



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

Minutes
Roseville Community Engagement Commission (CEC)
Thursday, October 8, 2015 - 6:30 p.m.

1. Roll Call

Chair Scot Becker called the meeting to order at approximately 6:30 p.m. and Communications Manager Garry Bowman called the roll.

Members Present: Chair Scot Becker; and Members Sherry Sanders, Michelle Manke, Jonathan Miller, Theresa Gardella, and Gary Grefenberg

Members Absent: Ebony Adedayo

Staff Present: Staff Liaison / Communications Manager Garry Bowman

Others Speaking: Lisa McCormick and Kathy Ramundt

2. Approve Agenda

Member Sanders moved amendment of tonight’s agenda, Item 7.A to adjust the order of information from existing neighborhood associations as follows: Lake McCarron’s Neighborhood Association followed by the SouthWest Area of Roseville Neighborhoods, and the Twin Lakes Neighborhood Association reporting last.

At the request of Member Grefenberg as to Member Sander’s rationale in requesting this order change, Member Sanders responded that her requested order reflected the longevity of the associations from oldest to newest.

Chair Becker declared the motion failed due to lack of a second.

Motion

Grefenberg moved, Manke seconded, approval of the agenda as presented.

Ayes: 6

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

3. Public Comment – Non Agenda Items

a. Kathy Ramundt, Laurie Road

Ms. Ramundt reported on several efforts she’d recently initiated some volunteer leadership initiatives in Roseville. Ms. Ramundt reported on her “Do Good Roseville” campaign to collect new and gently used coats, mittens and hats; as well as her upcoming “Community Idea Exchange”

45 gathering at Autumn Grove Park on Sunday, October 25, 2015 from 1:00 –
46 3:00 p.m. for community members to present and share their volunteer and
47 community need ideas.

48
49 On behalf of the CEC and community, Chair Becker thanked Ms. Ramundt
50 for her leadership and asked that she provide information (once corrected)
51 on these opportunities to staff for inclusion in the meeting packet.

52

53 **4. Discuss Meeting Minute Revisions and Approval Process**

54 Chair Becker referenced the document he'd prepared and included in tonight's
55 agenda packet entitled, "Proposed Community Engagement Commission Meeting
56 Minutes Revision and Approval Process," containing his recommendations to
57 more quickly review and make revisions to draft meeting minutes; and sought
58 CEC consensus moving forward. With a transition in recording secretary services,
59 Chair Becker expressed his anticipation that the product reflect the formatting and
60 archival information desired for a record of this advisory commission, using the
61 City Council meeting minutes as a benchmark and comply with the City Council's
62 recently-adopted Uniform Commission Code. Chair Becker noted the proposed
63 revision and approval process was drafted by him in consultation with the City
64 Council and their process and practices.

65

66 Member Grefenberg briefly summarized his understanding of Chair Becker's
67 meeting minute approval process for individual CEC member review and
68 submission of changes to staff, who would then incorporate the individual
69 member changes in the draft presented to the full CEC for review and approval.

70

71 Chair Becker referenced the step by step process in the document and briefly
72 reviewed the timetable for the process between meetings and agenda packet
73 publication and distribution, specific to minor grammatical or typographical errors
74 that are not content related that the entire body could address.

75

76 At the request of Member Manke as to whether this was the process to be followed
77 by all City Council advisory commissions, Chair Becker responded that this
78 internal process was proposed for the CEC in his attempt to follow the City
79 Council's lead, and if agreed upon by the CEC, would reflect the City Council's
80 Uniform Commission Code provisions regarding Commission minutes; he noted
81 that Code would be under discussion later in tonight's meeting.

82

83 **Motion**

84 **Becker moved, Manke seconded, adoption of the process as presented for**
85 **revision and/or approval of CEC meeting minutes.**

86

87 Member Grefenberg thanked Chair Becker for his work, with consensus by the
88 body showing their appreciation.

89

90 **Ayes: 6**

91 **Nays: 0**
92 **Motion carried.**

93
94 **5. Approval of August [14] [13], 2015 Meeting Minutes**
95 Chair Becker noted changes had been incorporated by Staff Liaison Garry
96 Bowman as provided by Member Grefenberg. Chair Becker advised that due to
97 ongoing issues with and inability to get the more substantial changes previously
98 requested from TimeSaver, Inc., the Commission’s former recording secretarial
99 service, the City had chosen to no longer work with them on this CEC account.

100
101 **Motion**
102 **Grefenberg moved, Miller seconded, approval of the August 13th Commission**
103 **meeting minutes as corrected.**

104
105 **Ayes: 6**
106 **Nays: 0**
107 **Motion carried.**

108
109 **6. Approval of September 10, 2015 Meeting Minutes**
110 Chair Scot noted inclusion of minor edits in the redlined copy of the September 10,
111 2015 CEC meeting minutes presented for approval.

112
113 Member Grefenberg opined that the minutes on lines 128-129 inaccurately
114 recorded a statement made by Ms. McCormick on lines 128 – 129 since he—not
115 Ms. McCormick—had used the term *smiling* in response to her comments
116 regarding his apparent conduct. He noted, more importantly, that these types of
117 personal comments or rejoinders are usually omitted from the formal minutes, and
118 therefore asked that instead of being corrected this section of the minutes be
119 omitted from this public record.

120
121 **Motion to Amend**
122 **Grefenberg moved, Manke seconded, approval to amend the minutes by**
123 **omitting Lines 128—129, Page 3 from the CEC meeting minutes of September**
124 **10, 2015.**

125
126 At the request for clarification by Member Sanders, Member Grefenberg
127 responded that he had reviewed the meeting video several times specific to this
128 item expressed by Ms. McCormick regarding his demeanor, and was unable to
129 find the comment attributed to Ms. McCormick that he should stop smiling. This
130 word was used by him in response to Ms. McCormick’s initial comment. Member
131 Grefenberg asked that lines 128-129 be stricken from the record, or that the
132 minutes be corrected to include his rebuttal as part of the record, opining that the
133 comments of Ms. McCormick from his perspective were unnecessary for the
134 permanent record of the meeting.

135

136 Having not been present at the meeting, but after reviewing the video after the fact,
137 Member Gardella opined that the written minutes appeared to be an accurate
138 record of the meeting. However, Member Gardella noted that she was not sure of
139 the procedure for approving content versus personal wishes, or of the protocol if
140 this determination created a precedent.

141
142 Chair Becker advised that he had also reviewed the meeting video, and, specific to
143 the section including Ms. McCormick’s comments, she had made a statement as
144 indicated in the draft, and Member Grefenberg had followed up with his comment.
145 Pursuant to the previous discussion as to the level of detail in the meeting minutes,
146 and whether or not either the comments including rebuttal were germane to the
147 minutes, Chair Becker opined that if one was allowed, both should be recorded.
148 Dependent on the consensus of the body as a whole, Chair Becker stated that he
149 had no objection to striking the comments and response, since he found neither
150 relevant to the discussion.

151
152 Member Sanders opined that the record should be accurately recorded.

153
154 Member Gardella agreed that the record needed to be accurate, but questioned if
155 that record needed to include everything said; and agreed that she was fine with
156 striking it or correcting it.

157
158 Member Miller agreed to either option as well from his perspective.

159
160 As she had stated at a previous meeting, Member Manke reiterated her lack of
161 interest in the snipes back and forth, and since this would only serve to
162 memorialize them if left in, her preference would be to strike them and keep the
163 record germane to the business at hand and not a record of personal behavior.

164
165 Chair Becker agreed, and offered to support the motion to amend the meeting
166 minutes, striking lines 128-129.

167
168 **Ayes: 5**
169 **Nays: 1 (Sanders)**
170 **Motion carried.**

171
172 **Motion to Amend**
173 **Grefenberg moved, Miller seconded, approval of the change to Line 423, Page**
174 **3 to read as follows:**
175 **“Commissioner Jonathan Miller thought [~~whatever they can~~] [the commission**
176 **could] do to move beyond some of the...”**

177
178 **Ayes: 6**
179 **Nays: 0**
180 **Motion carried.**

181

182 **Motion as Amended**
183 **Miller moved, Manke seconded, approval of the September 10, 2015 CEC**
184 **meeting minutes as amended.**

185
186 **Ayes: 6**
187 **Nays: 0**
188 **Motion carried.**

189
190 **7. Old Business**

191
192 **A. Receive Information from Existing Neighborhood Associations**
193 Chair Becker noted that Member Adedayo had framed and provided three
194 questions to all three existing neighborhood associations for their
195 presentation to the Commission tonight, as provided in the agenda.

196
197 **a. Twin Lakes Neighborhood Association (TLNA)**
198 Chair Becker invited Ms. McCormick, Chair and President of the
199 TLNA to present information on this association.

200
201 Ms. McCormick stated that she preferred to go last and provide her
202 comments following the other two Association representatives.

203
204 In response to a question from the Chair as to the reason for her
205 request McCormick responded that it would best be left off the
206 record.

207
208 Chair Becker noted that an amendment to change the order of
209 presentations at tonight’s meeting had been considered at the
210 beginning of the meeting but had not been supported by the
211 majority, and therefore would stand as is.

212
213 Ms. McCormick then thanked the CEC for being invited to speak
214 but declined to do so, offering instead to submit written responses
215 to the questions.

216
217 **b. Lake McCarron’s Neighborhood Association (LMNA)**
218 As Chairperson representing the LMNA, Sherry Sanders advised
219 that variations of her association had initially begun in the 1940’s.
220 In 1991 Diane Hilden moved into the area as a new Roseville
221 resident from out-of-state and as a way to get to know her neighbors
222 and build community Ms Hilden founded the current version of the
223 association. Ms. Sanders provided a brief history of the association
224 and their accomplishment to-date on behalf of the neighborhood
225 and the community, focusing on various areas, including acquisition
226 of Reservoir Park and the installation of a pathway, , crime issues
227 and water quality improvements.

228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272

Ms. Sanders noted the association concentrated on building social capital among neighbors through monthly events or social gatherings, community-wide assemblies, and an annual picnic. Ms. Sanders noted that the association had been involved in area park clean-up projects, supported the annual Night to Unite program, and promoted block and building clubs to engage residents.

Ms. Sanders reported that their association had 400 neighbors involved on NextDoor.com, on Facebook, and welcomed all residents and/or businesses within their borders from Dale to Rice Street and Larpenteur Avenue to Highway 36, representing almost 1,000 households. Ms. Sanders shared the association’s objectives, and as the oldest and first association registered as a non-profit organization, counted itself 200 members and friends strong.

As far as challenges, Ms. Sanders reported that the biggest challenge for the neighborhood was their location on the edge of a tri-city area, typically pushing businesses to those corners that may not be the most neighborhood-friendly or desired on Main Street, and often increasing crime and entering the community from other jurisdictions. Ms. Sanders reported that the lack of a healthy business district on Rice Street had been neglected over the years, and was further impacted by the recent infusion of immigrant populations.

As to how the City could assist, Ms. Sanders suggested helping the association with publicity and getting the word out for more residents and businesses to join the association to work together. Ms. Sanders stated that the association could use information and education without regulation, opining that the goal was for the association to be organic and ideas to come from within through residents living in that area.

In looking to the future, Ms. Sanders noted that most residents were empty nesters, or middle age or older; and creating an outreach to renters, young families and new citizen neighbors would help revitalize the association and create a more cohesive neighborhood.

Regarding education, Member Manke asked for more specific types of education desired by LMNA.

Ms. Sanders responded that the association would like access to a section of the City’s website and newsletter for publishing articles; and to have access to City buildings for larger meetings, such as

273 when guest speakers are available or to encourage interaction with
274 other association leaders.

275
276 In response to a question from Chair Becker, Ms. Sanders clarified
277 that the current park building used by the LMNA at no charge only
278 held about 35 people, and was now too small for their meetings;
279 often necessitating their meeting elsewhere due to lack of space.
280 Using a recent example, Ms. Sanders reported that four Roseville
281 Police Officers attended and shared with the LMNA for two hours,
282 which proved an awesome experience in sharing information from
283 the Police and neighborhood perspectives, and allowing residents to
284 be heard. Since the neighborhood had experienced lots of crime
285 recently, Ms. Sanders noted how assuring this had been for
286 residents in getting their questions answered.

287
288 In seeking additional specificity related to education desired by the
289 LMNA, Member Gardella asked what type of education was being
290 referenced.

291
292 Ms. Sanders suggested helping the association in educational efforts
293 to benefit and improve the quality of life for those joining the
294 LMNA.

295
296 Chair Becker asked Ms. Sanders to report on recent interactions
297 held with the LMNA and the communities of St. Paul and
298 Maplewood, sharing their borders with Roseville in this immediate
299 vicinity.

300
301 Ms. Sanders reported on the recent meeting she'd been invited to
302 attend regarding the Larpenteur Corridor from Highway 280 to
303 Highway 61, a two-mile stretch involving many jurisdictions. Ms.
304 Sanders stated that this resulted in those entities and agencies
305 committing to work together for a long-term fix, recognizing it
306 would not be a short-term solution but with all agreeing to make the
307 Rice Street/Larpenteur Avenue intersection a priority and involving
308 the assistance and commitment of all three mayors from the three
309 municipalities involved.

310
311 Ms. Sanders reported that she had reached out to her counterpart in
312 St. Paul, and they were working together to engage residents in
313 working together for suggestions in solving those issues. Ms.
314 Sanders further reported that she'd also reached out to the City of
315 Maplewood by phone and e-mail, but had yet to find a contact
316 person at this time, and had followed-up by letter that the City of
317 Maplewood consider participating by providing a contact person.
318 Ms. Sanders noted that the City of St. Paul, with their districts and

319 wards already established, provided a great opportunity; and
320 expressed her goal in all working together to help each other.

321
322 At the request of Chair Becker, Ms. Sanders advised that Ramsey
323 County as a whole did not have an engagement plan or person, but
324 had been present at the joint meeting and appeared to be on board
325 and supportive of ideas to work together to fix the issues. Ms.
326 Sanders opined that it wasn't nice over there right now, but
327 expressed her confidence that it could be and she was excited about
328 the possibilities.

329
330 Chair Becker asked Ms. Sanders to share any other support she'd
331 received from the Cities of St. Paul or Maplewood, or from Ramsey
332 County that the City of Roseville could mirror, including any
333 additional support from neighboring jurisdictions beyond education
334 or how Roseville could encourage residents in Roseville to form
335 associations. Chair Becker asked if there was any role in seeking
336 partnerships with associations in neighboring communities to foster
337 that partnership rather than remain as separate entities.

338
339 Ms. Sanders opined that may be a possibility, and with Mayor
340 Roe's attendance at the joint meeting, she noted that he had offered
341 to meet with the mayors of those other communities, but no
342 specifics had been yet addressed.

343
344 Using that meeting as an example, Member Miller asked how they
345 had known to contact Ms. Sanders; and if or how such a contact list
346 could be replicated in Roseville so newer – or all - neighborhood
347 associations could be kept in that loop.

348
349 Ms. Sanders noted that her contact involved being chair of the
350 LMNA and previous work done in trying to help plug in newer
351 immigrant neighborhoods so they could assimilate quicker,
352 including working with the KOM, such as through introducing them
353 to NextDoor.com to get to know their neighborhood better. Ms.
354 Sanders noted the work of the Karen interagency work group in
355 reaching out to immigrant children, with the Police Department's
356 Soccer Camp coordinated by Police Community Relations
357 Coordinator Corey Yunke and planning indoor gymnasium
358 sessions, as well as community gardens. Ms. Sanders advised that
359 Housing & Redevelopment Executive Director Jeanne Kelsey was
360 also actively involved in the work group, and her invitation to the
361 joint meeting had been prompted by Ms. Kelsey, and she had
362 considered it an honor to attend.

363

364 Member Grefenberg sought clarification as to whether the youth
365 activities were aimed specifically at Karen youth.

366
367 Ms. Sanders responded that the soccer camp held in August had
368 been open to all youth in the neighborhood, and she had personally
369 promoted it on NextDoor.com; but as it turned out no established
370 residents participated in the camp, with the majority of youth
371 representing the immigrant children in one apartment complex. Ms.
372 Sanders reported that it still turned out well, and recognized the
373 commitment of Police Chief Mathwig, Mr. Yunke and Roseville
374 Police Officers in reaching those kids. Given the fact that there
375 were over 260 kids in 12 apartment buildings, Ms. Sanders opined
376 that they really needed an outlet.

377
378 Ms. Sanders noted that there were “Friends of LMNA” outside the
379 immediate geographical neighborhood invited to see what the
380 association was doing, with no dues. Ms. Sanders advised that the
381 events sponsored or hosted by the LMNA were not intended to be
382 exclusive to LMNA members, and were open community-wide as
383 they sought to be as inclusive as possible.

384
385 At the request of Chair Becker and Member Grefenberg, Ms.
386 Sanders reported that regular membership dues were \$20/year to
387 cover the cost of speakers, locations beyond the free use of the
388 neighborhood park building, with a church used frequently and a
389 portion of the dues shared with them for using their facility.

390
391 At the request of Chair Becker, Ms. Sanders clarified that when
392 using park buildings, the LMNA was not charged a fee, but
393 reiterated that their inability to use a park facility was based more
394 on the size it was able to accommodate, since the goal was to keep
395 the meeting or event in the neighborhood, especially since many
396 attendees walk to the meetings or events.

397
398 **c. SouthWest Area of Roseville Neighborhoods**
399 In response to the three questions framed by Member Ebony
400 Adedayo on behalf of the CEC, Gary Grefenberg as Chairperson of
401 the SouthWest Area of Roseville Neighborhoods (SWARN)
402 provided a bench handout, with the association’s written responses,
403 *attached hereto and made a part hereof*. Mr. Grefenberg noted
404 that SWARN was a unique association of various southwestern
405 neighborhoods in Roseville, not just one neighborhood, and
406 incorporating a geographical area from Highway 280 across
407 Snelling Avenue. to Hamline Avenue and
408

409 Mr. Grefenberg reported that SWARN evolved initially as an
410 organization of Roseville residents and neighbors formed in
411 opposition to a proposed asphalt plant in 2009/2010, and then in
412 2012 had formalized into a neighborhood association. Its area
413 included three condominium or town home associations and six
414 specific neighborhoods as found in the southwest area of Roseville.

415
416 Mr. Grefenberg reviewed the goals of SWARN, as detailed in his
417 written report, basically coordinating and assisting in efforts to
418 facilitate and solve neighborhood issues. Ms. Grefenberg provided
419 several examples, including those of a lack of a pathway along
420 County Road B, and the potential loss of the Fairfield fields, a
421 unique and rare open space in this area of Roseville. Through
422 working with the City Council, Ramsey County and School District,
423 and other city advisory commissions, Ms. Grefenberg reported that
424 SWARN had achieved its goals for these projects.

425
426 Mr. Grefenberg also reported on other ways his organization's goals
427 are achieved by alerting neighborhoods to various issues and
428 proposals, typically through the publication of a SWARN electronic
429 newsletter by SWARN; he distributed various samples of this
430 newsletter for CEC members to view.

431
432 As a result of advocacy efforts of SWARN, Mr. Grefenberg
433 reported that ~~they~~ residents had felt empowered and wanted to do
434 more, and thus the "Monitor" newsletter had been developed to
435 provide neighbors with an understanding of ongoing issues-. ~~h~~He
436 opined this communication was critical for residents to have an
437 understanding of what the City was proposing or planning in order
438 to allow them a voice before it was decided. Mr. Grefenberg
439 recognized the initial efforts of Roseville resident Megan Dushin in
440 establishing a website for SWARN to get that information to
441 residents in a timely manner before decision-making had already
442 occurred, a continuing challenge for the group.

443
444 Mr. Grefenberg's written comments also included a list of SWARN
445 accomplishments in their advocacy efforts, and action alerts for
446 specific issues coming before the Planning Commission, Parks &
447 Recreation Commission, or City Council and copies of action alerts
448 distributed to association members. In SWARN's communication
449 efforts with the City Council, Mr. Grefenberg stated that the
450 association tried to maintain a good lobbying arm and good
451 relationships with individual Councilmembers, with a core group
452 monitoring City Council agendas to keep aware of current topics
453 and issues, along with issues on NextDoor.com.

454

455 As a goal of SWARN, Mr. Grefenberg reported that their goal for
456 ongoing organizational activities was to have southwest Roseville
457 neighborhoods be effective participants in city decision-making,
458 using a recent example of a neighbor experiencing a home burglary
459 twice in succession and SWARN's assistance in communication
460 efforts for the resident and City Council.

461
462 Mr. Grefenberg reported that one of the challenges faced was
463 burnout and a lack of advance city notice on upcoming projects.

464
465 As to how the City can assist SWARN, Mr. Grefenberg suggested
466 more publicity, having a specific SWARN page on the City's civic
467 engagement module, and other efforts to improve outreach.

468
469 From his personal perspective related to visionary goals for
470 SWARN, one of three questions submitted to all neighborhood
471 associations, Grefenberg stated his goal to have a minimum of five
472 viable neighborhood associations, noting the geographical area
473 involved 3,700 households; with the goal of breaking that large
474 group into a more manageable size, to facilitate working
475 relationships with city staff, which, he commented, had improved
476 significantly in recent years.

477
478 Member Gardella asked what support those other five
479 neighborhoods would provide to SWARN, specifically for
480 individuals wanting to start an association or what work they would
481 accomplish.

482
483 Mr. Grefenberg clarified that of the approximately eleven residents
484 involved as the core group of SWARN, they didn't represent a
485 specific neighborhood,. After the success of the County Road B
486 pathway last summer, Mr. Grefenberg reported, even though they
487 had done a great job promoting their issue, he had told that
488 neighborhood that he would no longer work with them and that they
489 should start their own association. However, unfortunately, Mr.
490 Grefenberg advised that they haven't moved forward, while the
491 larger SWARN group continued to work with and monitor the
492 larger SW Roseville area

493 At the request of Member Sanders, Mr. Grefenberg reported a
494 signed membership of around 65 SWARN applications, with a
495 mailing list of about 300; with no dues or fees. At the further
496 request of Member Sanders, Mr. Grefenberg confirmed that "no
497 dues" had initially been a purposeful decision, recognizing that
498 residents would be committing their time to attending a Planning
499 Commission or City Council meeting and they didn't want to
500 discourage that with a further commitment to paying dues. In

501 looking forward, and with a good foundation now in place, Mr.
502 Grefenberg admitted that SWARN was somewhat hindered in
503 getting critical information to all 3,700 SW households without
504 having funds available to do so.

505
506 With the membership of SWARN apparently begun over
507 controversial proposals such as the asphalt plant and Walmart,
508 Member Sanders asked how membership had now changed, and
509 questioned if the common enemy advocacy approach had seen to
510 wax and wane over time.

511
512 Mr. Grefenberg responded that the core group had changed, with
513 people initially motivated by a social justice desire to stop Wal-
514 Mart, some of those people were no longer involved in SWARN,
515 even though the general membership hadn't changed very much
516 other than through natural attrition – moving out of the
517 neighborhood or deaths, but no radical changes seen.

518
519 Given the difficulty in getting people to volunteer due to busy lives,
520 Member Sanders asked Mr. Grefenberg for ideas used by SWARN
521 to get good attendance as their meetings; as well as seeking
522 information on how often they met.

523
524 Mr. Grefenberg advised that SWARN didn't have regular meetings,
525 since people hate meetings; but used a format suggested by the
526 initial civic engagement task force as an informal prototype of an
527 association without regulations and/or meetings, making SWARN
528 somewhat different and a looser organization than that of the
529 LMNA. Mr. Grefenberg noted that SWARN basically served to
530 represent voices from the core group through NextDoor.com, and
531 while there were always complaints from some in the
532 neighborhood, improvements in the group continued to be made
533 and evolve.

534
535 At the request of Member Sanders, Mr. Grefenberg estimated that
536 15% of SWARN was on NextDoor.com, but they didn't rely on
537 only that one tool, and sent out notices to residents when needed as
538 well as relying on their own SWARN mailings.

539
540 At the request of Member Miller, Mr. Grefenberg advised that
541 SWARN's mailing list initiated from door-to-door contact by four
542 members (when the asphalt plant was proposed), and joint meetings
543 and sign-up sheets passed around by members attending advisory
544 commission meetings of the Parks & Recreation and Public Works,
545 Environment and Transportation Commission meetings.

546

547 Member Gardella noted the interesting aspects and distinct
548 differences in these two presentations, with one primarily motivated
549 as an issue-based association and the other of a more social and
550 issue based nature.

551
552 Member Sanders concurred that the LMNA was intentionally
553 intended as a more fun-based or social association.
554

555 Member Gardella noted that since the community part wrapped into
556 the civic aspect as well, it would be interesting for the CEC to
557 determine what motivates association development and what
558 support the CEC may recommend to the City Council to avoid the
559 high burnout rate and to involve those residents not looking to share
560 additional responsibility or time commitments in their already-full
561 lives.

562
563 Mr. Grefenberg noted SWARN's majority approval of their major
564 efforts, their statement of policies and those areas of commonality.
565 Mr. Grefenberg opined that SWARN's experience was organic as
566 well, resulting in the core group of people formed. Agreeing with
567 Ms. Sander's comment in desiring more publicity support from the
568 City, Mr. Grefenberg stated that was a common goal of SWARN
569 and LMNA going forward.

570
571 At the request of Ms. Sanders, Mr. Grefenberg reported that
572 approximately 8-10 of the core members of SWARN served as
573 decision-makers and represented all neighborhoods. While hoping
574 to become more structured moving forward, Mr. Grefenberg stated
575 that he offered no apologies for that small core group.
576

577 Members Sanders and Gardella opined that was a good number for
578 a core group on an association.

579 **B. Discussion on Background, Purposes and Benefits of Neighborhood**
580 **Associations**

581 Recognizing the interesting level of organizational purposes, whether social
582 or advocacy, Chair Becker stated he didn't want to be prescriptive in
583 defining associations rather than allowing them to form their own structure,
584 whether organic or fluid. Therefore, Chair Becker suggested the CEC's
585 recommendation to the City Council reflect their nature and outline what
586 the City can do or what could be expected of them.
587

588 To initiate tonight's discussion, Chair Becker noted his provision of
589 excerpts of Task Force deliberations specific to Neighborhood Associations
590 (Attachment A). Chair Becker suggested focusing the scope of tonight's
591 discussion on this area only, anticipating no action items, but just to begin
592 the general conversation.

593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638

Member Grefenberg noted that this particular section, Attachment A, was unanimously approved by those present at a task force meeting; and from his perspective, was the least controversial.

Chair Becker reiterated his intent for tonight to serve as a general discussion without format, anticipating those discussions over multiple CEC meetings, and serving as a precursor to the framing the broader recommendations to the City Council.

Member Grefenberg noted the definition of “civic engagement” was taken from the precursor of the task force, the Civic Engagement Task Force formed by the Human Rights Commission [in 2011 through 2013], and thus this may have created some of the confusion between that Task Force from the Human Rights Commission, and the Commission’s myriad of recommendations since 2014, as well as those of the Neighborhood Association’s Task Force recommendations.

Member Grefenberg opined, however, that there may have been little discussion by the most recent Task Force on those definitions since the Task Force felt the purposes of a particular association may be determined by that specific association. Grefenberg added that some aspects listed were not intended as regulatory but only to give some sense of what a neighborhood association could look like. Member Grefenberg concluded regarding “Purposes of Neighborhood Associations,” that this list was also in a general way organized in order of importance.

Member Sanders stated that, from her perspective, the purpose is to bond neighborhoods so when issues come up they’re more likely to get involved and participate, the basis or theory of social capital.

Member Gardella concurred that was the good part, building that sense of community.

Member Grefenberg suggesting that purpose included developing good relationships with the City Council and City staff as well.

Member Miller noted the updated definition of “civic engagement” after this document had been drafted.

Member Grefenberg noted that this definition was the same as the “community engagement” definition developed by Member Gardella a couple of months ago., Since CEC Members Manke and Miller had not been involved in the Task Force, Chair Becker sought their input.

639 Based on what she was seeing, Member Manke stated that she found
640 nothing of significance that she disagreed with.

641
642 Member Miller stated that this portion seemed pretty comprehensive and
643 well-thought-out, and shouldn't require too much modification.

644
645 Regarding the block club comment, Member Sanders opined that some
646 consider the neighborhood watch concept antiquated, but noted it was still
647 vital and part of those building blocks to community, thus opining it was
648 important not to forget and promote block clubs as a building block.

649
650 Chair Becker agreed that was a good point, to make sure an unintended
651 consequence didn't occur that would diminish their importance in the
652 CEC's final recommendation to the City Council.

653
654 Member Grefenberg stated he had a different view of block clubs, one
655 where they focused on crime rather than community or community
656 engagement at the City Council level. For instance, Member Grefenberg
657 noted that his neighborhood didn't have a block club, and suggested getting
658 a sense from Mr. Yunke, [the Police Departments Community Relations
659 officer,] on what the Police Departments block club coverage s was in
660 Roseville. Member Grefenberg recalled that at its very beginning a goal of
661 NextDoor was to coordinate activities with block clubs, but some block
662 captains in his neighborhood didn't want to do so; indicating to him that
663 more refinement was still needed and that this issue needed to be addressed
664 in the CEC's recommendation to the City Council.

665
666 Member Gardella stated that anything that brings people together served as
667 a beginning and should be considered good, no matter how they're
668 informed to build civic participation.

669
670 Member Grefenberg responded that he was trying to capture this as an
671 issue needing further discussion and definition.

672
673 Member Gardella clarified that she was stating that there were many other
674 forms for gathering, whether through block clubs, organizing around
675 specific issues, or an actual intentional neighborhood association, and it
676 was important to recognize those variables in the final CEC
677 recommendations Member Gardella opined it was important to recognize
678 the value of opportunities for people to gather together, while the CEC's
679 task was to identify what it wanted to say about neighborhood associations
680 and how best to define them.

681
682 Member Grefenberg noted there were different types of neighborhood
683 associations, and his sense from his association was that it would like to
684 get more formal.

685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729

Member Gardella suggested rather than “types of neighborhood associations,” perhaps identifying “different types of formed groups” may be more beneficial in making it broad enough to fit all, with all criterion not necessarily fitting each group.

Chair Becker opined that was an interesting way to frame it, since he had initially assumed a looser definition allowing more rigor for an organization; but now was revising his thinking to avoid stymieing smaller things, and at what point a group would best evolve. Therefore, Chair Becker suggested not getting too prescriptive, with the City’s goal to attempt to meet the needs of association members versus doling out expensive city services to each and any group. However, Chair Becker noted the need to define boundaries and where to draw the line for city support (e.g. defining free access to park buildings for neighborhood associations and various other forms of city support).

Member Gardella agreed with Chair Becker on the need to define that support.

Member Grefenberg opined that this highlighted excerpt was quite compatible with the issues currently being articulated, and while maybe missing the recognition of some other forms of community-building groups that should be included in the CEC’s final recommendations to the City Council, perhaps just providing examples of block clubs assisting in formation of community may suffice.

Chair Becker and Member Grefenberg both noted that they never have said neighborhood associations are the only way to promote community.

Public Comment

Lisa McCormick

Ms. McCormick expressed appreciation for the depth of conversation related to this item; and agreed wholeheartedly that there was a wide variation in types of organizations. Specific to the point made by Member Gardella, Ms. McCormick agreed that community happened in many different forms. Prior to initiation of Task Force conversations, Ms. McCormick reported that she had researched sixteen other municipalities with similar populations to that of Roseville between 18,000 and 50,000, with only two of those having formalized neighborhood associations, while the vast majority had some associations, with the most common being a hybrid a bit beyond that of a neighborhood watch program. Ms. McCormick further reported that two communities had informal neighborhood organizations, but not to the level of neighborhood associations, basically due to the potential cost and liability of those

730 associations, which was her rationale in expressing caution in forming
731 neighborhood associations.

732
733 Member Gardella asked Ms. McCormick what she meant by the “formal”
734 meaning for those two supported by a community.

735
736 Ms. McCormick responded that her reference to “formal” was their
737 recognition as a legal incorporated entity.

738
739 Ms. McCormick opined that the best way to encourage community was
740 how people were treated at gatherings like this. During her last 1.5 years of
741 civic engagement and with the Roseville City Council, Ms. McCormick
742 stated that she’d observed a lot of small neighborhood groups with a social
743 component and network coming together on civic issues, and opined that
744 they had been fairly effective in doing so. However, Ms. McCormick
745 further opined that this was not exclusive to neighborhood associations, but
746 expressed appreciation for the CEC’s recognition of the concept of block
747 clubs being included (Attachment C).

748
749 In reviewing the excerpts highlighted for tonight’s discussion and the
750 CEC’s eventual recommendation to the City Council, Member Grefenberg
751 asked Ms. McCormick if her suggestion was that language be included or
752 delineated to make it clear that all groups, whether formal or informal,
753 whether associations or block clubs, should be accorded the same respect
754 and be supported by the City.

755
756 Ms. McCormick stated that she was unwilling to comment on that point as
757 she couldn’t respond out of context until reviewing the CEC’s final
758 recommendation to the City Council.

759
760 Member Grefenberg suggested it would be helpful if Ms. McCormick
761 provided draft language for the CEC to consider including. Member
762 Grefenberg noted that he would be relying on the CEC minutes to refine his
763 version of the final recommendations to the City Council as discussions
764 continue.

765 **C. Update on Joint Task Force on Zoning Notification**

766 Member Manke advised that she had nothing to report at this time as time
767 had not allowed a meeting of the Task Force since the last CEC meeting,
768 but anticipated such a meeting within a week or two.

769
770 Specific to notification efforts, Chair Becker provided a sample notice a
771 several neighbors had provided him, representing a third party contractor
772 notice regarding water shut offs due to failure to provide water meter
773 access despite repeated notices. Chair Becker noted that the neighbors had
774 expressed concern in not having received any prior notices, and had been
775 offended by the language of the notice as he had received no prior notice.

776 Chair Becker advised that while much of the information he had to-date
777 was hearsay, he found the perception of the neighbors concerning, opining
778 it should be easily resolved by the City. However, since several neighbors
779 had the same experience, Chair Becker opined that there was obviously
780 some communication issue, whether with the subcontractor or by the City,
781 implying it was a final notice of shut-off.

782
783 Member Grefenberg asked Chair Becker to provide copies for him and
784 Member Manke to take back to the Task Force for their reference.

785
786 Chair Becker advised that, since he had not received permission from the
787 residents to forward their personal information also jotted down on the
788 notice, he would write out a synopsis of the notice itself in a more generic
789 form.

790
791 **D. Update on Civic Engagement Website Module**

792 Communications Manager Garry Bowman reported on the City Council's
793 approval on October 5, 2015 of the first two "discussions" and "ideas"
794 sections of the module. Mr. Bowman further reported that he had met with
795 City Manager Trudgeon to finalize the policy/procedures issues the City
796 Council had further refined for the Speak Up module, and once those
797 Council meeting minutes were available for confirmation, he would
798 incorporate them and.

799
800 Mr. Bowman advised that the Website Committee had met yesterday to
801 talk about the roll out and strategic marketing for that step, with taking it to
802 groups beyond the City itself to facilitate a successful launch, anticipated
803 about November 1, 2015.

804
805 Chair Becker noted that, referring to the staff-prepared Request for Council
806 Action (RCA) as well as the attachments in the Council's meeting packet s,
807 most of the CEC recommendations had made it into the final version as
808 adopted by the City Council with the exception of "posting of topics"
809 section. That provision had been further refined by the Council to solely
810 provide that the City Council provide guidance and the CEC could provide
811 advice but it would be treated as any other City Council commission in
812 suggesting topics for Speak Up.

813
814 To add to Mr. Bowman's comments, Member Grefenberg prepared, as a
815 bench handout *attached hereto and made a part hereof*, a summary of the
816 City Council's actions, with all CEC recommendations adopted with the
817 exception of Provision 8 in his attachment; with the City Council further
818 addressing those remaining two recommendations but amending them in
819 their final document. From his perspective, Member Grefenberg opined
820 that the City Council had listened to the CEC and based on their discussion
821 found them to express their concern in being more transparent if and when

822 questions or issues were discarded to ensure that transparency. Member
823 Grefenberg noted that a community member had recently suggested to him
824 that it should be more transparent when a topic was rejected by City staff
825 provide the CEC with a list of those items discarded, not as a future action
826 item, but simply as a report of what was left out before seen by the general
827 public.

828
829 At the request of Member Gardella, Mr. Bowman clarified that if a topic is
830 not approved or offensive, it would be removed from the website,
831 surmising that this was the information that Member Grefenberg was
832 apparently requesting.

833
834 Chair Becker opined that was an interesting point. However, from his
835 recollection, Chair Becker stated that the committee had been formed to
836 evaluate vendors and make recommendations on a vendor to work with the
837 City Council and Mr. Bowman in rolling out the module. From his
838 personal viewpoint, Chair Becker opined that the committee could then be
839 dissolved and perhaps a different committee would be needed to monitor,
840 feed or otherwise affect the module and ensure the vibrancy of the module
841 was maintained or enhanced. While that may become a future agenda topic,
842 Chair Becker suggesting waiting until the module was rolled out and had
843 been in operation for a while, such as determining if a second push was
844 needed to alert residents to the availability of this tool.

845
846 Member Grefenberg stated that he would send a copy of his summary on
847 the Council and Administration's response to the Commission's
848 recommendations on Speak Up Policies and Procedures to each
849 Commissioner, **CEC Social Gathering**

850 Due to time constraints, Member Manke reported that she was not prepared
851 to report on this item as it was still a work-in-progress.

852

853 **8. Chair, Committee and Staff Reports**

854

855 **A. Chair's Report**

856 Chair Becker reported on the newly-adopted City Council Uniform
857 Commission Code, included in the meeting agenda packet materials, and
858 calling attention to those items he had highlighted. Chair Becker noted that
859 Chapter 201 applied to all advisory commissions, while Chapter 209 spoke
860 specifically to the CEC; and called out those items of interest to the CEC
861 related to youth commissioners, annual ethics code and training, meeting
862 attendance, subcommittee roles, and meeting notices.

863

864 **B. Staff Report**

865 Chair Becker reported that a future City Council agenda may include
866 discussions on boundaries/formation of the current Human Rights
867 Commission with respect to the CEC; and thus a possible need for

868 attendance at that City Council Worksession of CEC members as part of
869 that broader discussion of commissions and potential blending or
870 restructuring of various commissions periodically.

871

872 **9. New Business**

873

874 **A. Discussion on Welcome Packet**

875 While having little conversation on this in the past, Member Manke
876 reported that she had sent a link to individual CEC members of an online
877 welcome packet, seeking their initial comments and impressions.

878

879 Members Sanders, Gardella and Miller advised that had not yet had a
880 chance to review the link.

881

882 Chair Becker stated that he had briefly reviewed the link, which was an
883 online version of a printed brochure that not only included the City's
884 website and links but also links to other related websites, with this example
885 providing advertising that made it more revenue-neutral. Chair Becker
886 opined that this style of presentation could be done in many ways; and
887 stated that his initial impression was it was easy to provide a print and
888 online version without maintaining separate documents, which made a lot
889 of sense from an ease of maintenance perspective after the initial
890 development.

891

892 Mr. Bowman reported that he had used that company before in other
893 publications, and their format was simply an uploaded pdf format.

894

895 Member Manke opined that she thought it presented a professional look for
896 new residents and offered lots of options for them to find information and
897 get a taste of the business climate promotion through this option.

898

899 Mr. Bowman stated that he didn't seek his information personally this way
900 and therefore his impression if a new resident would not apply. Mr.
901 Bowman questioned if this information was already being provided by
902 realtors or already included on the City's website or perhaps simply needed
903 better presentation on the website. While he didn't see anything negative
904 about the site, and found it well-done and well laid-out, Mr. Bowman
905 questioned if there would be significant interest from realtors in using this
906 option. As a first step, Mr. Bowman suggested the CEC first find that out.

907

908 Discussion ensued regarding outmoded information sources (e.g. hard copy
909 phone books); availability of information online; use of smart phone apps;
910 different research among citizens based on their demographics; and
911 whether the current welcome packet or a future packet was intended for
912 residents or businesses.

913

914 Member Manke advised that her online research of future versions of a
915 welcome packet was geared toward residents.

916
917 For background reference, Mr. Bowman advised that the previous
918 Welcome Packet had been produced by the Housing & Redevelopment
919 Authority (HRA) and initially offered their services geared toward
920 homeowners in the community.

921
922 As a recipient of a Welcome Packet ten years ago, Chair Becker stated that
923 he found it helpful and informative; but admitted most of the information it
924 contained was now readily available on the City's website.

925
926 Discussion ensued regarding the experience of other individual CEC
927 members, and the value of a physical folder versus online access; the "feel
928 good" aspect of the City having reached out to a new resident as a nice
929 gesture creating a welcoming feel; and potential cost savings by having the
930 information online yet available as a hardcopy by request

931
932 Member Grefenberg noted that when the welcome packet project was first
933 presented to the CEC, it had been intended as a joint project between the
934 CEC and HRA, but with the HRA in the process of dissolution and transfer
935 of its powers to the City Council, that partnership may not longer be
936 available.

937
938 At the request of Member Gardella, Chair Becker reviewed the original
939 CEC context and set of recommendations the future of a welcome packet,
940 with former CEC Member Mueller having been tasked to work on this
941 project but she since resigned, at which Member Manke had initially
942 expressed some interest in pursuing.

943
944 Since it had come back up at the last CEC meeting, Chair Becker asked the
945 body their preference in pursuing it, or whether they preferred to defer that
946 to 2016 priority planning, or if they wanted to survey realtors at this time.

947
948 Member Manke offered to survey realtors.

949
950 Member Miller asked if it was possible to get that question included in the
951 2016 community survey.

952
953 If the CEC was interested in a specific question on the 2016 community
954 survey, Mr. Bowman suggested they get that recommendation to the City
955 Council.

956
957 Member Grefenberg stated that, based on his recollection when this was
958 initially presented, it was intended to be done largely online, with only
959 updated versions listing ways to participate in local government.,.

960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000
1001
1002
1003
1004

Member Manke expressed her willingness to continue working on this, but wanted to make sure her efforts were still relevant.

Member Miller suggested this be included in 2016 work plans; with Chair Becker concurring that by doing so, it may provide time to complete a survey of realtors and gather additional information.

Member Grefenberg agreed, suggesting that it wait for the CEC's upcoming prioritization discussion for 2016.

Further discussion ensued about the amount of work it may involve depending on what form it takes; the CEC's role in making a recommendation to the City Council and resource implications with 4 color printing; and whether to seek business promotion as a revenue source to promote it, as well as staff time required to coordinate business advertizing.

10. Commission Communications, Reports, and Announcements

Member Sanders provided updates on the Act on Alzheimer's Project's presentation at the last meeting of the GavelClub Member Grefenberg added that at the next Gavel meeting he and Sanders were scheduled to make a presentation on the Commission; he asked Mr. Bowman if they could use—and he could set up—the slide show he had developed for Roseville U for this presentation to the Gavel Club.

Member Sanders continued with a brief report on the value of the recent civility training she had attended, and distributed meeting materials from that session. She also noted several SE Roseville initiatives.

In conclusion, Member Sanders also reported on the great community engagement opportunities through the national "Coffee with a Cop" program initiated by Police Chief Mathwig to meet police officers ~~aks~~ on an informal basis; and advised the Commission that it gave her the idea to pursue "Coffee with a Commissioner," as another great way to engage.

11. Commissioner-Initiated Items for Future Meetings

Chair Becker summarized the items brought forward at the meeting, including past community surveys anticipated January City Council Worksession discussion on the 2016 community survey format and how the CEC could engage in that discussion;; next step in reviewing excerpts of neighborhood association planning; and potential speakers being arranged by Member Grefenberg on neighborhood associations in other inner-ring suburbs; and, a review of previous Roseville efforts at encouraging neighborhood associations

12. Recap of Commission Actions This Meeting

1005 Chair Becker briefly recapped the actions and discussion of tonight’s meeting,
1006 including considering a community survey question(s) for inclusion in next year’s
1007 City survey; the possibility of surveying local realtors regarding the need for a
1008 Welcome Packet for new Roseville residents, and coordination by the Chair and
1009 Member Grefenberg on a speaker for the November CEC meeting from either
1010 Edina or St. Louis Park on neighborhood associations.

1011

1012 **13. Adjournment**

1013

1014 Gardella moved, Grefenberg seconded, adjournment of the meeting at
1015 approximately 8:55 p.m.

1016

1017 **Ayes: 6**

1018 **Nays: 0**

1019 **Motion carried.**

1020

1021

Next Meeting – Thursday, November 12, 2015 at 6:30 p.m.

1022