

Supplement

**Chris Miller**

---

**From:** Chris Miller  
**Sent:** Monday, March 26, 2018 7:34 AM  
**To:** \*RVCouncil  
**Cc:** \*RVFinanceCommission  
**Subject:** Supplemental Materials for Joint City Council-Finance Commission Meeting  
**Attachments:** Council\_Minutes\_2017\_March\_20.pdf; Council\_Minutes\_2017\_October\_9.pdf; Capital\_Investment\_Policy.pdf

Dear Council,

The attached files contain supplemental materials for tonight's Joint City Council-Finance Commission meeting discussion on CIP Priority Rankings. They include:

- Minutes from the March 20, 2017 City Council meeting
- Minutes from the October 9, 2017 City Council meeting
- The revised Capital Investment Policy which includes priority rankings, as adopted by the Council on April 10, 2017

We will get these added to the online packet and the printed packet that appears at the back table in the Council Chambers as well.

Thanks.

**Christopher K. Miller**  
**Finance Director**  
**651-792-7031**

ber and final budget negotiations to confirm their involvement and approvals, Mr. Miller noted this threw timing off for staff to approach the Roseville City Council before now.

Mayor Roe noted the need for more advance notice, duly noted by City Manager Trudgeon, even if things were pending with other agency funding.

**f. Receive Finance Commission Recommendations**

Finance Director Chris Miller provided a brief overview, turning the discussion over to representatives of the Finance Commission present tonight and their recommendations for changes to Chapter 208 related to the Finance Commission (Attachment A0 and Capital Investment Policy (Attachment B) and priority ranking system language for the city's capital improvement program (CIP) on page five.

Finance Commission

Five members of the Commission were present, with Chair Robin Schroeder, Matt Harold, and Pete Zeller speaking on their behalf.

Commissioner Harold read a memorandum dated March 19, 2017 from the Commission to the City Council entitled, "Finance Commission recommendation to establish a CIP Priority Ranking System." Criteria for the ranking system was displayed, identifying four criteria for the CIP policy (page 5, lines 157 – 162) to draw the broader CIP together and better justify items in the budget cycle.

Mayor Roe noted that this would provide another option for sorting CIP assets beyond their function, department or fund, by sorting them by priority and further analyze the financial strength of the bigger picture. Mayor Roe sought clarification that the intent was to aggregate reporting for the overall picture without eliminating or consolidating individual funds for each CIP area.

Chair Schroeder advised, if this recommendation was supported by the City Council, the Finance Commission's next step would be to get into more detail and provide additional information to the City Council.

Given the current needs represented in the CIP and their priority level, Chair Schroeder noted that this delved into the justification part, not currently part of tonight's recommendation, but overarching consideration at which time the Finance Commission would assist in defining guidance without categories and how best to apply it. As part of that, Commissioner Harold noted the Commission's interest in reviewing the Cedarholm Golf Course as part of the bigger picture and entire city CIP versus having each request come before the city in a piecemeal fashion but all included in that bigger picture.

Mayor Roe noted his hesitation in any perception that the CIP is adopted piecemeal when considerable thought was given to its summary form and fund by fund approval of the entire CIP as a full picture.

Councilmember McGehee spoke in support of these recommendations from the Finance Commission, specifically its tie to addressing maintenance of existing assets and not adding new assets without accounting for their maintenance and/or replacement. Councilmember McGehee stated her preference that the Commission review the CIP for the next year or two on an annual basis and provide their written suggestions following that review and their options and opinions of what was coming before the City Council. Councilmember McGehee opined that she found the CIP as a continuing problem area needing to be addressed, and expressed her confidence in the Commission's ability to provide additional information and assistance in addressing this area.

As a body, Councilmember Willmus clarified that the City Council reviewed the CIP on an annual basis. Regarding prioritization, Councilmember Willmus agreed with a more detailed and specific look on an annual basis and allocation of those dollars in line with recommendations of the Commission in their memorandum.

Councilmember Laliberte agreed, opining the recommendation was a good one and helped provide clarification as the City Council drilled down, including this piece related to the CIP. Councilmember Laliberte stated that she had already asked for a deeper dive into the short-term look and needs projected; and that combined with a "why" as to an expenditure need, would only serve to help, and therefore, would receive her support.

Mayor Roe spoke in support of the recommendations, especially now that he understood the process better. Additionally, noting the previously discussed the "condition index" concept, Mayor Roe opined that was a good idea and suggested an added column to the CIP listing that current year condition index and allowing for a consistent scaling system across all different city assets to help staff and the City Council better perform their analysis and move CIP items around from year to year and adjust funding accordingly as part of the overall CIP listing.

On behalf of the City Council, Mayor Roe thanked the Finance Commission for these good ideas, without objection, staff was directed to proceed in bringing this back for formal action.

**g. Establish a 2018 Budget Process Timeline**

Finance Director Chris Miller briefly summarized the proposed 2018 budget process timeline as detailed in the staff report, providing key discussion topics and their potential dates. Mr. Miller sought guidance on these milestone dates, tightened up from past schedules in the interest of "quality" versus "quantity" and rec-

As previously advised, Councilmember Willmus left the meeting at approximately 7:50 p.m.

e. **Discussion on the Use of Capital replacement Priority Rankings**

As outlined in the RCA and attachments, City Manager Trudgeon asked the City Council to provide more direction to staff on whether or not to assign individual rankings and how those rankings should be used in determining capital replacement priorities. Mr. Trudgeon noted the inclusion of budget and capital improvement program (CIP) documents for reference to address how to use the policy in practice and beyond theory.

Based on the last discussion held with the Finance Commission and as detailed in the RCA, Mayor Roe noted the need to revisit previously-adopted City Council policy on the use of capital replacement priority rankings. Mayor Roe noted the questions raised as to how these particular priorities worked with the CIP.

Personally, Mayor Roe stated that he considered the rankings, as outlined in lines 6 – 11 of the RCA, as follows:

- Priority Ranking #2 (Projects that responsibly maintain existing assets to either extend remaining service life or to create efficiency)

Mayor Roe opined that this ranking does not seem to address new capital spending by the city but rather replacement of existing assets. As such, it may encompass all areas of the CIP. There may be a further opportunity to review those items and give them categories (e.g. timing or operationally-critical versus those more optional items). Mayor Roe opined that this could assist in the City Council's decision making about that timing or funding within the CIP and may prove helpful to the process.

- Priority Rankings #1, 3 and 4 (Projects necessary for public health and safety or to meet legal mandates; projects that expand existing assets or services in order to benefit the public good; or projects that purchase new assets or services in order to benefit the public good)

Mayor Roe stated that he considered these categories to be helpful to the process for NEW capital items under consideration for the city.

Councilmember McGehee stated her total agreement with Mayor Roe's perspective: with Items 1, 3 and 4 perfect for new projects without a current guideline to-date and done piecemeal in the past. While appreciating staff's attempt to provide a description of those CIP items coming forward, Councilmember McGehee stated that she preferred a one-page, non-ranked list of items. Councilmember McGehee opined that it was part of the City Manager's job, along with his Department Heads, to determine if a particular CIP item should or could be delayed, noting that staff had been forthcoming in the past in providing that information. However, Councilmember McGehee opined that this knowledge resided within those departments and with the City Manager. She opined it was up to the de-

In general, Councilmember Etten agreed with Mayor Roe's comments: with Items 1, 3 and 4 used for additions or major expansions (e.g. Golf Course Clubhouse) after robust community discussions to bring those items to light. Councilmember Etten expressed his confidence in staff filtering and recommendations for CIP without each item being ranked, opining that he didn't find that a useful process other than in staff's typical analysis. Since the City Council had asked staff to provide significant information for a five-year and twenty-year CIP, Councilmember Etten opined that any more layers were not necessary and too labor-intensive for staff.

Councilmember Laliberte stated her agreement with the comments of her colleagues; opining that categories may be useful or helpful, but not necessary to predetermine each item beyond the annual staff review of CIP items and any potential deferrals that may be possible. However, Councilmember Laliberte suggested that as the City Council also annually reviews the CIP items, it would be helpful to keep these priority rankings in mind as well.

Since the City Council has a standing written policy in place, Councilmember Etten asked what action was indicated moving forward.

In response, City Manager Trudgeon stated that his understanding was that most of the CIP rankings under Item #2 were already addressing things proposed through the CIP, and that large new things were infrequent and rare at this point. Even with the Cedarholm Clubhouse, Mr. Trudgeon noted that was actually essentially new versus a replacement, and had involved a deliberate community process. Mr. Trudgeon recognized that the City Council was not interested in priority rankings within the CIP, but also noted that staff could continue to apply the rankings as outlined tonight minimally on an annual basis as long as staff keeps these priority rankings in mind when reporting to the City Council within the spirit of the intent of the policy. Mr. Trudgeon suggested staff's review of the policy accordingly.

Without the benefit of a copy of the policy tonight, and without objection, Mayor Roe suggested directing staff to review the current policy language and bring their recommendations back to the City Council. As part of that language review, Mayor Roe suggested rather than calling them "priority rankings," to consider "decision-making criteria or rubric." However, Mayor Roe disagreed with the interpretation of the Cedarholm Clubhouse as a replacement or maintenance item, and opined that it was a new item from his perspective. Mayor Roe stated that his interpretation of replacement or maintenance items would be for HVAC, roofs, windows, or other areas when an entire building wasn't being replaced. Another example of new from his perspective would be the new fire station, and would include other areas where new direction and/or one-time significant monies were involved. Under that scenario, Mayor Roe suggested that policy language should consider that each City Council be able to determine what was "new" and what

involved. Under that scenario, Mayor Roe suggested that policy language should consider that each City Council be able to determine what was “new” and what was “rehabilitation,” under the policy, especially since this City Council couldn’t anticipate future City Council interpretations, and in order to serve as a lens to filter new items. Mayor Roe agreed that the City Council shouldn’t need to review the CIP list item by item other than how it currently did on an annual basis to see what was new coming on and what was removed and/or deferred as suggested by staff and compared with the five-year and twenty-year master lists that would all continue to change from year to year.

Without objection, staff was so directed as detailed in the above discussion; suggesting that staff provide a draft of the revised policy language for the Finance Commission and their feedback based on tonight’s discussion as a future agenda item.

**g. Review Proposals for Recording Secretary Services**

As detailed in the RCA, Assistant City Manager Rebecca Olson summarized this requested action based on previous City Council direction.

Discussion ensued regarding each responding proposal and the specifics of each as they related to those quotes (e.g. length of time for transcription; average hours for various meetings; minimum number of hours and/or charged defined by each firm; and variables in each firm’s fee structures).

Further discussion included the end product for transcription services (e.g. verbatim or summarized discussion).

Councilmember McGehee opined that the current meeting minutes would serve as a good reference moving forward. However, Councilmember McGehee stated that her expectations were that of these two firms, the same quality of minutes be provided. Councilmember McGehee questioned how clarification of the draft minutes would work when there was no personnel present at the meeting.

In her recollection of past conversations about having a recording secretary present, Councilmember Laliberte noted that the minutes currently being provided by TimeSavers for advisory commission meetings were a fair depiction and summary without recording unnecessary items.

Mayor Roe concurred, based on his review of Planning Commission meeting minutes done by TimeSavers, stating he found them similar to what had been provided by the current recording secretary. Mayor Roe also noted that it was good to expect consistent results with summary services provided versus a literal transcript that may actually prove harder to understand than a summary of the conversation. Mayor Roe clarified that he was not interested in a literal transcription and therefore preferred the proposal by TimeSavers versus that of CAP.

## Capital Investment Policy

The purpose of the City's Capital Investment Policy is to ensure future capital improvements, maintenance, and replacements are made when needed, in a manner which is both fiscally and operationally prudent. The goal of this policy is to provide a stable funding mechanism for the City's infrastructure by setting aside specific resources on a periodic basis. This will ease the burden on present and future taxpayers, without significant fluctuations in annual property tax levies.

It is not the intent of the City Council to fund major new facilities, which have not had the original funding established either through tax increment, general taxes, bonding or other such sources. The replacement funds and corresponding fund interest earnings are expected to be only for replacement purposes.

### Scope

All departments and City funds are included in the 20-Year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP). The CIP identifies the timing and financing of all capital items.

### Policy

- ❑ The City will develop a 20-year Plan for capital investments and update it at least every 2 years.
- ❑ All capital investments shall be made in accordance with an adopted Capital Improvement Plan.
- ❑ The City will coordinate development of the capital improvement budget with development of the operating budget. Future operational costs associated with new capital improvements will be projected and included in operating budget forecasts.
- ❑ The City will provide ongoing preventative maintenance and upkeep on all its assets at a level adequate to protect the City's capital investment and to minimize future maintenance and replacement costs. The City should periodically review and follow industry-recommended replacement schedules for all City capital assets.
- ❑ The City will identify the estimated costs and potential funding sources for each capital project proposal before it is submitted to Council for approval.
- ❑ The City will determine the least costly financing and acquisition method for all new projects.
- ❑ For future development or redevelopment proposals that require public infrastructure and/or public financing assistance and/or City support services, a fiscal analysis shall be prepared identifying the project sources and uses. The analysis should also demonstrate the costs and benefits of the project. The cost of this analysis shall be borne by the developer.
- ❑ The City will establish departmental Vehicle and Equipment Replacement Funds. The City will appropriate monies to them annually to provide for timely replacement of vehicles and equipment. The amount will be maintained at an amount equal to the proportion of useful life expired multiplied by estimated replacement cost.

- ❑ The City will establish a Building Capital Maintenance Fund, and will appropriate funds to it annually to provide for timely maintenance of all buildings supported by general governmental funding. Only maintenance which meets the capitalization threshold shall be paid for out of this fund. Maintenance includes major items such as roof repair and HVAC replacement.
- ❑ The City shall establish a Street Infrastructure Replacement Fund to provide for the general replacement of streets and related infrastructure throughout the community. The annual MSA capital allocation, will be included as a part of the source of funds for computing the adequacy of this fund. This fund has been formally categorized by the Council as a permanent fund, whereby the interest proceeds are only used for the stated purpose. The cash reserve amount should remain between \$8-12 million.
- ❑ The City shall establish a Park Capital Maintenance Fund to provide for the general replacement of parks and related infrastructure throughout the community. The funding should equal the proportion of useful life expired multiplied by estimated replacement cost for all park system assets.
- ❑ Within each enterprise fund, the City shall establish a funding mechanism to provide for the general replacement of related infrastructure throughout the community. The funding should equal the proportion of useful life expired multiplied by estimated replacement cost for all enterprise fund system assets.
- ❑ From time to time the City Council shall establish additional replacement funds as the need becomes apparent.
- ❑ The Finance Commission will annually oversee and report to the City Council a review and analysis of planned capital investments and related reserve balances. The purpose of such analysis will be to gauge the health and sustainability of City reserves related to capital investments for the short (1-3 year), medium (4-9 years), and long term (10+ years). It will also take into account related borrowing and repayment costs.
- ❑ Capital Replacements should be considered using the following priority rankings (in order):
  1. Projects necessary for public health and safety, or to meet legal mandates.
  2. Projects that responsibly maintain existing assets to either extend remaining service life or to create efficiency.
  3. Projects that expand existing assets or services in order to benefit the Public Good.
  4. Projects that purchase new assets or services in order to benefit the Public Good.



## Definitions

Capital assets – Assets which cost \$5,000 or more and have a useful life of two or more years.

Capital Improvement Plan – A comprehensive 20 year outlook itemizing all capital assets and their replacement funding requirements. The plan will take into account useful asset lives and salvage values.

Replacement Cost– In today’s dollars, the cost to replace the asset. If it is expected the retired asset will have a salvage value, the estimated salvage value should be deducted from the expected replacement cost.

Asset Life – The number of years which is the asset is in use, also known as the useful life of a capital asset.

Bonding – The amount of debt incurred to obtain capital assets.

Capital Asset Maintenance – Expenditures which protect the City’s investment in capital assets and provide for ongoing upkeep.

Equipment – A tangible capital asset which does not qualify as a vehicle, building, street, or park asset. Examples are mowers, tools, etc.

MSA Capital Allocation – Municipal State Aid is money the City receives from the State to help pay for maintenance of MSA-designated streets. MSA streets are collector or arterial streets that interconnect to other cities or major thoroughfares.

Enterprise Fund – A separate accounting and financial reporting mechanism for municipal services for which is 100% fee supported. Examples are Water, Sewer, and Golf Course.

General Governmental Fund – A separate accounting and financial reporting mechanism for spending in which a property tax is generally levied. Examples are police, fire, streets, parks and recreation.

Enterprise Fund System Asset – Assets which support enterprise services such as water, sewer, and golf course.

Park System Asset – All assets within city parks excluding buildings. Examples would be trails, equipment, and courts.

## Implementation

The City shall use replacement funds to assist in the replacement of equipment, vehicles, and capital building maintenance. New equipment or buildings are to be funded from new dollars, unless they are designated to replace currently owned assets. Funds may be used up to the amount of the replacement funds set aside for that particular asset. Any additional funding shall be from new sources.

**Chris Miller**

---

**From:** Chris Miller  
**Sent:** Monday, March 26, 2018 7:34 AM  
**To:** \*RVCouncil  
**Cc:** \*RVFinanceCommission  
**Subject:** Supplemental Materials for Joint City Council-Finance Commission Meeting  
**Attachments:** Council\_Minutes\_2017\_March\_20.pdf; Council\_Minutes\_2017\_October\_9.pdf; Capital\_Investment\_Policy.pdf

Dear Council,

The attached files contain supplemental materials for tonight's Joint City Council-Finance Commission meeting discussion on CIP Priority Rankings. They include:

- Minutes from the March 20, 2017 City Council meeting
- Minutes from the October 9, 2017 City Council meeting
- The revised Capital Investment Policy which includes priority rankings, as adopted by the Council on April 10, 2017

We will get these added to the online packet and the printed packet that appears at the back table in the Council Chambers as well.

Thanks.

**Christopher K. Miller**  
**Finance Director**  
**651-792-7031**

## **Capital Investment Policy**

The purpose of the City's Capital Investment Policy is to ensure future capital improvements, maintenance, and replacements are made when needed, in a manner which is both fiscally and operationally prudent. The goal of this policy is to provide a stable funding mechanism for the City's infrastructure by setting aside specific resources on a periodic basis. This will ease the burden on present and future taxpayers, without significant fluctuations in annual property tax levies.

It is not the intent of the City Council to fund major new facilities, which have not had the original funding established either through tax increment, general taxes, bonding or other such sources. The replacement funds and corresponding fund interest earnings are expected to be only for replacement purposes.

### Scope

All departments and City funds are included in the 20-Year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP). The CIP identifies the timing and financing of all capital items.

### Policy

- ❑ The City will develop a 20-year Plan for capital investments and update it at least every 2 years.
- ❑ All capital investments shall be made in accordance with an adopted Capital Improvement Plan.
- ❑ The City will coordinate development of the capital improvement budget with development of the operating budget. Future operational costs associated with new capital improvements will be projected and included in operating budget forecasts.
- ❑ The City will provide ongoing preventative maintenance and upkeep on all its assets at a level adequate to protect the City's capital investment and to minimize future maintenance and replacement costs. The City should periodically review and follow industry-recommended replacement schedules for all City capital assets.
- ❑ The City will identify the estimated costs and potential funding sources for each capital project proposal before it is submitted to Council for approval.
- ❑ The City will determine the least costly financing and acquisition method for all new projects.
- ❑ For future development or redevelopment proposals that require public infrastructure and/or public financing assistance and/or City support services, a fiscal analysis shall be prepared identifying the project sources and uses. The analysis should also demonstrate the costs and benefits of the project. The cost of this analysis shall be borne by the developer.
- ❑ The City will establish departmental Vehicle and Equipment Replacement Funds. The City will appropriate monies to them annually to provide for timely replacement of vehicles and equipment. The amount will be maintained at an amount equal to the proportion of useful life expired multiplied by estimated replacement cost.

- ❑ The City will establish a Building Capital Maintenance Fund, and will appropriate funds to it annually to provide for timely maintenance of all buildings supported by general governmental funding. Only maintenance which meets the capitalization threshold shall be paid for out of this fund. Maintenance includes major items such as roof repair and HVAC replacement.
- ❑ The City shall establish a Street Infrastructure Replacement Fund to provide for the general replacement of streets and related infrastructure throughout the community. The annual MSA capital allocation, will be included as a part of the source of funds for computing the adequacy of this fund. This fund has been formally categorized by the Council as a permanent fund, whereby the interest proceeds are only used for the stated purpose. The cash reserve amount should remain between \$8-12 million.
- ❑ The City shall establish a Park Capital Maintenance Fund to provide for the general replacement of parks and related infrastructure throughout the community. The funding should equal the proportion of useful life expired multiplied by estimated replacement cost for all park system assets.
- ❑ Within each enterprise fund, the City shall establish a funding mechanism to provide for the general replacement of related infrastructure throughout the community. The funding should equal the proportion of useful life expired multiplied by estimated replacement cost for all enterprise fund system assets.
- ❑ From time to time the City Council shall establish additional replacement funds as the need becomes apparent.
- ❑ The Finance Commission will annually oversee and report to the City Council a review and analysis of planned capital investments and related reserve balances. The purpose of such analysis will be to gauge the health and sustainability of City reserves related to capital investments for the short (1-3 year), medium (4-9 years), and long term (10+ years). It will also take into account related borrowing and repayment costs.
- ❑ Capital Replacements should be considered using the following priority rankings (in order):
  1. Projects necessary for public health and safety, or to meet legal mandates.
  2. Projects that responsibly maintain existing assets to either extend remaining service life or to create efficiency.
  3. Projects that expand existing assets or services in order to benefit the Public Good.
  4. Projects that purchase new assets or services in order to benefit the Public Good.

ber and final budget negotiations to confirm their involvement and approvals, Mr. Miller noted this threw timing off for staff to approach the Roseville City Council before now.

Mayor Roe noted the need for more advance notice, duly noted by City Manager Trudgeon, even if things were pending with other agency funding.

**f. Receive Finance Commission Recommendations**

Finance Director Chris Miller provided a brief overview, turning the discussion over to representatives of the Finance Commission present tonight and their recommendations for changes to Chapter 208 related to the Finance Commission (Attachment A0 and Capital Investment Policy (Attachment B) and priority ranking system language for the city's capital improvement program (CIP) on page five.

Finance Commission

Five members of the Commission were present, with Chair Robin Schroeder, Matt Harold, and Pete Zeller speaking on their behalf.

Commissioner Harold read a memorandum dated March 19, 2017 from the Commission to the City Council entitled, "Finance Commission recommendation to establish a CIP Priority Ranking System." Criteria for the ranking system was displayed, identifying four criteria for the CIP policy (page 5, lines 157 – 162) to draw the broader CIP together and better justify items in the budget cycle.

Mayor Roe noted that this would provide another option for sorting CIP assets beyond their function, department or fund, by sorting them by priority and further analyze the financial strength of the bigger picture. Mayor Roe sought clarification that the intent was to aggregate reporting for the overall picture without eliminating or consolidating individual funds for each CIP area.

Chair Schroeder advised, if this recommendation was supported by the City Council, the Finance Commission's next step would be to get into more detail and provide additional information to the City Council.

Given the current needs represented in the CIP and their priority level, Chair Schroeder noted that this delved into the justification part, not currently part of tonight's recommendation, but overarching consideration at which time the Finance Commission would assist in defining guidance without categories and how best to apply it. As part of that, Commissioner Harold noted the Commission's interest in reviewing the Cedarholm Golf Course as part of the bigger picture and entire city CIP versus having each request come before the city in a piecemeal fashion but all included in that bigger picture.

Mayor Roe noted his hesitation in any perception that the CIP is adopted piecemeal when considerable thought was given to its summary form and fund by fund approval of the entire CIP as a full picture.

Councilmember McGehee spoke in support of these recommendations from the Finance Commission, specifically its tie to addressing maintenance of existing assets and not adding new assets without accounting for their maintenance and/or replacement. Councilmember McGehee stated her preference that the Commission review the CIP for the next year or two on an annual basis and provide their written suggestions following that review and their options and opinions of what was coming before the City Council. Councilmember McGehee opined that she found the CIP as a continuing problem area needing to be addressed, and expressed her confidence in the Commission's ability to provide additional information and assistance in addressing this area.

As a body, Councilmember Willmus clarified that the City Council reviewed the CIP on an annual basis. Regarding prioritization, Councilmember Willmus agreed with a more detailed and specific look on an annual basis and allocation of those dollars in line with recommendations of the Commission in their memorandum.

Councilmember Laliberte agreed, opining the recommendation was a good one and helped provide clarification as the City Council drilled down, including this piece related to the CIP. Councilmember Laliberte stated that she had already asked for a deeper dive into the short-term look and needs projected; and that combined with a "why" as to an expenditure need, would only serve to help, and therefore, would receive her support.

Mayor Roe spoke in support of the recommendations, especially now that he understood the process better. Additionally, noting the previously discussed the "condition index" concept, Mayor Roe opined that was a good idea and suggested an added column to the CIP listing that current year condition index and allowing for a consistent scaling system across all different city assets to help staff and the City Council better perform their analysis and move CIP items around from year to year and adjust funding accordingly as part of the overall CIP listing.

On behalf of the City Council, Mayor Roe thanked the Finance Commission for these good ideas, without objection, staff was directed to proceed in bringing this back for formal action.

**g. Establish a 2018 Budget Process Timeline**

Finance Director Chris Miller briefly summarized the proposed 2018 budget process timeline as detailed in the staff report, providing key discussion topics and their potential dates. Mr. Miller sought guidance on these milestone dates, tightened up from past schedules in the interest of "quality" versus "quantity" and rec-

As previously advised, Councilmember Willmus left the meeting at approximately 7:50 p.m.

e. **Discussion on the Use of Capital replacement Priority Rankings**

As outlined in the RCA and attachments, City Manager Trudgeon asked the City Council to provide more direction to staff on whether or not to assign individual rankings and how those rankings should be used in determining capital replacement priorities. Mr. Trudgeon noted the inclusion of budget and capital improvement program (CIP) documents for reference to address how to use the policy in practice and beyond theory.

Based on the last discussion held with the Finance Commission and as detailed in the RCA, Mayor Roe noted the need to revisit previously-adopted City Council policy on the use of capital replacement priority rankings. Mayor Roe noted the questions raised as to how these particular priorities worked with the CIP.

Personally, Mayor Roe stated that he considered the rankings, as outlined in lines 6 – 11 of the RCA, as follows:

- Priority Ranking #2 (Projects that responsibly maintain existing assets to either extend remaining service life or to create efficiency)

Mayor Roe opined that this ranking does not seem to address new capital spending by the city but rather replacement of existing assets. As such, it may encompass all areas of the CIP. There may be a further opportunity to review those items and give them categories (e.g. timing or operationally-critical versus those more optional items). Mayor Roe opined that this could assist in the City Council's decision making about that timing or funding within the CIP and may prove helpful to the process.

- Priority Rankings #1, 3 and 4 (Projects necessary for public health and safety or to meet legal mandates; projects that expand existing assets or services in order to benefit the public good; or projects that purchase new assets or services in order to benefit the public good)

Mayor Roe stated that he considered these categories to be helpful to the process for NEW capital items under consideration for the city.

Councilmember McGehee stated her total agreement with Mayor Roe's perspective: with Items 1, 3 and 4 perfect for new projects without a current guideline to-date and done piecemeal in the past. While appreciating staff's attempt to provide a description of those CIP items coming forward, Councilmember McGehee stated that she preferred a one-page, non-ranked list of items. Councilmember McGehee opined that it was part of the City Manager's job, along with his Department Heads, to determine if a particular CIP item should or could be delayed, noting that staff had been forthcoming in the past in providing that information. However, Councilmember McGehee opined that this knowledge resided within those departments and with the City Manager. She opined it was up to the de-

In general, Councilmember Etten agreed with Mayor Roe's comments: with Items 1, 3 and 4 used for additions or major expansions (e.g. Golf Course Clubhouse) after robust community discussions to bring those items to light. Councilmember Etten expressed his confidence in staff filtering and recommendations for CIP without each item being ranked, opining that he didn't find that a useful process other than in staff's typical analysis. Since the City Council had asked staff to provide significant information for a five-year and twenty-year CIP, Councilmember Etten opined that any more layers were not necessary and too labor-intensive for staff.

Councilmember Laliberte stated her agreement with the comments of her colleagues; opining that categories may be useful or helpful, but not necessary to predetermine each item beyond the annual staff review of CIP items and any potential deferrals that may be possible. However, Councilmember Laliberte suggested that as the City Council also annually reviews the CIP items, it would be helpful to keep these priority rankings in mind as well.

Since the City Council has a standing written policy in place, Councilmember Etten asked what action was indicated moving forward.

In response, City Manager Trudgeon stated that his understanding was that most of the CIP rankings under Item #2 were already addressing things proposed through the CIP, and that large new things were infrequent and rare at this point. Even with the Cedarholm Clubhouse, Mr. Trudgeon noted that was actually essentially new versus a replacement, and had involved a deliberate community process. Mr. Trudgeon recognized that the City Council was not interested in priority rankings within the CIP, but also noted that staff could continue to apply the rankings as outlined tonight minimally on an annual basis as long as staff keeps these priority rankings in mind when reporting to the City Council within the spirit of the intent of the policy. Mr. Trudgeon suggested staff's review of the policy accordingly.

Without the benefit of a copy of the policy tonight, and without objection, Mayor Roe suggested directing staff to review the current policy language and bring their recommendations back to the City Council. As part of that language review, Mayor Roe suggested rather than calling them "priority rankings," to consider "decision-making criteria or rubric." However, Mayor Roe disagreed with the interpretation of the Cedarholm Clubhouse as a replacement or maintenance item, and opined that it was a new item from his perspective. Mayor Roe stated that his interpretation of replacement or maintenance items would be for HVAC, roofs, windows, or other areas when an entire building wasn't being replaced. Another example of new from his perspective would be the new fire station, and would include other areas where new direction and/or one-time significant monies were involved. Under that scenario, Mayor Roe suggested that policy language should consider that each City Council be able to determine what was "new" and what



involved. Under that scenario, Mayor Roe suggested that policy language should consider that each City Council be able to determine what was “new” and what was “rehabilitation,” under the policy, especially since this City Council couldn’t anticipate future City Council interpretations, and in order to serve as a lens to filter new items. Mayor Roe agreed that the City Council shouldn’t need to review the CIP list item by item other than how it currently did on an annual basis to see what was new coming on and what was removed and/or deferred as suggested by staff and compared with the five-year and twenty-year master lists that would all continue to change from year to year.

Without objection, staff was so directed as detailed in the above discussion; suggesting that staff provide a draft of the revised policy language for the Finance Commission and their feedback based on tonight’s discussion as a future agenda item.

**g. Review Proposals for Recording Secretary Services**

As detailed in the RCA, Assistant City Manager Rebecca Olson summarized this requested action based on previous City Council direction.

Discussion ensued regarding each responding proposal and the specifics of each as they related to those quotes (e.g. length of time for transcription; average hours for various meetings; minimum number of hours and/or charged defined by each firm; and variables in each firm’s fee structures).

Further discussion included the end product for transcription services (e.g. verbatim or summarized discussion).

Councilmember McGehee opined that the current meeting minutes would serve as a good reference moving forward. However, Councilmember McGehee stated that her expectations were that of these two firms, the same quality of minutes be provided. Councilmember McGehee questioned how clarification of the draft minutes would work when there was no personnel present at the meeting.

In her recollection of past conversations about having a recording secretary present, Councilmember Laliberte noted that the minutes currently being provided by TimeSavers for advisory commission meetings were a fair depiction and summary without recording unnecessary items.

Mayor Roe concurred, based on his review of Planning Commission meeting minutes done by TimeSavers, stating he found them similar to what had been provided by the current recording secretary. Mayor Roe also noted that it was good to expect consistent results with summary services provided versus a literal transcript that may actually prove harder to understand than a summary of the conversation. Mayor Roe clarified that he was not interested in a literal transcription and therefore preferred the proposal by TimeSavers versus that of CAP.



**Regular City Council Meeting Minutes  
City Hall Council Chambers, 2660 Civic Center Drive  
Monday, October 23, 2017**

**5. Business Items**

**a. Joint Meeting with the Human Rights, Inclusion and Engagement Commission (HRIEC)**

Mayor Roe welcomed HRIEC Commissioners to this first joint meeting of the newly-formed HRIEC. Commissioners introduced themselves: Chair Chelsea Holub; Commissioners Lauren Peterson, Lisa Carey, Vice Chair Nicole Dailey, Etienne Djevi, John Eichenlaub, James Reyerson, Michelle Manke and Wayne Groff; and Youth Commissioners Acer Iverson and Elizabeth Hansel.

Chair Holub provided an overview of the HRIEC's work in developing shared goals and actions for 2017 – 2018, as detailed in the draft Action Plan (Attachment A).

Commissioner Dailey assisted Chair Holub in reviewing the core objectives set forth by the HRIEC to advise, engage and evaluate those action items in addition to "parking lot" ideas not currently proposed but of interest to the HRIEC. Chair Holub reported that these goals had been developed with Ordinance No. 1526 in mind (Attachment B).

Chair Holub reviewed each of the three objectives and the rationale in proposing them for the work plan, seeking City Council feedback and input based on previous direction and new initiatives, including what to retain and what to eliminate, or what additions to make to these goals and objectives. Chair Holub advised that, using that input as a foundational base, the HRIEC would then create a more detailed plan development for each objective.

**City Council Comments/Discussion**

**Councilmember McGehee** opined that her first impression indicated to her that this plan was too ambitious. Councilmember McGehee stated that her review would be to prioritize the Essay Contest and include all areas of the "engage" category with the exception of the photo project. With the other three engagement opportunities (essay contest, events/films/discussions co-sponsored with other commission or community groups, and high school summer book read program) having proven successful in the community in the past, Councilmember McGehee opined they were extremely useful.

Specific to the welcome materials used in the past, Councilmember McGehee opined that she wouldn't want to see the HRIEC spend a lot of time on that effort.

Specific to the Town Hall/Open House concept, Councilmember McGehee opined that, unless the HRIEC had a brilliant idea to make it work beyond just another mix/mingle event, it was an expensive effort and was yet unclear as to whether it would be well-received by the community or productive for anyone.

Councilmember McGehee stated that she saw the HRIEC with two basic roles as with other advisory commissions: an opportunity to bring things forward as ideas and suggestions, and then to receive assignments from the City Council. Councilmember McGehee noted that the City Council had particularly asked for assistance from the HRIEC on the community engagement portion of the comprehensive plan update process to ensure outreach was good. For her personally, Councilmember McGehee stated that another overarching consideration was to define what was meant by "equity" in the Roseville community and what is achievable, what could be done, and how a bridge could be created to other things. As far as the HRIEC being a vehicle for that, Councilmember McGehee stated that she saw this commission as part of the definitional process, but not the group to direct the activities of other commissions, since each had their own particular charge. When equity issues and projects are defined and unified, or a subsequent policy created by the City Council and staff, Councilmember McGehee opined that then that would be carried forward to other commissions through their respective staff liaisons. Councilmember McGehee stated that she wasn't interested in setting up one commission as more important than or overseeing other commissions, opining that such a structure would set a bad precedent, and she wanted to see a more cooperative effort.

Recognizing that the HRIEC had done a lot of work on their action plan, Councilmember McGehee stated that she would like to see more cohesion in their efforts rather than breaking into subcommittees (e.g. 1-2 commissioners reading essays as a duty or task versus the entire commission), especially based on her experience in having previously served as a Human Rights Commissioner.

In his read of comprehensive plan for equity component of the "advise" objective, **Mayor Roe** stated that was a suitable objective of the commission and City. However, additionally Mayor Roe suggested that the HRIEC look at a comprehensive engagement plan for the city by starting off with some commission member training and the science or theory behind engagement. Mayor Roe recognized that staff needs to be brought up to speed as well as when engagement opportunities come along, something foremost in everyone's mind as an organization.

Mayor Roe noted the mention of the HRIEC helping with the engagement portion of the comprehensive plan effort that was well underway as well as the work of the Southeast Roseville Working Group and other efforts already underway. Mayor Roe admitted that one shortcoming in the past up to this point was in not getting engagement efforts to the HRIEC for feedback early in the process to allow them to help design it, or serve as a sounding board, for proposed drafts and

to provide their input as to the stakeholders to be included and other aspects that were important parts for the HRIEC to be involved with.

Specific to “issue monitoring and input,” as well as commission engagement and “representation on city work groups,” Mayor Roe cautioned the HRIEC that they not bite off more than they were able to process, pay attention to, and follow-through on. With City Council meetings, Mayor Roe noted the numerous things that came before the body, and how unfair it would be to task the HRIEC with monitoring those initiatives, opining that he didn’t expect that type of work from the HRIEC.

Specific to “proactive equity recommendations,” Mayor Roe stated that he’d appreciate the HRIEC alerting the City Council to issues in the area and bring policy proposals and weigh in accordingly, whether anticipated or not, but not for all things coming before the city and/or advisory commissions.

Chair Holub stated that she appreciated that comment, but noted that the intent of the HRIEC was how to realistically have those conversations, beyond submitting an annual work plan to the City Council if the HRIEC wasn’t monitoring issues coming before other commissions.

Mayor Roe duly noted that intent, suggesting part of that discussion by the HRIEC needed to be how to provide that timely input on issues under consideration, and taking into consideration the timing concerns for the City Council meeting agendas, as well as the typical monthly meetings and cycling of pertinent agenda items from those commissions.

**Councilmember Etten** thanked the HRIEC for their work and time in working through the process of melding the two former commissions together. Councilmember Etten stated that he liked a lot of the things done by the HRIEC to-date, having watched their meetings and evidenced their attempts to work together. Councilmember Etten recognized that this is a unique commission since it sponsored activities, a valuable part of what they did. Councilmember Etten stated his appreciation for the draft work plan, but expressed concern that some of the items listed in the “engage” objective seemed to him to involve more evaluation than engagement.

Chair Holub clarified that came from evaluating methods about how those events are currently handled.

Specific to the photo project, Councilmember Etten stated that he wanted to see it fleshed out in more detail; if it involved the faces of Roseville as discussed previously, he wanted to see how that worked out with local businesses or resident traffic to make the project work.

On the “advise/engage” objective, Councilmember Etten stated that he supported the HRIEC’s work with Rosefest and Party in the Park, especially by engaging other commissions. As to the Open House/Town Hall concept, Councilmember Etten stated that he was interested in that blended idea, possibly involving 4-5 hours by city staff and advisory commissioners, with a Town Hall forum of perhaps one hour’s duration in the middle of the event.

Specific to the welcome materials, Councilmember Etten referenced his personal experience when first moving to Roseville, and the value he found in that information, opining he would like to see it continue for new families, with that information providing information on updating homes, loan programs, and other interests of newcomers to Roseville (resources and opportunities, such as the pathway system). Councilmember Etten agreed that it needed to be done in different format than the past “packet” but still should welcome people.

Councilmember Etten agreed with the skepticism of his colleagues with the HRIEC monitoring other commissions.

At the request of Councilmember Etten, Chair Holub clarified that the HRIEC does not currently have a representative on the Southeast Roseville Working Group since they’re not currently meeting, but that former Human Rights Commission (HRC) Chair Wayne Groff had served in that capacity in the past.

Regarding the HRIEC monitoring other commissions, Councilmember Etten noted the City Council’s reliance on the future agenda reports provided by administration, typically 1-2 months out, as a way for them to keep aware of upcoming items on the City Council’s agenda. Councilmember Etten suggested that the City Manager or his staff could send a copy of that to the Chair or Vice Chair of the HRIEC as a tool for long-term planning. While not all agenda items went through that process, Councilmember Etten suggested that may help in their monitoring of issues coming before the city. However, as far as the HRIEC observing or monitoring other commissions, Councilmember Etten stated that he was uncomfortable in reading that as part of the work plan and also how the HRIEC could realistically achieve that objective.

Councilmember Etten asked how things were moved off the “parking lot” or how their status was reviewed; with Chair Holub responding that those items were grouped and would be moved forward if and when feasible or removed depending on feedback tonight, as well as how things evolved over time.

Speaking for the “parking lot” items identified as “RAHS and Teens for Human Rights Club Partnership, Councilmember Etten referenced his knowledge of some of the great work to-date with those efforts, and suggested the HRIEC youth commissioners provide a natural connection and multi-generational look at issues the HRIEC was dealing with and different points of life. Councilmember Etten

stated his interest in advocating that this specific item be moved to another of the active objectives.

**Councilmember Willmus** also welcomed HRIEC commissioners and thanked them for their work in drafting this work plan to facilitate tonight's discussion. However, Councilmember Willmus stated that his first impression had been similar to that of Councilmember McGehee: that it was too ambitious, causing him to question how the HRIEC could accomplish these things. Therefore, Councilmember Willmus stated that he wanted to highlight areas he thought the HRIEC should focus on, but also offered to listen to further priority items on the list or items that would be realistically attainable by the HRIEC in a given year.

For the "engage" objective, Councilmember Willmus stated the importance to him of this goal as part of the former HRC when it ultimately started to spin off to the then newly-created Community Engagement Commission (CEC). Councilmember Willmus offered his agreement with the first three engagement items, and even though he was initially supportive of the photo project when it was first put forward, when considering it deeper, he was concerned about how it would work logistically. If it can still work, Councilmember Willmus stated that he was still open to the idea. As to the High School Summer Book Read and Councilmember Etten's suggestion for the RAHS and Teens for Human Rights Club Partnership, Councilmember Willmus stated his interest in continuing to explore them, especially providing an explanation and more background on why the Club Partnership and other items had been moved to the "parking lot."

Specific to the "Advise/Engage" objective, Councilmember Willmus stated categorically that he didn't want the HRIEC to assume any oversight for other activities and/or advisory commissions serving the city. Councilmember Willmus offered his continued support of HRIEC efforts with Rosefest and Party in the Park. While having talked about the Town Hall/Open House concept in the past with the CEC, Councilmember Willmus suggested another format not necessarily related to a City Council meeting, but to host a city-wide open house to reach out to those not typically aware of those more formal events that would make them feel more part of the process and provide a welcoming view of the city campus, what it was about, and lend a broader, district-wide understanding of their local government.

Specific to the "Advise" objective, Councilmember Willmus asked that the HRIEC provide a better understanding of the scope/work plan they intended, via a broader HRIEC discussion, about what the "Roseville Comprehensive Plan for Equity" would look like and how it would function.

**Councilmember Laliberte** thanked the HRIEC for attending tonight, and recognized their cooperative work over the last few months as she and Mayor Roe participated in their monthly meetings, as part of the City Council's appointed subcommittee to oversee the merger of the former HRC and CEC. Having since

stepped back from that oversight, Councilmember Laliberte noted that this was the first opportunity for her and Mayor Roe, along with their colleagues, to view the draft activity plan and provide feedback on the overall efforts of the HRIEC to-date.

Regarding the “advise” objective, Councilmember Laliberte also considered it ambitious but also understood that the work plan at this point was broad and that project plans and proposals would be forthcoming. Overall, Councilmember Laliberte stated that she wasn’t sure how intensely to interpret the draft plan or provide feedback accordingly at this meeting. Councilmember Laliberte agreed with a previous proposal by Councilmember McGehee for a second meeting with the HRIEC to address projected silo items and determine their future cohesiveness; especially since Councilmember McGehee had agreed with her that so many things that come before the City Council for action prior to the HRIEC being able to provide input.

However, Councilmember Laliberte opined that the engagement piece seemed to be missing from the “advise/engage” objective, whether intentional or not. Councilmember Laliberte also expressed her agreement with Mayor Roe that she saw the HRIEC’s role to develop an engagement plan for the City that provided tips or suggestions for them and/or staff as the HRIEC investigated what could be improved upon versus how its always been done. Councilmember Laliberte opined that she found that a missing piece now was commission engagement and collaboration and joint work (e.g. several commissioners from various commissions work together on a specific issue) to share ideas. Councilmember Laliberte shared her colleagues’ concern with any attempt by the HRIEC for oversight or monitoring other groups. Councilmember Laliberte suggested that the HRIEC instead provide a fuller engagement plan for how to better reach the community that aren’t currently being done (e.g. how to garner interest) and providing tips that could be brought to advisory commission meetings by the HRIEC, such as best practices used by other communities, or League of Minnesota Cities (LMC) resources specific to engagement efforts.

The HRIEC’s interest in representation on city work groups was commendable, but Councilmember Laliberte suggested that the dots needed to be connected to ensure follow-through. Councilmember Laliberte reminded the HRIEC that the City Council had charged the HRIEC to provide specific recommendations to move the efforts of “Imagine Roseville” efforts beyond the current organic status, whether by including it as a line item on the annual budget or through an appointment process.

Councilmember Laliberte stated that she loved the idea of continuing the welcome packet, not on paper or in a folder as had been done in the past, but through digital means that could be provided to new businesses or residents to explain resources, people to help or contact for support, and the attributes of the city they should be aware of versus being left to discover on their own.

Regarding the “engage” objectives, even though many of the community events don’t necessarily tie back specifically to the City of Roseville, Councilmember Laliberte stated that the HRIEC was doing a great job with Rosefest and Party in the Park, opining they were on the right track in seeking more participation from advisory commissions, anticipating that would continue to get stronger.

Councilmember Laliberte stated that she had always been and continued to be in favor of a Town Hall/Open House concept, recognizing that it had been initiated as the CEC sought ways to change up Roseville University efforts. Councilmember Laliberte questioned if that got lost in the shuffle between the CEC and staff in how to logistically manage it; but asked that the HRIEC continue to work on it and provide a recommendation to the City Council, opining it tied back specifically to what the city could do better. However, Councilmember Laliberte noted the importance of soliciting staff input so the HRIEC and staff could co-author a proposal based on the intended goals.

Councilmember Laliberte spoke in support of the annual Essay Contest and the current rubric in place for that process; and spoke in support of the High School Summer Book Read program as well as the RAHS Club. Councilmember Laliberte stated that she continued to be interested in pursuing the Events/Films/Discussions that were co-sponsored with other commissions or community groups, but questioned what the HRIEC would do differently and what could be done by the city. Specific to the last statement in that category regarding “evaluating methods used by the city to promote events,” Councilmember Laliberte suggested instead that the HRIEC solicit feedback from staff and other advisory commissions or departments about what they already did, ultimately providing an inventory for the City Council that had been assessed or vetted by the HRIEC with their subsequent suggestions for additions, revamping, or elimination.

Specific to the photo project planning, Councilmember Laliberte stated her support for it to show the diverse and broad humanity in Roseville, but as her colleagues had stated, she needed to see more detail and what the city’s support in time and resources would look like.

Councilmember Laliberte questioned how and why the annual naturalization ceremony had ended up in the “evaluate” objective, or if the intent was to change it up or do it differently, or provide an analysis as to what is or isn’t working; with confirmation of that intent provided by Chair Holub.

Councilmember Laliberte suggested, as a first step for the HRIEC, to connect with the city’s volunteer coordinator on volunteer efforts prior to working on a volunteer fair partnership concept.



In conclusion, Councilmember McGehee reiterated that based on tonight's discussion among council members, the draft HRIEC action plan was too aggressive without enough prioritization. However, Councilmember McGehee opined that she had observed several themes, including that the HRIEC was in the community and better able to observe engagement efforts, including the need to understand equity and bring together issues from G.A.R.E. and Imagine Roseville, and other issues in the community and to bring other organizations (e.g. League of Women Voters and churches) together to address those gaps.

Councilmember McGehee opined that she saw the HRIEC's role as one of education and awareness and to identify areas for improvement or ideas on how the community, staff and City Council can work cooperatively. Specific to those parking lot items on page 4 (Attachment A), Councilmember McGehee opined that diverse stories were of more value than diverse photos, by sharing narratives and experiences of people with perhaps a small photo involved. While recognizing that all of these objectives are good, and not being concerned that the HRIEC knows how to engage, Councilmember McGehee suggested that they not require their members to work extensively on issues, but instead make collaborative contributions to several of these projects and return to the City Council with more realistic priorities based on feedback tonight.

Mayor Roe concluded that the one message heard tonight was the need for prioritization; and also suggested that since it was the consensus that this action plan was very ambitious suggested that it be adopted to a two-year plan with specific focus on year one and year two, including the potential to move "parking lot items" during that timeframe as well. Based on tonight's feedback, Mayor Roe suggested that the HRIEC put less emphasis on issue monitoring and commission engagement, but to provide more support for idea-sharing and cooperative efforts. Mayor Roe clarified that it was not the intent of the City Council for the HRIEC to draft the welcome packet or facilitate or staff a Town Hall/Open House, but to simply advise on what the city should undertake.

Specific to Councilmember McGehee's last comment about many groups involved in many things within the city, Mayor Roe suggested that the HRIEC needed to review what the city needed to be involved in or partnering with to focus on the most important elements, through the HRIEC's determination of criteria and making recommendations accordingly. Mayor Roe asked that the HRIEC consult the Uniform Commission Code throughout the process, seeking City Council approval as outlined. Mayor Roe suggested that, based on tonight's feedback from the City Council, the HRIEC take the draft action plan back and develop a final updated action plan to present to the City Council for their review and approval.

In conclusion, Councilmember Laliberte reported that council members and staff had learned from other entities (e.g. LMC, Metro Cities, etc.) that there is a "spectrum of participation," and suggested that the HRIEC should review that concept;

suggesting that the HRIEC inform the City Council of ways that they and/or staff could get better information to the HRIEC of how staff could identify points or projects for residents to be aware of where a project was at in the process. Councilmember Laliberte opined that this was part of the learning or educational process for residents, staff and the City Council to involve residents and other stakeholders on the decision-making process to avoid frustration or lack of knowledge about a project concerning them. Councilmember Laliberte asked that the HRIEC find a way to attain that deeper engagement early-on in the process for decisions before the City Council.

Referencing the enabling ordinance (Attachment B) for the HRIEC, Councilmember Etten noted their charge to look at and make recommendations about the bigger engagement picture, such as improvements made to the land use notification process and open house by developers, to determine if there were other or better ways to improve that communication effort.

Councilmember Willmus concurred with Councilmember Etten's comments.

Mayor Roe welcomed comment from the HRIEC related to tonight's feedback.

Commissioner Djevi asked the City Council collectively for their three objectives for the HRIEC's first year work plan. If specific to human rights and equity, Commissioner Djevi asked what specific things the HRIEC should try to do; stating that for him reaching out to under-reached communities was his priority and how to get them more engaged.

Basically, Mayor Roe opined that it came down to the HRIEC's action plan and what they could achieve as they checked things off their list of objectives.

Councilmember Etten stated that Commissioner Djevi's concern with under-reached groups was absolutely what the City Council was looking at to improve city processes to connect with people. Councilmember Etten referenced typical meetings where those attending didn't necessarily represent the city's diverse population; and therefore he saw that as part of the "advise/engage" objective to develop timing and tools as a high priority on the action plan.

While appreciating Commissioner Djevi's question, Councilmember Laliberte opined that she didn't see that priority in the information provided by the HRIEC tonight; but clarified that this was indicative of what she and Mayor Roe were suggesting: not for the HRIEC to get those under-reached communities to attend meetings or events, but to make recommendations for city staff, advisory commissions, or the City Council to use as best practices and tools to use to do a better job.

opined that she wanted to see independent commissions, and opined that everyone was different and had different perspectives.

Councilmember Laliberte spoke in support of the motion, opining that the work she and Mayor Roe had been tasked with was to bring two separate former commissions to the table as one cohesive group in partnership, identifying what had or had not worked with each of those bodies, and laying the foundation for the newly-created HRIEC, and stick with them while their leadership was put in place and working toward their action plan. Councilmember Laliberte recognized that the HRIEC had accomplished that and commended them on the great job they had done, and encouraged them to return to the full City Council as often as needed.

Councilmember Etten also spoke in support of the motion, opining that the HRIEC was more than ready to move out under its own power.

Mayor Roe spoke in support of the motion as well, expressing hope that neither he nor Councilmember Laliberte had interjected too much into HRIEC conversations, but had served in a consulting capacity. Mayor Roe stated that he supported decision-making by the entire commission and the entire City Council. He encouraged individual communication without undue influence, whether actual or perceived.

#### **Roll Call**

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

**Nays:** None.

#### **Subcommittees of Advisory Commissions in General**

Councilmember Laliberte noted some investigatory or homework tasks that may be needed between monthly meetings, observing that it sometimes worked well for someone outside the meeting to make calls, perform research or make contacts; then reporting back to the full body for a more robust conversation based on that information. Councilmember Laliberte stated that she felt strongly that when interviewing candidates for commissions, the City Council was looking for diverse viewpoints to provide for healthy debate, opining that when the full commission was unable to participate, they and the community were missing out.

Councilmember Willmus stated his strong feeling that, even with larger groups like the HRIEC, all commissioners should be involved in discussions from their genesis through fruition as recommendations moved up to the City Council for action. When appointing members to a commission, Councilmember Willmus also stated that he looked to varying backgrounds and opinions. When asking Assistant City Manager Olson for a breakdown of subcommittees before tonight's meeting, Councilmember Willmus noted that all areas the various groups were working on were important. However, Councilmember Willmus stated that he wanted all commissioners to be working on them; possibly meaning that such an aggressive work plan was not feasible, but beyond a task force to look at a certain

issue if and when indicated, he was not supportive of discussions outside a full commission meeting. If any task force or subcommittee meetings were held, Councilmember Willmus stated his preference that they be made available for public observation by the community, and on a set schedule if ongoing meetings. Councilmember Willmus asked that commissions err on the side of openness and transparency for the benefit of all.

At the request of Councilmember McGehee, City Attorney Gaughan advised that the city held advisory commissions to the same standards of the City Council when a quorum of members was participating.

In general, Councilmember Etten agreed with the comments of Councilmembers Laliberte and Willmus, and whether or not a subcommittee met and met noticing requirements, at a minimum asked that notes be taken and made part of any agenda packet materials coming back to the full commission and/or the City Council, and that they be posted on line as well. Councilmember Etten opined that was an important part of being open and transparent. Councilmember Etten stated that he was skeptical of the need for most subcommittees, but recognizing that one person may be tasked with researching a topic for the benefit of all members and making that information known to the full body. Councilmember Etten opined that the only exception may be the annual Essay Contest given the realistic time to filter them. However, in general, Councilmember Etten stated that he didn't see business being done well through subcommittee work.

As he previously noted, Mayor Roe stated that he was not concerned with several commissioners taking on a research topic but agreed with the general consensus of the City Council that deliberation and discussion should occur with the full commission. Mayor Roe recognized that this would be a change for the HRIEC from past practice and may take some adjustment, but referenced the Uniform Commission Code stating that any subcommittees will be approved by the City Council. If assigning a smaller group to review essays before they arrive at the full body, Mayor Roe opined that he considered this a task and not part of deliberation or issue-recommendations.

Councilmember Laliberte noted the agreement on the Essay Contest; and suggested that if the HRIEC had specific recommendations for subcommittees or rationale in doing so, that when bringing their work plan back in final form, they provide that information to the City Council at that time.

#### **HRIEC Feedback/Concluding Comments**

Chair Holub thanked the City Council for their comments; however, she expressed concern about restricting HRIEC subcommittees that may limit their work and make them less productive and able to provide as many recommendations for the City Council and city. Chair Holub opined that this wasn't what individual commissioners had signed up for, to work on one project at a time, but instead

preferred to be efficient, suggesting that by curtailing involvement it may come to that outcome.

Commissioner Carey agreed with Chair Holub, and based on her tenure with the HRC and new focus of the HRIEC, noted that different members of the HRIEC had stronger passions in different areas. Referencing the HRC historically, Commissioner Carey noted that by allowing different members to speak to their particular area of expertise, it allowed the commission to accomplish a lot more due to that passion, even when the former HRC wasn't fully staffed.

Commissioner Djevi noted that whenever a subcommittee was created by the HRIEC, they always reported to the whole commission at which time discussions ensued.

Commissioner Groff suggested that the HRIEC find some middle ground, recognizing the various perspectives being expressed, and making subcommittee work more accessible through advance notice, holding them publicly at City Hall, and posting agendas and minutes/notes to allow for more transparency.

Mayor Roe clarified that he wasn't as concerned with posting or accessibility of subcommittees, but was more concerned that the reports of subcommittees get into the packets made available right away and not showing up, as sometimes was current practice, on the day of the meeting. As emphasized to staff for those items coming before the City Council, Mayor Roe noted that as much as possible complete information be made available in the packet for the City Council and public.

Councilmember McGehee opined that individual commissioners could submit and share those items they were passionate about with the full group. However, Councilmember McGehee stated that she saw subcommittees as an association of 2-3 people working on one task; and stated that she would rather fail to accomplish as many activities as proposed versus not having transparency.

Councilmember Willmus clarified that his concern was with 3-4 commissioners doing the work basically to completion and then bringing the package to the full commission, curtailing broader discussion. Councilmember Willmus noted a number of advisory commissions working on complex issues without the need for subcommittee involvement. Councilmember Willmus opined that a better way was needed to formulate ideas prior to a report by providing discussion amongst the broader group that may not be involved in a subcommittee but whose perspectives are just as important. Councilmember Willmus stated that he had no issue with 1-2 commissioners performing research to present to the full body.

Councilmember Etten agreed with Councilmember Willmus, stating that the line for him happens when a subcommittee produced a report for the full commission without bringing that discussion back to the broader group and thereby changing

the dynamics of ongoing discussion throughout the process by the full commission. Councilmember Etten recognized that most sitting council members had sat through advisory commissions for years and were aware of the complicated issues and multiple issues at a time that were brought forward. While difficult, Councilmember Etten opined that it was possible to do, even if and when some things may be delayed, progress could still be made on multiple items on an annual work plan.

Mayor Roe suggested that, at this point, this discussion stood and suggested it be referred back to the HRIEC for their further discussion as their work plan is finalized and how it can be accomplished, whether by using subcommittees or groups of the HRIEC. However, Mayor Roe noted that the City Council was clear on where they stood on this issue, and suggested more thought by the HRIEC as to how to work through that, seeking additional discussion after their deliberation.

Councilmember Laliberte recognized that the HRIEC's work plan may not be as ambitious as first drafted, but opined once they got used to doing things as a larger group, agreed with Commissioner Djevi's comments to identify three things to focus on and do a robust, excellent and thorough job on those things versus only doing an adequate job on ten objectives. Councilmember Laliberte recognized that some of those items were a work in progress, while some would review more in-depth work. Opining that the City Council may not have provided clear direction to the HRIEC on their annual work plan, Councilmember Laliberte invited the HRIEC to take tonight's discussion under advisement and return with their final plan.

At this time, Mayor Roe reiterated that no subcommittees of the HRIEC were sanctioned by the City Council, including the Racial Profiling and Discrimination Subcommittee, consisting of four commissioners and a student commissioner.

Councilmember Willmus stated his desire to discontinue the Racial Profiling Subcommittee at this point and have the full commission work on this issue.

Councilmembers concurred, and without objection, Mayor Roe ruled that the Racial Profiling Subcommittee no longer existed at this point.

Mayor Roe thanked the HRIEC commissioners for their attendance tonight and the work they put into the draft action plan, and their cooperation in working as a commission to-date. Mayor Roe encouraged the HRIEC to continue with the process and to continue dialogue with the City Council, inviting them back as they reflect on tonight's discussion.

**Recess**

Mayor Roe recessed the meeting at approximately 8:02 p.m., and reconvened at approximately 8:09 p.m.

Rebecca Olson

---

**From:** noreply@civicplus.com  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 15, 2018 1:16 PM  
**To:** \*RVCouncil; Dawn O'Connor; Pat Trudgeon  
**Subject:** Online Form Submittal: Contact City Council

## Contact City Council

Please complete this online form and submit.

---

**Subject** Raise age to purchase tobacco products to 21

---

### Contact Information

---

**Name:** Alexandra M Ecklund

---

**Address:**

---

**City:** Roseville

---

**State:** Minnesota

---

**Zip:** 55113

---

This form goes to the Mayor, all Councilmembers and certain City Staff. Due to the volume of emails submitted, a personal reply is not always possible.

---

**How would you prefer to be contacted? Remember to fill in the corresponding contact information.** Phone

---

**Email Address:**

---

**Phone Number:**

---

**Please Share Your Comment, Question or Concern**

Dear Mayor Roe and Roseville City Council Members: My husband and I live in Roseville with our six year old son, who attends Harambee as a kindergartner. We moved to Roseville in 2008 because it seemed like a safe and healthy place for families, and we are very committed to this community. I am writing to express my strong support of an ordinance to increase the tobacco sales age to 21 in our city. I am writing as a constituent, a parent, and a public health professional. The schools and parents in our community work hard to equip students with knowledge about tobacco harms, but that alone

---

cannot prevent them from using tobacco. Education and information about the damaging health effects are only one piece of the puzzle. Public policy is a key aspect of preventing young people from starting down the path of addiction. This month I turned 36 and also celebrated my 10 year anniversary being tobacco free. I had started smoking shortly before my 13th birthday, and as I approached 26, I realized I was crossing a line where I would then have been smoking half of my life. I had just been accepted to the University of Minnesota to pursue a Masters in Public Health and I knew it was finally time. I had tried and failed to quit many (many, many, many) times. This time it stuck. I loved cigarettes. A part of me still does. What this means is that most memories of my adolescence and young adulthood are all accessorized with cigarettes, and my boxes full of photos taken on real film show that tobacco was always there. I don't want the same for my child or for the children in my community. I recently came across an article in the Pioneer Press about the alarming increased tobacco use by high school students in Minnesota due to products like e-cigarettes. Here is the link to the article. <https://www.twincities.com/2018/02/15/more-minnesota-high-school-students-vaping-e-cigarettes-alarming-health-officials/> Considering that most adults start smoking before they are 21, and this increased tobacco use by high school students, raising the sales age to 21 would both reduce kids' access to tobacco products and reduce the number of kids who become smokers. Cities across the metro and in other communities have raised the tobacco sales age to 21. As a constituent and as a concerned parent, I am asking you to please pass a similar law in Roseville to protect the health of the children in our community. I am happy to meet with the Mayor or any City Council members to further discuss this important issue. Sincerely, Ali Ecklund 706 Roma Ave. Roseville, MN 55113

---

Unless restricted by law, all correspondence to and from Roseville City government offices, including information submitted through electronic forms such as this one, may be public data subject to the Minnesota Data Practices Act and/or may be disclosed to third parties.

---

Email not displaying correctly? [View it in your browser.](#)



**Rebecca Olson**

---

**From:** noreply@civicplus.com  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 6, 2018 7:35 AM  
**To:** \*RVCouncil; Dawn O'Connor; Pat Trudgeon  
**Subject:** Online Form Submittal: Contact City Council

## Contact City Council

Please complete this online form and submit.

---

**Subject** Change age for buying cigarette products

---

### Contact Information

---

**Name:** gloria anderson

---

**Address:**

---

**City:** Roseville

---

**State:** MN

---

**Zip:** 55113

---

This form goes to the Mayor, all Councilmembers and certain City Staff. Due to the volume of emails submitted, a personal reply is not always possible.

---

How would you prefer to be contacted? Remember to fill in the corresponding contact information.

Email

---

**Email Address:**

---

**Phone Number:**

---

**Please Share Your Comment, Question or Concern** Please support raising the age to purchase tobacco products to 21.

---

Unless restricted by law, all correspondence to and from Roseville City government offices, including information submitted through electronic forms such as this one, may be public data subject to the Minnesota Data Practices Act and/or may be disclosed to third parties.

---

Email not displaying correctly? [View it in your browser.](#)

**Rebecca Olson**

---

**From:** noreply@civicplus.com  
**Sent:** Friday, March 23, 2018 2:27 PM  
**To:** \*RVCouncil; Dawn O'Connor; Pat Trudgeon  
**Subject:** Online Form Submittal: Contact City Council

## Contact City Council

Please complete this online form and submit.

---

**Subject** Tobacco Age

---

### Contact Information

---

**Name:** Arianna Prunty

---

**Address:** 12513 Central Ave NE

---

**City:** Blaine

---

**State:** MN

---

**Zip:** 55434

---

This form goes to the Mayor, all Councilmembers and certain City Staff. Due to the volume of emails submitted, a personal reply is not always possible.

---

How would you prefer to be contacted? Remember to fill in the corresponding contact information.

Email

---

**Email Address:** aprunty@toptenliquors.com

---

**Phone Number:** 6122261866

---

**Please Share Your Comment, Question or Concern**

Dear Mayor Roe and members of the Roseville City Council:  
My name is Jon Halper and I am the owner of Top Ten Liquors, a new small retail liquor store that will be opening in Roseville at 1611 County Road C, West in May 2018. I appreciate the warm welcome into the Roseville business community that I have received and thank you for the approval of our liquor license. I look forward to operating my business within the Roseville community. The purpose of my letter is to request that you as mayor and city council members consider raising the tobacco sales age in Roseville from 18 to 21. As a

---

responsible retailer, I take the duty to prevent illegal sales to underage liquor and tobacco customers very seriously. Top Ten customers must be 21 (or accompanied by a parent) to enter our stores. In furtherance of our commitment to prevent underage sales we do not allow 18-20-year-olds in our stores even to purchase non-alcohol items. I am a parent of three teenagers and take very seriously the dramatic increase in teen tobacco use. Top Ten sells cigarettes only as a courtesy to our customers and because of our exclusion of 18-20-year-olds, Top Ten effectively only sells cigarettes to our over 21 customers. Despite the fact that a few businesses like mine choose to exclude younger adult customers and despite the fact that the tobacco sales age is 18, somehow younger teens are still able to purchase or receive these harmful and highly addictive products. The sad reality is that it is incredibly easy for a 16-year-old to receive cigarettes from an 18-year-old peer due to proximity and interaction. Increasing the age to purchase cigarettes from 18 to 21 will assist in preventing the purchase and exchange of cigarettes through the removal of the natural social interactions between 18-year-olds and the children they come in contact with on a daily basis. I am bringing this request to your attention because I recently read in the Roseville Review that the Falcon Heights City Council is considering raising the minimum tobacco sales age from 18 to 21. I support this decision and request that Roseville do the same. Sincerely, Jon Halper Top Ten Liquors 12513 Central Ave NE Blaine, MN 55434

---

Unless restricted by law, all correspondence to and from Roseville City government offices, including information submitted through electronic forms such as this one, may be public data subject to the Minnesota Data Practices Act and/or may be disclosed to third parties.

---

Email not displaying correctly? [View it in your browser.](#)