member Daire asked for feedback from the Police
193 Department in terms of what correlations they saw happening in Roseville and the
194 general crime rate and their suggested actions and/or responses to address what
195 could be done. As an example, Member Daire cited building design standards as
196 one way security or confidence would be achieved, with input from the Police
197 Department in advising that area.

198 Ms. Major referenced a design standard, called CPTED, addressing security of the
199 environment and crime prevention through environmental design. Ms. Major
200 advised that this provided a set of standards for designers to use in creating safe
201 spaces (e.g. lighting, landscaping, building design, etc.) and agreed it would be
202 good to talk to the Police Department in addition to revising that design standard.

Planning Commission – Comprehensive Plan Update

Minutes – Wednesday, April 26, 2017

Page 6

203 Ms. Collins advised that the Police Department’s Community Relations and
204 Crime Analyst Corey Yunke had recently talked about SEPTED, and advised that
205 the Community Development staff frequently sent plans to him for his input on
206 that design aspect.

207 Member Daire agreed, and based on his planning experience, suggested those
208 responses should be addressed and whether trends were being established or
209 paralleling other areas; or if there were perceptions among the public of increased
210 crime rates specific to Roseville.

211 Goal 6: Roseville housing meets community needs

212 Member Daire opined that the action item “create housing that contributes to our
213 existing neighborhoods,” seemed vague to him.

214 Chair Murphy agreed that it may be a good goal but hard to measure.

215 In conjunction with community survey results, Member Bull noted Metropolitan
216 Council growth goals of 600 units in Roseville. However, with the community
217 clearly preferring single-family detached versus multi-family apartment housing
218 stock, Member Bull suggested that the city emphasize why higher density was
219 needed to meet those housing objectives as part of the comprehensive plans’
220 guidance. Member Bull noted that this also impacted potential affordability with
221 smaller lot sizes and meeting the desirability for single-family versus multi-
222 generational housing.

223 Goal 7: Roseville is an environmentally healthy community

224 Member Bull suggested a need to measure trends for greenhouse gas emissions
225 specific to Roseville.

226 Chair Murphy questioned how to address that for Roseville when the city was
227 surrounded by numerous interstates and trunk highways.

228 Ms. Major assured commissioners that there were a number of metropolitan
229 communities that had and continued to study emissions, water use and other
230 factors that served as annual measurables (e.g. commuters, residential power use,
231 etc.) Ms. Major advised that her firm, LHB, ran such a program and suggested
232 commissioners visit their website to view the various components of the program.
233 For the record, Ms. Major clarified that she did not author that goal.

234 Moving toward trends for cost effective or renewable energies beyond greenhouse
235 gas emissions, Member Sparby suggested a measurable to measure metrics on a
236 smaller versus larger scale and how it could transition into something a local
237 decision-maker could actually utilize.

238 Specific to the goal itself stating that Roseville “is” an environmentally health y
239 community, Member Bull suggested changing that to a goal to “increase” the
240 city’s environmental health.

241 Ms. Major clarified that she had heard from numerous sources that they
242 considered Roseville to be very proactive in this area and wanted the community
243 to be even more so.

244 Member Daire asked how “environmentally healthy” related to living wage jobs
245 as a measurable.

246 Ms. Major advised that it depended on your outlook on “healthy” and proven
247 studies correlating living wage jobs with community health. While it may not be
248 the intention of that particular measurable, Ms. Major advised that they would
249 further define that.

250 Member Sparby agreed that “environmentally healthy” may fit somewhere in the
251 goals, but not this particular one related to living wage jobs; and therefore
252 suggested its removal from this goal.

253 Goal 8: Roseville has world-renowned parks, open space and multi-generational
254 recreation programs and facilities

255 At the request of Chair Murphy, Ms. Major clarified that this goal had been an
256 aspiration since the Imagine Roseville 2025 community visioning process.

257 Member Daire asked if the “world-renowned” was realistic or accurate or if the
258 city advertised its park system worldwide.

259 Chair Murphy agreed that the goal may be more realistic for the recreation system
260 to be great in the city, state and possibly nation-wide, he questioned “world-
261 renowned” as well. Chair Murphy stated that he’d settle for a Minnesota-
262 renowned park system, and use any resulting cost savings in “world-wide”
263 advertising for more public safety personnel.

264 Member Daire opined that it could serve as a measurable if the park system
265 received awards on a regional basis, and suggested that would serve to focus on a
266 regionally-significant park system.

267 Member Bull opined that the community parks only needed to be as good as
268 Roseville residents wanted them to be; further opining that there was no need to
269 be the best in Minnesota or beyond as long as the system provided what Roseville
270 residents needed and wanted.

271 Related to metrics, Chair Murphy noted that allocated budget dollars would
272 always serve as a measurable, but suggested the number of participants may serve
273 as a better measurement, particularly Roseville resident participation.

274 Member Bull noted that the community survey also addressed these goals.

275 Chair Murphy noted the need to yoke the city to the school districts and
276 encourage that they mesh with the city’s parks and recreation programs and
277 facilities by being collaborative rather than competitive.

278 Member Sparby suggested that the community survey would also address multi-
279 generational programs and could provide a wealth of information that would be
280 measurable rather than how it was currently focused in most part on the budget.
281 Member Sparby suggested a better measurable from his perspective would be to
282 focus on statistics such as who was using the parks, facilities and programs versus
283 weighting that measurable so highly on dollars.

284 Member Daire opined that park building use could also serve as a measurable.

285 Goal 9: Roseville supports the health and wellness of community members

286 At the request of Chair Murphy, Ms. Major advised that healthcare facilities
287 within a ¼ mile of transit stops was considered an industry standard in providing
288 equitable access.

289 If everyone wants to be health and well, Member Daire asked if this was an
290 appropriate goal for the comprehensive plan or if had come from the Imagine
291 Roseville 2025 visioning process.

292 Ms. Major advised that she would research the origination of this goal; but did
293 advised that health and wellness was becoming an ever-increasing focus of
294 planning and how equitable services were provided. Ms. Major clarified that it
295 separated health outcomes or illness from well-being and measurables as part of
296 the planning and land-use process.

297 Member Bull opined that health and wellness was appropriate here, but
298 questioned whether health care facilities were, especially when reviewing past
299 community survey responses that seemed to rate those facilities low. While it
300 may come out in other outreach methods, Member Bull noted that in the
301 community survey results, it had rated low except in one oddly-worded question
302 where it had come out high.

303 With concurrence by Member Bull, Ms. Major suggested, as with budget dollars
304 and park measurables, this didn't prove the broadest and best way to view this
305 goal.

306 Member Sparby agreed with Member Bull, noting that 2/3 of the measurables
307 focused on health care facilities. In Roseville, Member Sparby observed that
308 residents had access to broader facilities than just those in the municipality; and
309 while he considered walkability and access to bike trails as a good measurables,
310 he suggested promoting a healthy lifestyle and general wellness to be a better
311 measurable than bus stops correlating with the location of healthcare facilities.

312 Member Bull suggested another measurable would be access to healthy food
313 choices; with Member Sparby suggesting another measurable would be access to
314 fitness facilities.

315 Goal 10: Roseville supports high quality, lifelong learning

316 Member Daire asked if this created a partnership with educational institutions or
317 how the city might express interest in partnering to provide lifelong learning
318 opportunities.

319 Member Bull clarified that community education was currently conducted at the
320 schools frequently through partnership with the city in sharing staff, equipment,
321 facilities and/or other amenities, and cited several examples.

322 Chair Murphy agreed, referencing the Fairview Community Center owned and
323 operated by School District No. 623, but used by the city for park and recreation
324 programs and appropriately coordinated, similar with partnerships with the
325 Mounds View School District No. 621. However, Chair Murphy suggested those
326 efforts could be built on further to complement needs and opportunities.

327 Member Bull concurred, further noting the ability to keep prices low for resident
328 participation in programs, and for cost efficiencies for the school districts and
329 city.

330 Ms. Major noted that this dovetailed with the next goal; and during education
331 focus groups, noted that city support of education efforts might be with
332 transportation.

333 Member Bull stated that he didn't like the measurable related to the "number of
334 city representatives working on collaborative efforts..." with Ms. Major
335 suggesting it needed to be elaborated more; with Member Daire suggesting that
336 instead of "city representatives," it state "agencies" working on those
337 collaborative efforts.

338 Additionally, Member Sparby suggested it wasn't just the number of programs,
339 but the number of attendees as a measurable, since some may prove more popular
340 than others, creating a need for that benefit to be measured.

341 Member Daire agreed, suggesting further measurables could be what groups (e.g.
342 diversity) amid that number.

343 Goal 11: Roseville has a comprehensive, safe, efficient and reliable transportation
344 system

345 Chair Murphy asked if the mark was missed on that goal in how the city met a
346 local transportation goal versus what was offered regionally. While the number
347 of miles of bike trails and pathways may be an easy measurable, Chair Murphy
348 suggested that measurable would be better-suited in the parks and recreation or
349 wellness goal unless the intent was that goods were moved by bike. Chair
350 Murphy opined that the intent was to seek more health and wellness in the
351 community recreationally versus for those commuting.

352 Member Bull opined that there were significant commuters; and that they
353 considered themselves as alternative transportation commuters. Part of the city's
354 participation or measurable, opined Member Bull, would be to provide safe
355 shoulders, etc. for bikers.

356 Ms. Major agreed, and challenged commissioners to see community from a daily
357 and year-round perspective as a measurable.

358 Member Sparby suggested not just the number of miles as a measurable, but the
359 strategic placement of bike trails to bring together areas of the community in a
360 helpful way to allow bikes to commute, not just for trails that didn't serve a
361 purpose, but as a viable way to access both downtowns. Member Sparby opined
362 that the city didn't go a good job of that now.

363 Specific to job-related commuting, Member Daire noted that those bikes they
364 were a different vehicle than those used for recreational purposes. Therefore,
365 Member Daire suggested rewording of that goal to state "Roseville has access to
366 and is in a position to influence and participate in additional light rail lines, and
367 with its park system, could create additional bike and pedestrian ways to serve
368 commuting routes." This way, Member Daire opined that the city could use the

369 transportation system and make its parks contribute or enforce that goal beyond a
370 focus on recreational use.

371 Member Bull agreed that the city could influence it by creating park and ride hubs
372 and providing city programs to help residents identify carpool partners to those
373 park and ride partners with malls providing designated spaces.

374 Goal 12: Roseville has technology that gives us a competitive advantage

375 At the request of Member Daire, Ms. Major reviewed what a “technology
376 infrastructure plan” involved (e.g. access to high speed internet, fiber optics,
377 community-wide wi-fi, etc.).

378 Member Bull noted that it also involved controls to move traffic more efficiently
379 (e.g. stop light controls, camera monitoring systems, etc.). Member Daire further
380 noted the potential for capital equipment owned by the city with the ability to read
381 irregularities by alerting for preventive maintenance before breakdown, allowing
382 more efficient operation and less cost; as well as improvements in building and
383 home security systems.

384 General Comments

385 Given that several members of the commission are unavailable for this discussion,
386 Chair Murphy consulted with Mr. Lloyd and Ms. Major on how best to submit
387 written comments from any and all individual commissioners to solidify their
388 thoughts while avoiding Open Meeting Law-restricted private communications
389 between commissioners.

390 Mr. Lloyd asked that all comments or feedback be provided to him for forwarding
391 to Ms. Major, including any language refinements as applicable. Mr. Lloyd
392 clarified that this isn't the last touch to this list; and with submission of tonight's
393 feedback and additional individual feedback, it may change it even more. Mr.
394 Lloyd offered to include additional individual comments via email to all
395 commissioners for their review.

396 Member Bull asked that a revised document be provided for commissioners as the
397 basis for the next meeting; with concurrence by Ms. Major.

398 **b. Community Engagement Input**

399 In addition to the memorandum from LHB dated April 18, 2017 and attached
400 community engagement feedback received to-date, Ms. Major also provided
401 bench handouts, attached hereto and made a part hereof, summarizing intercept
402 board notes, and focus group meeting minutes for diversity, economic
403 development, education, housing (two) and opportunity focus groups.

404 Ms. Major clarified that the intent in the engagement process at this point was to
405 consider what was heard in general, and not to interpret findings but for the
406 commission to be aware of any themes coming out of this feedback to-date.

407 Member Bull opined that the commission did need to interpret results to help
408 guide the remainder of the process.

409 Ms. Major clarified that while demographics could be considered, with the
410 commission having just received the entire survey results today, she encouraged
411 the commission not to focus on survey responses yet at a public meeting, since the
412 goal was to not change the types of responses still coming in based on responses
413 to-date, but to ensure the process remained open.

414 At the request of Ms. Major and with the updated schedule displayed, Ms. Major
415 reviewed the community engagement opportunities still coming up in May and
416 June, and the intent to keep the online survey running throughout that time as
417 well; with approximately 2/3 of the engagement process completed up to this
418 point.

419 At the request of Chair Murphy for the next three Planning Commission meetings
420 specific to the comprehensive plan update, Mr. Lloyd reviewed upcoming topics
421 for the benefit of the public wishing to provide their input on specific topics and
422 which meeting they should attend (e.g. land use, zoning designations for low-,
423 medium- and high-density zoning designations). Mr. Lloyd advised that topics
424 were still being reviewed for which months they will be identified; but for those
425 seeking to comment at this point and unsure of how or when to do so, Mr. Lloyd
426 encouraged them to look online for updated information on the city’s website or
427 to contact him directly at the Community Development Department offices.

428 Stating his need to give considerable thought to those more global land use
429 designations, Chair Murphy suggested a land use map be provided at a
430 commission work session to allow better discussion.

431 While unable to designate the particular month for that discussion, Ms. Major
432 suggested that the commission start looking at it now; since this schedule was last
433 updated by Ms. Purdu late last week and suggests that land use discussion is
434 slotted for the May meeting.

435 Based on that confirmation of his perception, Chair Murphy suggested that the
436 commission and the public start doing their homework and come geared up with
437 comments and suggestions for that May meeting.

438 Mr. Lloyd agreed, advising that staff would confirm that schedule in the next few
439 days to further inform their preparation.

440 Specific to Ms. Major’s presentation on community engagement efforts, Member
441 Bull suggested that an email be provided to those attending the public kick-off
442 meeting and provide an opportunity for a short “how to” session on how to
443 conduct “meetings in a box” by those interested parties, allowing them to be
444 aware of the tools available to them and how they can be used or presented; as
445 well as suggesting types of groups or organizations at which they may prove of
446 interest and help.

447 Commission Questions/Comments on the Process To-date

448 At the request of Chair Murphy, Mr. Lloyd clarified that the joint Rice
449 Street/Larpenteur Avenue community meetings would occur through the
450 remainder of 2017 and into 2018, sometimes paralleling the comprehensive plan
451 update and its conclusions/findings of those corridor meetings would be reflected
452 as applicable.

453 Ms. Collins concurred noting that Roseville staff had just met with other involved
454 communities in that multi-jurisdictional effort to determine how those plans could
455 be integrated with respective comprehensive plan updates for those communities
456 and Ramsey County, under the direction of the various consultants involved.
457 With those discussions running parallel to each other, Ms. Collins suggested
458 future discussions of the Planning Commission and Roseville City Council as to
459 how that process compared to and impacted the comprehensive plan would be
460 forthcoming; whether as standalone documents or integrated in areas as
461 applicable. At that point, Ms. Collins advised that then it would be better known
462 how to handle the process; but since the community advisory group
463 representatives had just been appointed, the process was still in its infancy.

464 As an example of how that effort could be incorporated independent of later
465 decisions, Mr. Lloyd compared the former work of the Parks Master Plan that had
466 not yet happened when the last comprehensive plan update was being completed,
467 and was referenced as part of the comprehensive plan chapter and identifying
468 correlated areas.

469 While the Larpenteur Avenue/Rice Street represents a small area plan, Member
470 Daire noted that consideration should and would be given to various community
471 stakeholders and individuals for consistency with the overall direction of the
472 comprehensive plan. Member Daire opined that it would prove a marvelously
473 good exercise in seeing how they fit together, while zeroing in on one specific
474 area and developing their own plan of how things should be versus its specific
475 application with the comprehensive plan, resulting in an exciting process to
476 undertake.

477 Chair Murphy noted that indications were that the comprehensive plan may come
478 to fruition before completion by that group.

479 Ms. Collins agreed with that assessment, and while both processes may be
480 finalized about the same time, there would also be a window of time for adjacent
481 communities and the Metropolitan Council to review the Roseville
482 comprehensive plan update, at which point the city should have a better idea of
483 the broader vision for Rice Street/Larpenteur Avenue.

484 For those commissioners interested, Member Daire suggested applying rubrics in
485 that context, whether or not those comprehensive plan rubrics are implemented in
486 that small area plan, opining it seemed a natural step to him.

487 Ms. Collins agreed that it would provide an additional lens for the Roseville
488 community to take into consideration, assuming Roseville goals are the same as
489 those of the Cities of Maplewood and St. Paul, and Ramsey County and trying to
490 unify those goals with Roseville’s comprehensive plan.

491 Whether at the smaller or larger levels, if all are paying attention, Member Daire
492 opined that it shouldn’t be difficult to achieve a consistency, especially when
493 working with common consultant teams.

494 Ms. Collins agreed that would help.

495 In his personal review, Member Bull noted there was a lot of great information
496 provided, as well as questions and suggestions; and when there were others
497 voluminous in other categories, suggested that it would be prudent to categorize
498 them as well (e.g. what type of businesses, restaurant categories, etc.) and other
499 areas being duplicated.

500 Ms. Major clarified that at this point in the summaries and meeting notes, and
501 online survey results, the commission was seeing raw data to-date, but by the end
502 of the process those responses will be categorized. Ms. Major asked that the
503 commission not draw any conclusions yet as to specificity of the comments other
504 than their initial recognition of common themes recurring.

505 Member Daire expressed his appreciation in reviewing the raw data that showed a
506 number of ways trends were displayed (e.g. bar graphs, tabular form, individual
507 comment, etc.). Member Daire stated that he found himself getting a flavor of the
508 responses and becoming engrossed, emphasizing the benefit of how raw data was
509 presented by the consultant. As a result, Member Daire advised that he found
510 himself coming up with other categories not necessarily linked to existing goals
511 that further stimulated thought and consideration on his part.

512 Ms. Major advised that the format was coming out of Survey Monkey, but agreed
513 and shared the sense of momentum on categories of thought in the broader
514 themed sense.

515 Based on the diversity of participation, Member Bull asked if the responses that
516 Ms. Major had expected to this point or if there were any surprises or areas of
517 concerns.

518 Ms. Major responded that comments and areas of concern expressed to-date were
519 mostly what she expected, but while recognizing that early efforts would be
520 harder and be based on trial and error, she noted there was not a broad enough
521 range of participants involved yet. Therefore, Ms. Major noted the need to target
522 that, especially those unable to attend earlier focus groups. Ms. Major advised
523 that she and Mr. Lloyd would review that and determine better ways other than
524 meetings as part of considering their next steps.

Planning Commission – Comprehensive Plan Update

Minutes – Wednesday, April 26, 2017

Page 14

525 Member Bull suggested it may prove beneficial for the city’s Communications
526 Department staff to explain the survey and provide an easy link to access it.
527 Member Bull opined that it was easier to respond from behind a computer rather
528 than in person.

529 Ms. Major noted that social and email outreach had already been done, but
530 offered to try it again.

531 Member Sparby expressed his curiosity about long-range plans and whether that
532 incorporated the entire city in the process from beginning to end.

533 Mr. Lloyd referenced the schedule as outlined in response with Ms. Major noting
534 that schedule went all the way through January of 2018 and advised that the
535 schedule was reviewed and updated annually.

536 **6. Adjourn**

537 **MOTION**

538 **Member Daire moved, seconded by Member Sparby to adjourn the meeting at**
539 **approximately 8:15 p.m**

540 **Ayes: 4**

541 **Nays: 0**

542 **Motion carried.**