



# Community Engagement Commission Agenda

Thursday, March 10, 2016

6:30 p.m.

City Council Chambers

- 6:30 p.m.      **1. Roll Call**
- 2. Approve Agenda**
- 3. Public Comment on Items Not on Agenda**
- 4. Approval of February 11 meeting minutes**
- 5. Old Business**
  - 6:45 p.m.            a. Review draft list of neighborhood association recommendations
  - 7:30 p.m.            b. Update on community listening and learning events
  - 7:40 p.m.            c. Update on Joint Task Force on Zoning Notification
- 6. New Business**
  - 7:50 p.m.            a. Adopt revised 2016 priority projects
  - 8:05 p.m.            b. Discuss work plan for 2016 priority projects
- 7. Chair, Committee, and Staff Reports**
  - a. Chair's Report
  - b. Staff Report
    - i. Upcoming items on future council agendas
    - ii. Other items
- 8:40 p.m.      **8. Commission Communications, Reports, and Announcements**
- 9. Commissioner-Initiated Items for Future Meetings**
- 10. Recap of Commission Actions This Meeting**
- 8:50 p.m.      **11. Adjournment**

*Public Comment is encouraged during Commission meetings. You may comment on items not on the agenda at the beginning of each meeting; you may also comment on agenda items during the meeting by indicating to the Chair your wish to speak.*

*Be a part of the picture....get involved with your City....Volunteer. For more information, contact Kelly at [kelly.obrien@cityofroseville.com](mailto:kelly.obrien@cityofroseville.com) or (651) 792-7028.*





## Minutes

### Roseville Community Engagement Commission (CEC)

Thursday, February 11, 2016 - 6:30 p.m.

#### 1. Roll Call

Chair Scot Becker called the meeting to order at approximately 6:30 p.m. and ~~City Manager Patrick Trudgeon~~~~communications Manager Garry Bowman~~ called the roll.

**Commissioners Present:** Chair Scot Becker; and Commissioners Michelle Manke and Gary Grefenberg

**Commissioners Absent:** Commissioners Theresa Gardella and Jonathan Miller.

**Staff Present:** Staff Liaison/ City Manager Patrick Trudgeon

#### 2. Approve Agenda

##### Motion

Commissioner Grefenberg moved, Chair Becker seconded, approval of the agenda as amended to delete the term “update” regarding Item 6.c entitled “Update on Joint Task Force on Zoning Notification” and instead entitle it “Report of the Joint Task Force on Zoning Notification.”

**Ayes: 3**

**Nays: 0**

**Motion carried.**

#### 3. Public Comment – Non Agenda Items

None.

#### 4. Approval of January 14, 2015 Meeting Minutes

*Comments and corrections to draft minutes had been submitted by various CEC Commissioners prior to tonight’s meeting and those revisions were incorporated into the draft presented in the tonight’s agenda packet.*

Commissioner Grefenberg moved, Commissioner Manke seconded, approval of the January 14, 2016 meeting minutes as amended.

##### Corrections:

- **Page 1, Item 4 (Recording Secretary)**  
Correct date to December 10, 2015 meeting minute approval
- **All pages following page 1 (Recording Secretary)**  
Correct date in header to January 14, 2016

Roseville Community Engagement Commission (CEC) Meeting Minutes  
Page 2 – February 11, 2015

46           **Ayes: 3**  
47           **Nays: 0**  
48           **Motion carried.**

49

50   **5. New Business**

51

52   **a. Overview of the Comprehensive Planning Process**

53           Chair Becker introduced Community Development Director Paul Bilotta  
54           and City Planner Thomas Paschke to speak to the upcoming  
55           comprehensive plan update process.

56

57           Mr. Bilotta advised that there were two steps to this update required every  
58           ten years: 1) requirements of the Metropolitan Council as evidenced in  
59           their “2015 System Statement for the City of Roseville dated September  
60           17, 2015 (Attachment 5.a) and 2) the local municipal review.

61

62           Mr. Bilotta referenced the System Statement used by the Metropolitan  
63           Council to identify the goals each metropolitan municipality needs to  
64           achieve, and general guidelines in how the City of Roseville fit in with the  
65           rest of the metropolitan area; after which they turn the process over to  
66           individual communities to built out their own unique picture.

67

68           Mr. Bilotta advised that the subsequent document would need to satisfy all  
69           points outlined in the Metropolitan Council’s System Statement once  
70           forwarded onto the Council for their review, approval or return to the City  
71           for revision. Mr. Bilotta advised that most comprehensive plans of first-  
72           ring suburbs proceeded smoothly through ~~first ring suburbs~~ the process,  
73           but noted that it varied depending on the an-individual community.

74

75           At the request of Commissioner Grefenberg, Mr. Bilotta confirmed that  
76           the chapters in the new update were not limited to current chapters in the  
77           comprehensive plan update completed eight years ago ~~last~~. Mr. Bilotta  
78           advised that the chapters had to sufficiently satisfy those systems listed for  
79           the metropolitan area by the Council, but individual cities could add  
80           additional chapters (e.g. economic development, community engagement).

81

82           At the request of Chair Becker, City Planner Paschke advised that a  
83           community could choose to update their comprehensive plan at five year  
84           intervals, but all were required to do so at a minimum of every ten years.  
85           Mr. Paschke noted that the City had already put forth two amendments to  
86           their current comprehensive plan this year.

87

88           Mr. Bilotta clarified that such general amendments providing for re-  
89           guiding particular property designations. Mr. Bilotta noted that every  
90           decade is bigger, and with this cycle, it would note the cities struggling  
91           right before the recession hit with their population projections, with a lot

Roseville Community Engagement Commission (CEC) Meeting Minutes  
Page 3 – February 11, 2015

92 of those communities not meeting their population goals, and some cities  
93 doing limited updates accordingly based on some of those previous  
94 assumptions.

95  
96 Chair Becker asked if other first-ring suburbs with existing aging  
97 infrastructure were experiencing similar challenges to those of Roseville.

98  
99 Mr. Paschke responded that this was a special area of focus and zoning  
100 (e.g. SE Roseville) and how to redevelop those areas in the future, with  
101 some proving more challenging than the global Roseville community and  
102 requiring more effort to work through.

103  
104 Mr. Bilotta noted that a common challenge for first-ring-suburbs was often  
105 that of transportation, not only locally but regionally with the amount of  
106 that traffic going through the community (e.g. expansion of Trunk  
107 Highway 36 long-term and the I-35W MnPass lanes) and changes to those  
108 significant roadways over time that affected the local municipality. Mr.  
109 Bilotta noted the areas to consider: housing, aging infrastructure, is the  
110 community meeting the needs of its aging demographic, and other issues  
111 required long-term, as well as its diverse demographic continuing to  
112 change and evolve and how that fit into the broader or comprehensive  
113 planning process.

114  
115 Commissioner Manke asked what the City was specifically looking for as  
116 it related to involvement by the CEC.

117  
118 Mr. Bilotta responded that most work will happen in 2017; and from his  
119 perspective the key thing for the CEC to assist with will be the how to  
120 guide the Request for Proposals (RFP) process to obtain an outside  
121 consultant based on realistic budget considerations. Mr. Bilotta noted that  
122 the budget for a community may be \$50,000 to \$500,000 depending on the  
123 scope, but advised that he certainly didn't anticipate Roseville being at the  
124 top of that range. However, Mr. Bilotta noted that the city didn't have  
125 staffing at a level to accomplish the update internally, which would require  
126 their use of an outside consultant. As part of the budget, Mr. Bilotta  
127 advised that the biggest driver of it was the level of and number of  
128 meetings.

129  
130 Mr. Bilotta advised that the ~~CEC~~ Commission could assist in helping  
131 determine – in putting together the RFP – what was successful with the  
132 last update; what wasn't successful and should be eliminated; how to  
133 effectively utilize the electronic tools available now that weren't available  
134 at the last update (e.g. Speak Up! Roseville); and how most effectively to  
135 reach the community and receive that community-wide level of public  
136 input. Whether that meant a large meeting at the OVAL, and the  
137 frequency of that option; neighborhood meetings in each new park

Roseville Community Engagement Commission (CEC) Meeting Minutes  
Page 4 – February 11, 2015

138 building to hear from neighborhoods throughout the community; or other  
139 effective means necessary ~~to keep the budget in line but~~ obtain the  
140 necessary community input, which information was critical for developing  
141 the project budget. And whether that meant using the steering committee  
142 concept mixed with staff, neighborhood representatives, and advisory  
143 commissions to obtain that broader community engagement or another  
144 concept.

145  
146 Mr. Bilotta noted that staff would be serving in two roles: part of the  
147 technical advisory committee (e.g. engineers, staff, Ramsey County,  
148 watershed districts, MnDOT, and other agencies) and also assisting with  
149 the public input process ~~as liaisons~~ to inform that process in a timely and  
150 effective manner, while making sure the broadest geographical spread is  
151 available to ensure neighborhood involvement and input.

152  
153 At the request of Chair Becker, Mr. Bilotta confirmed that part of the  
154 consultant budget involved their facilitation of and leading of those  
155 meetings and the organizational structure of those meetings; which would  
156 be ~~ultimately subject to City Council approval as to the final process~~  
157 determined and when it will happen and schedule.

158  
159 Mr. Bilotta noted that most expenses for the RFP process and solicitation  
160 of the outside consultant will occur later this year; but advised that those  
161 cost estimates would need to be penciled in by May of 2016 to facilitate  
162 the 2017 budget cycle prior to City Council approval of that budget.

163  
164 For the purpose of full disclosure, Commissioner Grefenberg advised that  
165 he had contacted Mr. Bilotta several weeks ago and suggested that the  
166 previous steering committee, ~~of~~ to which he had been ~~a member~~  
167 appointed, be allowed to comment on the last Comprehensive Plan process  
168 and in order to inform the new process by learning from ~~those its past~~  
169 mistakes and successes. Commissioner Grefenberg noted, for example,  
170 that from his perspective one of the mistakes eight years ago was that land  
171 use changes didn't go back to the affected neighborhood(s), creating  
172 subsequent problems with those neighborhoods unaware of those changes.  
173 Commissioner Grefenberg ~~suggested~~ recommended the new process be  
174 organized to provide that second look neighborhood – review by the  
175 neighborhood(s) when such land use changes became apparent but before  
176 they were adopted ;

177  
178 Commissioner Grefenberg and also said noted that he had ~~also~~ asked staff  
179 to early in the process indicate ~~for the benefit of the public~~ why this  
180 ~~periodic new e~~ Comprehensive p Plan update ~~was is~~ important for  
181 Roseville residents. From his perspective, ~~Commissioner Grefenberg he~~  
182 opined that ~~most~~ much of the information in the Ceomprehensive p Plan  
183 would ~~it~~ be of little ~~importance~~ interest to most residents, but ~~he~~

Roseville Community Engagement Commission (CEC) Meeting Minutes  
Page 5 – February 11, 2015

184 ~~considered that the~~ land use changes review and possibly other issues ,  
185 such as community vision and goals, would ~~prove~~ be of importance to  
186 residents.

187  
188 Commissioner Grefenberg suggested that the ~~asked that the~~ previous  
189 Comprehensive Plan terminology “steering committee” not be so named  
190 this time, as it gave an indication that ~~they~~ the 2006-2008 steering  
191 committee was ~~were~~ in charge. Commissioner Grefenberg expressed his  
192 personal appreciation that the community could go beyond the chapters  
193 required in the System Statement.

194  
195 Commissioner Grefenberg opined that the role of the CEC was to ensure  
196 that public comment is heard ~~and heard~~ at the right time and in the relevant  
197 ways. Commissioner Grefenberg expressed appreciation for how city staff  
198 had handled the ~~overall~~ previous update process, especially in being clear  
199 about what was the responsibility of the steering committee and what was  
200 not. He ~~;~~ ~~and~~ encouraged Planning staff to ~~that it be handled~~ it similarly,  
201 with those things learned from the last process ~~to informing~~ this ~~the~~ next  
202 process. As an example, when the last update was done, there were blocks  
203 of chapters left to staff as they were not of interest to the public; and he  
204 encouraged ~~that~~ this process be followed again.

205  
206 -Commissioner Grefenberg further expressed his hope that ~~by~~ staff  
207 organizing meetings with the consultant, ~~it would allow those meetings~~  
208 ~~to~~ be open to the “steering committee” or whatever other citizen advisory  
209 group was formed. Commissioner Grefenberg expressed his trust in Mr.  
210 Bilotta and Mr. Paschke; and thanked them for the opportunity for the  
211 CEC to look at the process before ~~moving~~ putting out ~~to~~ the RFP, since  
212 he felt that was the Commission’s role ~~of the CEC~~.

213  
214 Chair Becker sought direction for the CEC from the City Council on their  
215 intent for community visioning, and if that was intended as an additional  
216 section or chapter.

217  
218 Mr. Bilotta responded that, using population projections as an example,  
219 the City of Roseville was obligated to meet the Metropolitan Council’s  
220 requirement to increase and accommodate a share of that population  
221 density. Mr. Bilotta noted that this could be through various types of  
222 housing units (e.g. apartments, single-family homes, and mixed use  
223 stacked villages) which could end up looking much as it does today, or  
224 very different in the future and impacting various areas of the community.  
225 Mr. Bilotta clarified that the Metropolitan Council was only concerned  
226 that the City meet its ~~their total obligation~~ mandated requirements, not  
227 how it did so. Mr. Bilotta noted that the key for Roseville was to figure  
228 out its preferred methods to achieve that total number of units.  
229

## Roseville Community Engagement Commission (CEC) Meeting Minutes

Page 6 – February 11, 2015

230 Mr. Bilotta further reviewed historical chapters with the last  
231 comprehensive plan update, including the demographic analysis that rolled  
232 into the housing chapter, then into the map, and subsequently into  
233 decision-making. Mr. Bilotta estimated that approximately 90% of the  
234 comprehensive plan, from a land use perspective, was done in areas of  
235 decline or changing uses needing review and upgrading.

236  
237 At the request of Commissioner Manke, Mr. Paschke advised that staff  
238 will initially review which chapters need to be addressed and by whom;  
239 but eventually each chapter will need to be somehow addressed, and  
240 refreshed with new goals and objectives.

241  
242 Mr. Bilotta advised that staff would initially read through the  
243 comprehensive plan to determine what remained valid or what is no longer  
244 needed prior to moving toward the consultant review. ~~He but~~ reiterated,  
245 however, -the importance of community input early on whether as a broad  
246 overview or as a first step to identify any issues that ~~may not yet be~~  
247 needed to be addressed. After that initial input, Mr. Bilotta advised that  
248 the input would then be consolidated with previous assumptions, and  
249 become more focused as it moved through the process. Mr. Bilotta opined  
250 that he anticipated 3-4 major issues at the end of the process on which ~~the~~  
251 the community will need to focus.

252  
253 Commissioner Manke asked where the citizen group fit in.

254  
255 ~~Mr.~~ Bilotta responded that their input would be needed at the beginning, in  
256 the middle, and at the end in order to provide a broad citizen perspective.  
257 At that point, Mr. Bilotta suggested some type of citizen advisory  
258 committee or task force may then be or remain actively involved in the  
259 whole process, and/or a geographic advisory commission; with each group  
260 having their own specific role and their own level of detail or  
261 involvement. Mr. Bilotta clarified that the technical committee made of  
262 mostly staff and various agencies (e.g. Ramsey County, MnDOT, and  
263 similar agencies) would use their expertise to look at infrastructure issues  
264 and any problematic areas.

265  
266 Commissioner Grefenberg noted that there was a brief subsection on  
267 community engagement in the 2030 comprehensive plan approved in  
268 2008.

269  
270 Mr. Bilotta concurred, while noting that ~~it- the Plan~~ focused on regionally  
271 mandated pieces. However, Mr. Bilotta stated that the comprehensive  
272 plan can be a tool used to direct a city's future, while recognizing that it  
273 isn't the only report ever produced, but may suggest various aspects. Mr.  
274 Bilotta noted that some documents will be referenced in the  
275 comprehensive plan, but not be a part of it (e.g. detailed housing studies,



Roseville Community Engagement Commission (CEC) Meeting Minutes  
Page 7 – February 11, 2015

276 identified redevelopment areas, and/or future individual exercises to  
277 address specific areas such as the Park Master Plan document). By  
278 referencing those existing documents, Mr. Bilotta noted the need to avoid  
279 starting from scratch in the comprehensive plan.

280  
281 Commissioner Grefenberg questioned if the community visioning should  
282 be done first ~~for~~ in order to coordinate the Plan's development  
283 purposes.

284  
285 Specific to a potential timeframe, Mr. Bilotta responded that each  
286 community's visioning process for its comprehensive plan update differed,  
287 with some having a process and others not having one. From that  
288 perspective, Mr. Bilotta expressed the need to not get bogged down with  
289 the details of the comprehensive plan, but utilize a visioning process  
290 where everyone sits back and thinks where the community will be in the  
291 future, not specifically reviewing individual lots citywide.

292  
293 Mr. Bilotta noted that eventually the comprehensive plan process will get  
294 into ~~those~~ that level of details, but after the foundational visioning and  
295 public understanding and agreement with the vision. Mr. Bilotta noted  
296 that this may be as simple as one paragraph or up to a few pages in length.

297  
298 Mr. Bilotta suggested the first step would be reviewing the existing vision  
299 and determining if it remained relevant and adequate enough to allow the  
300 eComprehensive pPlan update to be built on that same vision, if it needed  
301 tweaking, or needed to be totally revised. Mr. Bilotta opined that was a  
302 key decision point to determine if the community wanted to stick with the  
303 previous vision or pursue an entirely separate process.

304  
305 Chair Becker referenced the City Council's suggestion on Monday night  
306 to simply refresh the vision and keep it relatively short via a bulleted list.

307  
308 **6. Old Business**

309  
310 **a. Continue Discussion on Neighborhood Associations**  
311 Since the St. Louis Park presenter was not yet present, Chair Becker  
312 adjusted the agenda accordingly.

313  
314 **ii. Discussion of Next Steps**  
315 Chair Becker briefly reported on his meeting with the City Council on  
316 Monday night, and his sense that they were eager to get pending  
317 recommendations from the CEC sooner rather than later. Specific to  
318 the neighborhood association recommendation, Chair Becker asked  
319 commissioners what if anything they felt was still missing; what  
320 additional learning was needed by the CEC; and whether or not the

Roseville Community Engagement Commission (CEC) Meeting Minutes  
Page 8 – February 11, 2015

321 CEC was prepared to complete its analysis before making its final  
322 recommendation to the City Council.

323  
324 At the request of Commissioner Manke, Chair Becker noted that the  
325 CEC had reviewed the minimum requirements expected by the city  
326 from neighborhood associations ~~if~~ receiving city support or assistance.  
327 Chair Becker noted that the ~~CEC Commission~~ has covered a lot of  
328 information to-date; but anticipated a concise and ~~,~~ fluid set of  
329 recommendations rather than ~~versus a~~ rigid recommendations ~~to the~~  
330 ~~City Council~~ versus ~~in~~ a long, drawn-out report. Chair Becker  
331 suggested a set of recommendations and context for them in order to  
332 guide ~~for~~ the City Council ~~to guide them on this effort~~.

333  
334 Chair Becker clarified that it was the charge to the CEC to provide the  
335 recommendations, whether or not the City Council nixed some right  
336 away, sought additional input, or tweaked some items at their ~~its~~ initial  
337 review.

338  
339 Chair Becker noted City Manager Trudgeon's offer ~~of his time on a~~  
340 ~~one-on-one opportunity~~ to sort out the first cut of those  
341 recommendations.

342  
343 City Manager Trudgeon concurred, stating that he was happy to help  
344 assemble the document and get it into the appropriate format for the  
345 full CEC to look at prior to their presentation to the City Council.  
346 Given the amount of time the City Council had been awaiting this  
347 recommendation, Mr. Trudgeon suggested that review, including  
348 looking at old reports, meeting minutes and other background  
349 information and materials, would ~~could~~ be helpful in making ~~to~~ the  
350 ~~CEC Commission in~~ make ~~making~~ their final decision and ~~as well as~~  
351 serve to ~~move~~ moving the process along.

352  
353 Commissioner Grefenberg thanked City Manager Trudgeon for that  
354 offer, recognizing that it represented a time-consuming ~~commitment to~~  
355 ~~do so on his part~~. Commissioner Grefenberg asked that both he and  
356 Chair Becker be allowed to participate in that review since both had  
357 been directly involved ~~in this work in bringing the Neighborhood~~  
358 Association recommendations this far.

359  
360 Chair Becker asked commissioners if they were aware of any further  
361 analysis or discussion needed, remembering that the focus was to  
362 remain at a higher level ~~versus~~ rather than providing the details. Chair  
363 Becker asked if commissioners felt the CEC was ready to compile its  
364 recommendations for review as a complete set.

365

Roseville Community Engagement Commission (CEC) Meeting Minutes  
Page 9 – February 11, 2015

366 Commissioner Manke opined she was ready to compile the  
367 recommendations in order to have something tangible in front of the  
368 CEC and tweak it as necessary; and then move onto the next project.

369  
370 Commissioner Grefenberg cautioned that there may be some  
371 additional issues raised with the St. Louis Park presentation that  
372 needed to be addressed. Therefore, Commissioner Grefenberg stated  
373 that he wasn't yet ready to provide a final answer to Chair Becker.  
374 ~~Commissioner Grefenberg opined that since~~ St. Louis Park ~~had an~~  
375 provided an excellent example of how neighborhood forums are held,  
376 an issue that remained unclear to him, and how to deal with the issue  
377 of determining neighborhood association boundaries particularly with  
378 his support for the City Council reviewing boundaries for each  
379 neighborhood association.

380  
381 Discussion ensued regarding the how the city's website would be  
382 available to existing neighborhood associations or affiliated  
383 associations ~~to be recognized specific to their availability on the city's~~  
384 ~~website; It was with clarification clarified~~ that this issue had been  
385 covered in the material support discussion at the last Commission  
386 meeting.-

387  
388 Chair Becker ~~clarified added~~ that ~~his had also been discussed~~ at the  
389 last CEC meeting; ~~with~~ the initial recommendations ~~had being been~~  
390 that the boundaries could not overlap, nor could they be too large or  
391 too small. Chair Becker reiterated that the specific method should  
392 remain a City Council decision as they discuss their approval of  
393 boundaries and the process depending on the specific situation, ~~rather~~  
394 ~~than at the CEC level.~~ Chair Becker noted that the City Council could  
395 determine if they wanted to delegate that to the City Manager or make  
396 that decision as an elected body; ~~and but~~ suggested that the CEC not  
397 get bogged down in those details.

398  
399 Depending on how quickly staff is able to view background materials,  
400 and assist the working group of Becker and Grefenberg in developing  
401 the initial draft recommendations followed by ~~review of the full CEC~~  
402 Commission review, Chair Becker opined that conservatively he  
403 anticipated that the final version could come to the CEC by April of  
404 2016 and be placed on the next available City Council agenda. Chair  
405 Becker noted his impression that the City Council was more than eager  
406 to see the recommendation; and expressed his ~~own~~ eagerness to move  
407 onto other work ~~of the CEC~~ for 2016.

408  
409 **i. Presentation from St. Louis Park**  
410 Chair Becker welcomed St. Louis Park Community Liaison Breanna  
411 Freedman; who provided brief personal biography and a history of

Roseville Community Engagement Commission (CEC) Meeting Minutes  
Page 10 – February 11, 2015

457 neighborhood associations in St. Louis Park. Ms. Freedman provided  
458 distributed numerous handouts during the discussion and referenced  
459 that material as well as other items she volunteered to provide city  
460 staff for dissemination to the ~~CEC~~ Commission if not available on the  
461 City of St. Louis Park website.

462  
463 ~~Discussion with~~ Ms. Freedman touched upon how neighborhood  
464 associations were initiated in St. Louis Park by citizens who found the  
465 City Council in favor of and open to their formation; a map (trail map)  
466 identifying and highlighting boundaries for those associations, how  
467 they started and where the process was at now; and the geographic  
468 area and the number of dwelling units houses in each neighborhood,  
469 St. Louis Park had originally been broken divided into 35 areas during  
470 previous neighborhood revitalization efforts. Now there were with 26  
471 associations now existing whose using boundaries were determined  
472 by using ~~of~~ major highways, ~~or~~ natural boundaries, or commercial  
473 areas, resulting in but each unique and specific neighborhoods based  
474 on their specific neighborhood.

475  
476 Additional discussion included ~~members of the~~ St. Louis Park's  
477 Community Development Department initially partnering with and  
478 hosting neighborhood meetings based on the relationship within the  
479 community; drawing of neighborhood boundaries after they were  
480 surveyed, and the huge engagement part of that process.

481  
482 At the request of ~~the CEC Commission members~~, Ms. Freedman  
483 reviewed the type and frequency of support offered associations by the  
484 city: funding and city staff performing the first initial post card mailing  
485 expressing interest of the neighborhood in organizing mailed to every  
486 household and apartment in that identified boundary without releasing  
487 that mailing list, but providing information on the meeting (e.g. time,  
488 date, etc.) with a representative usually working with Ms. Freedman;  
489 space provided for that meeting at city hall or a park building at no  
490 charge; and continued meeting space at no fee for all future meetings.

491  
492 Ms. Freedman reviewed the City of St. Louis Park's use of grants  
493 through its Neighborhood Revitalization Grant Program, funded by  
494 city tax dollars from housing rehabilitation monies, and in place since  
495 1996. This grant program and providing provided up to \$30,000 in  
496 grant funds distributed among neighborhoods, and with ~~the~~ grant  
497 application process running ran from May through April of the  
498 following year; the process included ~~with~~ eligibility requirements  
499 which served to ~~which~~ helps determine if a neighborhood is an a valid  
500 association and eligible for city grant funds ~~based on their application~~.

457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501

Roseville Community Engagement Commission (CEC) Meeting Minutes  
Page 11 – February 11, 2015

502 Chair Becker asked Ms. Freedman to summarize what hadn't worked  
503 as if ~~they~~ St. Louis Park could ~~were to~~ start the program over again;  
504 and what challenges she saw or what ~~the~~ her city had learned.  
505

506 Ms. Freedman prefaced her comments by acknowledging that she had  
507 not been employed by the City of St. Louis when the program was  
508 initiated. However, Ms. Freedman opined that she found the key was  
509 communication and maintaining a supportive role to continuously  
510 encourage each association as it got going. Ms. Freedman also noted  
511 the need for all parties to have clear expectations of what is expected  
512 and her their role and place in the eCity.  
513

514 Ms. Freedman ~~opined~~ added that her staff role was huge in keeping  
515 that daily communication going, attending a number of meetings as  
516 needed; and while not seeing it necessarily as a challenge, it required  
517 ~~someone staffing~~ that the staff position ~~that had~~ have some flexibility  
518 that could be depended upon as a consistent resource to keep  
519 associations on track and answer their questions.  
520

521 At the request of Chair Becker, Ms. Freedman advised that she was  
522 full-time in this role; but also served as Human Rights Commission  
523 liaison ~~through~~ for the City of St. Louis Park's Police Department,  
524 part of their community outreach efforts. By having the Police  
525 Department involved, Ms. Freedman noted that it helped keep them  
526 involved in neighborhoods and what was happening in each area of the  
527 community. Ms. Freedman advised that her outreach team attended  
528 various events and tried to maintain as much public contact as possible  
529 by spending face-to-face time with the community, including working  
530 with annual National Night Out efforts, with 139 different registered  
531 parties in 2015 requiring a considerable amount of coordination in  
532 having a Police or Fire Department presence in each neighborhood.  
533

534 Commissioner Grefenberg asked if St. Louis Park required a set of  
535 bylaws ~~had a set of bylaws for each neighborhood to help and whether~~  
536 it had examples bylaws to help associations get started, ~~or if it required~~  
537 a set of bylaws.  
538

539 Ms. Freedman advised that the City of St. Louis Park provided two  
540 model bylaw templates for developing an association's specific  
541 bylaws, not specifying if one or the other needed to be used, but  
542 providing options of what those bylaws could look like. Ms.  
543 Freedman noted that it was helpful if a neighborhood had organized in  
544 the past, with those bylaws being provided and the association  
545 membership voting on changes for new bylaws going forward versus  
546 starting from scratch.  
547

Roseville Community Engagement Commission (CEC) Meeting Minutes  
Page 12 – February 11, 2015

548 Commissioner Manke asked what the type of structure St. Louis Park  
549 asked of ~~for~~ associations.

550  
551 Ms. Freedman responded that at a minimum the City of St. Louis Park  
552 required a Chair or President, and a Vice Chair, basically two roles;  
553 with some deciding they wanted a Secretary or Treasurer office as  
554 well; ~~while~~ Others may choose a detailed programming  
555 committee, others may wish to have a ~~using~~ volunteer coordination ~~or~~;  
556 Thus the organizational structure could ~~and~~ range anywhere from 3  
557 to 10 officers or leaders, depending on the size, function, and kind of  
558 neighborhood involved.

559  
560 Commissioner Grefenberg noted the population of St. Louis Park ~~at is~~  
561 45,000; and noted that the population couldn't determine the average  
562 size of neighborhood associations. Commissioner Grefenberg opined  
563 that was one issue the CEC was grappling with; ~~should there be a~~  
564 ~~maximum size for an association neighborhood; and~~ He sought input  
565 from Ms. Freedman on this issue of whether there was an optimal  
566 minimal and maximum size of neighborhood population. their  
567 requirements.

568  
569 Ms. Freedman responded that they had no size requirements; and had  
570 found that the sizes or membership didn't change with boundaries in  
571 place; even though some neighborhoods may be more densely  
572 populated than others, advising that the city may then try to balance  
573 things out based on that density level.

574  
575 As addressed by Chair Becker, Ms. Freedman recognized that most  
576 associations resulted from block parties or smaller block groups  
577 naturally coalescing and not city dictated. Ms. Freedman advised that  
578 the City of St. Louis Park had a sworn Community Outreach Officer  
579 who worked directly with ~~the~~ block captains, often someone who has  
580 stood out as a natural neighborhood leader and their desire to be  
581 involved in their neighborhood.

582  
583 Chair Becker asked if Ms. Freedman was aware of any other free-  
584 standing organizations not identified as an official neighborhood, who  
585 attempted to receive free city website space or free mailings.

586  
587 Ms. Freedman advised that this was not a problem; and that the  
588 incentive for becoming an official neighborhood association was the  
589 availability of City grant monies, opining that it didn't make sense to  
590 have an organization if not applying for support to fund it. However,  
591 Ms. Freedman noted that, even without that grant funding, a lot of  
592 those neighborhoods would continue to thrive as an informal  
593 association.

Roseville Community Engagement Commission (CEC) Meeting Minutes  
Page 13 – February 11, 2015

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  
639

Commissioner Manke asked what the grant funds could be used for.

Ms. Freedman responded that the eCity allowed considerable flexibility and each neighborhood association varied, with some used for environmental efforts (e.g. compostable products, park improvements, park clean-up supplies); or insurance component for volunteers, among other uses.

Ms. Freedman advised that until recently, they hadn't seen many businesses typically involved in neighborhood associations, but clarified that the city didn't have any policies in place if a neighborhood chose to be inclusive to businesses and left it up to them to determine the extent they wanted to be. However, Ms. Freedman advised that the city didn't encourage businesses being part of the neighborhood's steering committee, and preferred that be left to residents, whether single-family home owners or those in rental units.

Chair Becker asked how and when renters participated in St. Louis Park.

Ms. Freedman advised that typically they saw renters involved in organizing neighborhood associations, even though it could be challenging to get their involvement.

City Manager Trudgeon asked how city businesses, land use decisions, street projects and other issues flowed into neighborhoods and how those neighborhoods plugged into the City Council decision-making process. City Manager Trudgeon also asked how their city handled automatic mailing notifications and how that worked.

Ms. Freedman advised that neighborhood meetings were a big deal for the City of St. Louis Park for those impacted; with the neighborhood association contact or chairperson used as the main point of contact to alert their ~~constituents~~ neighbors. However, Ms. Freedman clarified that city staff ran those informational meetings, and sought input from the appropriate –association as to the best location to hold these meetings and other logistics; ~~with~~ The City's Planning Department hosted these meetings on a regular basis, and thus significantly involved ~~and~~ neighborhoods, very involved, with attendance varying depending on how controversial an issue is.

Ms. Freedman advised that City staff took those meetings very seriously and assured appropriate staff representation was available. For instance, Ms. Freedman noted that the Police Department was undertaking its second year of meeting with all neighborhoods, in its

Roseville Community Engagement Commission (CEC) Meeting Minutes  
Page 14 – February 11, 2015

640 four different police districts (similar to wards) and inviting  
641 appropriate staff depending on what's happening in their neighborhood  
642 to respond to questions ~~immediately~~. Ms. Freedman noted that, as  
643 much as possible, the City used team resources to touch base with  
644 neighborhoods at every ~~possible~~ opportunity to gather their input and  
645 feedback. Ms. Freedman further noted that the City of St. Louis Park  
646 had a ward and at-large system for electing their six council members,  
647 with ~~had 6 council positions~~: four wards and two at-large positions.

648  
649 Discussion continued regarding whether or not neighborhoods  
650 advocated for their residents at the City Council level or leaders  
651 spearheaded the efforts on various issues through listening sessions  
652 and direct engagement efforts, or through engaged individuals active  
653 in their neighborhood ~~and~~ taking the initiative to pursue various  
654 concerns. Ms. Freedman added that ; and attendance by St. Louis Park  
655 Council Mmembers at public open forums allowing them to hear  
656 directly from their residents ~~and~~ which input often influencing their  
657 decision-making ~~based on that input about specific projects and~~  
658 ~~specific neighborhoods.~~

659  
660 Commissioner Grefenberg asked Ms. Freedman if the City of St. Louis  
661 Park placed any specific expectations or responsibilities on  
662 neighborhood associations beyond an annual meeting and adopting  
663 bylaws, such as requiring annual election of officers to avoid the  
664 associations becoming insular with the same people getting elected  
665 repeatedly.

666  
667 Ms. Freedman responded that the City did require each association to  
668 had some method of transferring leadership from one year to the next  
669 in order to provide an opportunity for new leadership to step forward.  
670 Ms. Freedman noted that it didn't have to occur at their annual  
671 meeting, but typically that made the most sense. As part of their  
672 requirements, Ms. Freedman also noted that the City of St. Louis Park  
673 requires that the eCity be advised of the annual meeting date, which  
674 was part of each association's grant application that serves to verify  
675 the date and also questions how they plan to encourage new residents  
676 to become involved in the steering committee. Ms. Freedman noted  
677 that one association's bylaws require election of a new present  
678 president annually, which has proven successful for them; ~~and~~ in her  
679 opinion, this provision allowed those associations and neighborhoods  
680 to thrive without the eCity dictating their governance model.

681  
682 At the request of Commissioner Manke, Ms. Freedman noted that  
683 there were also some associations that kept the same president year  
684 after year; and others that rotated that office among their steering  
685 committee.



Roseville Community Engagement Commission (CEC) Meeting Minutes  
Page 15 – February 11, 2015

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  
730  
731

Commissioner Manke expressed her preference for term limits, which Ms. Freedman agreed with as more advantageous.

Ms. Freedman further reported that, as part of the grant application and program, the City required neighborhood associations to provide evidence of how they engaged and incorporated neighborhood input; and to report on how their grant funds had been and were intended to be used. Ms. Freedman noted that this information could be obtained by each association in a variety of ways, including a suggestion box, paper surveys, online surveys, other broad and creative ways to help ensure all residents are given an opportunity to be engaged in the decision-making process as they desire. Ms. Freedman noted that this helped keep one person or group from monopolizing or taking over the neighborhood ~~and/or~~ association.

At the request of Commissioner Grefenberg, Ms. Freedman advised answered that she personally reviewed and approved each association's bylaws in her position as the St. Louis Park community liaison. Ms. Freedman noted that the current bylaws had to be submitted annually with the grant application; but were more closely scrutinized when a group was first organizing.

Ms. Freedman advised that she retained a master contact list for each neighborhood association and/or their steering committee, and whenever a big event was coming up in St. Louis Park of interest to them, an email was provided to all steering committee members, not just the president, to ensure that everyone ~~is~~ was included and invited.

Ms. Freedman further noted ~~their~~ the annual leader<sup>2</sup>ship forum to which ~~she invited~~ all neighborhood leaders were invited to attend, with an annual theme and speakers that may involve particular grant options or city leaders. Ms. Freedman advised that grant awards are presented and monies distributed at that meeting.

Commissioner Grefenberg referenced the task force report suggesting setting up meetings of all affiliated -neighborhood chairs or presidents ~~heads~~ with the City Manager 2-3 times each year.

Chair Becker expressed his appreciation for Ms. Freedman's reference to emailing the entire steering group as their point of contact rather than only one person (e.g. the president) filtering information. Chair Becker asked if Ms. Freedman was aware of any neighborhood associations violating rules or excluding renters, or any other problematic issues.

Roseville Community Engagement Commission (CEC) Meeting Minutes  
Page 16 – February 11, 2015

732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777

Ms. Freedman reported that she actually had neighborhood leaders coming to her seeking ~~her~~ suggestions for contacting renters and getting them included, which always was a challenge. Ms. Freedman advised that she frequently referred them to property managers for posting event flyers to advertise their activities and encouraging them to become part of the process by providing input and ideas. ~~Ms. Freedman noted that many of the associations use a portion of their grant funds for postage for mailings, while most associations only do one mailing per year depending on how large their group is.~~ Ms. Freedman noted that grant funds help further the community engagement attempt.

Ms. Freedman reported only one problem she was aware of regarding Chair Becker's concern regarding contacts and control of associations. Ms. Freedman noted a recent instance when a neighborhood resident asked that all email communications be sent to her directly, which raised flags ~~whether to question~~ her intent was to filter information. Ms. Freedman noted a neighborhood association may provide a sign-up sheet for email communications, with another role in having a newsletter editor and having them email any city communication from and to the editor and the city, or from the city to the steering committee to disseminate that information to their full email list. Ms. Freedman noted that the City of St. Louis Park also used NextDoor.com to disseminate that information.

Commissioner Grefenberg asked Ms. Freedman to report on how the City of St. Louis Park ensured accountability beyond requiring an annual ~~one~~ meeting per year or whether there were other ways to hold held neighborhood associations accountable to their neighbors. ~~to get information out to neighbors without limiting that interaction.~~

Ms. Freedman stated that she hadn't seen any issues with neighborhoods wanting to keep information to themselves, since a required ~~goal of their each Association's steering committees is~~ was to bring people in, adding that each association governing entity was advised to ~~and typically~~ seek as many options as possible to engage their neighbors.

~~Ms. Freedman noted that there hadn't been that tension or need for the city to get involved~~ if there were issues over an association's accountability; ~~but she~~ anticipated that ~~would~~ could be part of her role as liaison if that problem ever became evident. In her conversation with peers and colleagues, Ms. Freedman reported that she had not heard of that being a problem elsewhere, especially when neighborhood associations aren't necessarily formed around issues but

Roseville Community Engagement Commission (CEC) Meeting Minutes  
Page 17 – February 11, 2015

778 created for the purposes of maintaining quality relationships ~~with~~  
779 between residents and allowing access to the City Council, city staff,  
780 and city resources. Ms. Freedman noted that this purpose, rather than  
781 issue-based, allowed promotion to be a good neighbor and addressed  
782 the general upkeep of neighborhoods and personal investment in their  
783 communities.

784  
785 Commissioner Grefenberg noted, as ~~an-recent~~ example: ~~-recent, issues~~  
786 ~~in~~ the Twin Lakes Redevelopment Area where ~~turf building- local~~  
787 impact seemed to be a sensitive issue ~~overriding that had~~ a citywide  
788 impact.

789  
790 Ms. Freedman referenced a similar situation when the City of St. Louis  
791 Park was redeveloping citywide, and the decision-making ~~involved in~~  
792 included how to establish project boundaries. Ms. Freedman  
793 suggested that one way to avoid negative issues was to recognize and  
794 highlight that each neighborhood was unique and different, while all  
795 may be experiencing similar issues. Ms. Freedman offered to do  
796 further research from meeting minutes from their city's neighborhood  
797 revitalization committee and send that information to the Roseville  
798 CEC for their reference.

799  
800 Commissioner Grefenberg referenced his favorable impressions with  
801 the City of St. Louis Park's website ~~with-which had~~ information  
802 available on each neighborhood association and its organization,  
803 beyond just a map and contact people, but providing neighborhood  
804 characteristics and information on the association itself. Regarding  
805 authorship of that information, Commissioner Grefenberg asked Ms.  
806 Freedman if there were any problems or if she reviewed that input  
807 before it was added to the City's website.

808  
809 Ms. Freedman reported that this information was in place before she  
810 was employed as by St. Louis Park as community liaison less than  
811 three years ago; and as referenced by Commissioner Grefenberg,  
812 provided neighborhood demographics and characteristics, and if in  
813 organized neighborhoods, their consent was sought before publication  
814 by the City. Ms. Freedman advised that she was only aware of minor  
815 and infrequent issues with newsletter content, since the City supplied  
816 printing costs for newsletters, even though most are being done  
817 electronically now or gone from 4 pages to a single page and  
818 distributed more frequently. Ms. Freedman reported that the problem  
819 had been with some neighborhoods advertising political campaigns,  
820 creating a conflict of interest with the city supplying that resource and  
821 the neighborhood supplying the newsletter, and creating local political  
822 issues in wards. However, after the City created some newsletter

## Roseville Community Engagement Commission (CEC) Meeting Minutes

Page 18 – February 11, 2015

823 policies, Ms. Freedman reported that ~~this~~ these problems had been  
824 squelched.

825  
826 Ms. Freedman also noted that some associations used advertising as a  
827 revenue source for their newsletters, and of course, that was being  
828 taken advantage of at times, requiring the city to put a cap on some of  
829 those practices. Ms. Freedman further noted that local businesses had  
830 an opportunity to advertise, however, and this allowed neighbors to  
831 support those important resources in their community, and develop  
832 relationships with those businesses, thus allowing them to become  
833 involved and engaged with neighborhood associations, frequently by  
834 donating goods or services to the association for a special event.

835  
836 At the request of Commissioner Manke, Ms. Freedman advised that  
837 each neighborhood association put together their individual  
838 newsletters, which were in turn reviewed by her according to city  
839 policy; but clarified that the city did not mail it out. Ms. Freedman  
840 reported that typically the block captains or volunteers commit to  
841 distribute the newsletters. Ms. Freedman noted that this was part of  
842 the grant application process, with the neighborhood associations  
843 reporting on their in-kind match of city grant funds.

844  
845 Commissioner Manke asked if neighborhood associations had a link  
846 on city websites to their own websites if available.

847  
848 Ms. Freedman reported that she had seen that done, but noted that  
849 most neighborhood associations don't have a website, but typically use  
850 Facebook or shift to NextDoor.com.

851  
852 Commissioner Grefenberg noted that NextDoor.com had its own  
853 national prohibitions regarding political advertising postings that was  
854 not subject to removed from municipal authority. Mr. Grefenberg  
855 reported that approximately 15% of Roseville residents were involved  
856 in NextDoor.com; leaving 85% of its residents needing informed of  
857 decisions through another method of communication.

858  
859 Ms. Freedman stated that the City of St. Louis Park used every  
860 available social media to promote and inform residents about  
861 neighborhood meetings; ~~She and~~ recognized that a good portion of  
862 its residents didn't depend on social media; and therefore if possible  
863 meeting information was also included in the local newspaper or city  
864 newsletter, depending on timing. Ms. Freedman emphasized the  
865 importance of communication as the key to make contact with  
866 residents and encourage their involvement, further noting the  
867 importance of community and neighborhood leaders in assisting with  
868 those opportunities.

869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887  
888  
889  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
898  
899  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914

Chair Becker thanked Ms. Freedman for the information; and Ms. Freedman offered to provide any other information as requested by the CEC.

**b. Update on Community Listening and Learning Events**

With Commissioner Gardella unable to attend tonight's meeting, Chair Becker asked City Manager Patrick Trudgeon to report on her behalf subsequent to his meeting last week with Commissioner Gardella, a representative from ~~and~~ the Advocate for Human Rights and Lake McCarrons Neighborhood Association President Sherry Sanders.

City Manager Trudgeon reported on that meeting and discussion on how the recently ~~awarded~~ ~~granted~~ award ~~from TLC~~ could be incorporated into the larger vision of the working group and residents in SE Roseville. City Manager Trudgeon noted that this discussion led to clarification that the proposed listening/learning sessions intended for funding from grant funds was more about welcoming new arrivals into the area and their interaction directly with the neighborhood association, the Karen Organization of Minnesota (KOM), and School District No. 623. Mr. Trudgeon noted that while there may not be a direct role for the City of Roseville, there remained a definite interest by them.

Given the broader timeframe required for SE Roseville efforts from the City's perspective and partnering agencies and stakeholders, Mr. Trudgeon advised that those efforts would be more long-term and much more expansive than just targeting a specific population, such as the Karen community. Keeping that in mind, Mr. Trudgeon expressed appreciation for these background opportunities that would certainly serve to inform the broader process. Mr. Trudgeon recognized that, due to timelines and grant deadlines, the process may have been more convoluted and while not falling within city grant application procedures, it was still a great step to build relationships and connections or systems that would become the foundation for future needs.

Commissioner Grefenberg enquired whether Mr. Trudgeon knew that the Commission itself was neither aware of this specific proposal nor had it approved the submission of the grant application. City Manager Trudgeon responded that he was aware of that.

Since these events involve a more direct and hands-on approach, Mr. Trudgeon advised that he felt more comfortable, from the city's perspective, after the recent meeting with these groups. Mr. Trudgeon emphasized the CEC's role and that of the City of Roseville was to encourage community engagement ~~versus~~ rather than play an active role in shaping that engagement. Mr. Trudgeon noted that, in some shape or

Roseville Community Engagement Commission (CEC) Meeting Minutes  
Page 20 – February 11, 2015

915 role, all residents, including city staff and council members, were  
916 welcomed to attend the learning sessions or seek other ways to become  
917 involved.

918  
919 Chair Becker noted that the Human Rights Commission (HRC) was  
920 definitely interested in engaging in those events as well, and suggested  
921 coordination with that advisory commission.

922  
923 City Manager Trudgeon advised that he would be explaining this  
924 particular grant award and process to the City Council at their February  
925 22, 2016 meeting; along with a representative of the Advocate group, the  
926 Lake McCarrons Neighborhood Association and the ~~CEC~~ and the  
927 Community Engagement Commission.

928  
929 In response to Chair Becker's query as to whether any other Community  
930 Engagement Commissioners ~~representatives of the CEC were desired~~  
931 ~~should to~~ attend, Mr. Trudgeon responded that he didn't feel it was  
932 necessary, since the Lake McCarrons Neighborhood Association and the  
933 Advocates group were the leading ~~and driving~~ forces as part of their desire  
934 for outreach. Mr. Trudgeon opined that he didn't see a direct formal role  
935 for the CEC.

936  
937 In response to Commissioner Grefenberg's expressed ~~confusion~~ desire for  
938 more information on ~~with~~ the grant itself, City Manager Trudgeon advised  
939 that Lake McCarrons Neighborhood Association was listed as the grantee,  
940 and it would be their task and work to coordinate with those agencies  
941 previously mentioned in his opening comments for the three  
942 listening/learning sessions at various locations. Mr. Trudgeon advised that  
943 there was no direct role for the city, but rather more of a support role  
944 based on its strong interest in fostering these type of relationships. If there  
945 are some take-aways as a result of these sessions, Mr. Trudgeon noted that  
946 the city could be in a position to help, or ways to inform the broader  
947 community of these efforts. However, Mr. Trudgeon reiterated that, upon  
948 his meeting with the group, it served to confirm for him and the City  
949 Council that there was no direct role for the ~~cities~~ City.

950  
951 Commissioner Grefenberg opined that he wasn't totally sure that the CEC  
952 shouldn't play a ~~minor~~ some role or at least be able to observe those  
953 listening sessions.

954  
955 Chair Becker ~~reiterated those~~ agreed with City Manager Trudgeon's  
956 comments of City Manager Trudgeon that the sessions were open to  
957 anyone; ~~but~~ he clarified that the role of the CEC as a body would be to  
958 determine how well this type of engagement tool worked. Chair Becker  
959 further noted the ~~reinforced~~ direction provided by the City-Council  
960 reinforced the Commission's understanding that their charge ~~to the CEC~~

Roseville Community Engagement Commission (CEC) Meeting Minutes  
Page 21 – February 11, 2015

961 was focused –more on policy recommendations ~~versus~~ than hands-on  
962 work. Chair Becker expressed his confidence in ~~CEC~~ Commissioner  
963 Gardella to provide sufficient and accurate reporting and updates on the  
964 sessions.

965  
966 City Manger Trudgeon concurred with Chair Becker on his interpretation  
967 of the City Council’s charge: that the CEC define what works and what  
968 doesn’t work, by recommending a tool box of infrastructure options or  
969 best practices for the City Council in promoting community engagement.  
970

971 **c. Update on Joint Task Force on Zoning Notification**

972 At the request of Chair Becker, Commissioner Grefenberg presented the  
973 draft report from this group including the preamble or cover memorandum  
974 from him and Commissioner Manke; a reprint of the goals and strategies  
975 approved by the CEC in November of 2014 related to the current  
976 notification process; and the Task Force six-page report itself.  
977 Commissioner Grefenberg asked for the Commission’s approval ~~by the~~  
978 ~~CEC~~ tonight, noting subsequent review ~~by at the next~~ Planning  
979 Commission next month for approval, and then both Commissions would  
980 forwarding the report and its recommendations to the City Council.  
981

982 Commissioner Grefenberg reviewed various sections of the report in  
983 detail, including notification processes beyond just zoning ~~or~~ and land use  
984 issues; ~~involving and the notification of~~ rental and business tenants.  
985 Commissioner Grefenberg reviewed recommendations of the task force  
986 for “extraordinary” notification strategies and how to define those  
987 situations, as well as asking the Community Development Department’s  
988 staff to review open house and/or public hearing notice language to make  
989 sure it was clear understandable for laypersons ~~to understand~~.  
990

991 Commissioner Manke advised that her basic understanding of this review  
992 was that the eCity had been doing an extraordinary job above and beyond  
993 statutory ~~or other notification~~ requirements. Commissioner Manke noted  
994 that this made it easy for the task force to pick out just a few things that  
995 could help provide residents with a better understanding.  
996

997 Chair Becker noted that the feedback had been constant that Community  
998 Development Director Bilotta and City Planner Paschke were doing a  
999 great job work ~~with notifications~~ supporting the task force.  
1000

1001 City Manager Trudgeon noted the recent addition of signage on  
1002 development or redevelopment sites, similar to that he’d seen done for  
1003 another community he’d worked ~~with~~ in. While that signage wasn’t  
1004 overly descriptive, Mr. Trudgeon noted that it did provide sufficient  
1005 contact information and frequently prompted calls to eCity Hhall allowing  
1006 for more detailed conversations.

Roseville Community Engagement Commission (CEC) Meeting Minutes  
Page 22 – February 11, 2015

1007  
1008  
1009  
1010  
1011  
1012  
1013  
1014  
1015  
1016  
1017  
1018  
1019  
1020  
1021  
1022  
1023  
1024  
1025  
1026  
1027  
1028  
1029  
1030  
1031  
1032  
1033  
1034  
1035  
1036  
1037  
1038  
1039  
1040  
1041  
1042  
1043  
1044  
1045  
1046  
1047  
1048  
1049  
1050  
1051  
1052

Commissioner Manke concurred, noting that the signage may not necessarily affect you as a resident, or you may not even live in Roseville and only commute through; but ~~it was obviously working and would~~ allowed the information to be available to anyone interested.

Commissioner Grefenberg opined that signage was also another way to reach renters, along with the ~~completion of~~ city staff's database of rentals and renters, with renters shown by unit and address, not ~~by name~~; but addressed to "occupant at apartment #" ~~at specific~~ rental complexes.

Commissioner Grefenberg expressed his positive impression ~~with~~ and ~~his~~ respect for the cooperation ~~and collaboration and assistance~~ provided by the City's Planning staff; ~~and compared it to his experiences of ten years ago~~. Commissioner Grefenberg asked that City Manager Trudgeon convey the ~~T~~ask ~~F~~orce's and his personal thanks for Mr. Bilotta and Mr. Paschke's collaboration.

Commissioner Manke concurred, noting the value of being able to feed off their knowledge ~~and~~ from their areas of expertise, as well as providing an opportunity to get to know them better and their role in the community.

Chair Becker expressed his appreciation and anticipation that this would become the cooperative nature for the community moving forward.

**Motion**

Commissioner Grefenberg moved, Commissioner Manke seconded, to acknowledge the Commission's receipt of the Joint Zoning Notification Task Force Report and Recommendations to the City Council their receipt and to approval approve of the report and its recommendations from the Zoning Notification Task Force as submitted and as dated February 4, 2016.

**Ayes: 3**

**Nays: 0**

**Motion carried.**

**7. Chair, Committee and Staff Reports**

**a. Chair's Report**

Chair Becker referenced the invitation from the City of Roseville and encouraged his colleagues to attend the annual volunteer celebration in early March.

Chair Becker provided a recap of his meeting on Monday, February 8<sup>th</sup> with the City Council as they reviewed the overall scope of the HRC, CEC



Roseville Community Engagement Commission (CEC) Meeting Minutes  
Page 23 – February 11, 2015

1099 and Ethics Commissions and their current respective ordinances, including  
1100 meeting frequency. Chair Becker reported that he had provided the City  
1101 Council with the 2015 summary and 2016 work plan for the CEC as  
1102 approved by the body at their previous meeting. Chair Becker noted  
1103 feedback from the City Council on priority projects, merger of some  
1104 items, and his revisions presented tonight as a bench handout entitled  
1105 *~~“Proposed Revisions to 2016 Priority Projects,”~~ attached hereto and*  
1106 *made a part hereof.* Chair Becker advised that based on that feedback, he  
1107 had reorganized some of the CEC’s previously agreed-upon bullet points,  
1108 but noted no significant changes were made.

1109  
1110 Specific to the Karen Interagency Task Force or Working Group, and at  
1111 the request of Commissioner Grefenberg, Chair Becker clarified that the  
1112 CEC’s starting point as directed by the City Council was to determine if  
1113 any stakeholders were missing. Chair Becker noted that the CEC would  
1114 continue to learn and refine itself and its charge with the City Council as it  
1115 moved forward and gained more experience.

1116  
1117 Chair Becker noted one request of the City Council was for a periodic  
1118 check-in with the City’s Volunteer Coordinator Kelly O’Brien on CEC-  
1119 specific items. Chair Becker advised that he would add that as a periodic  
1120 agenda item accordingly.

1121  
1122 Commissioner Manke suggested if Ms. O’Brien was unable to personally  
1123 attend a CEC meeting, perhaps she could provide something in writing as  
1124 applicable.

1125  
1126 City Manager Trudgeon advised that he had spoken to Ms. O’Brien earlier  
1127 today and the intent was that she attends a CEC meeting sooner rather than  
1128 later to obtain their feedback and determine how she could best assist and  
1129 inform the CEC.

1130  
1131 Chair Becker noted that the City Council appears to ~~prefer-support~~ the  
1132 CEC’s infrastructure work and wanted the group to continue that work,  
1133 thus his cataloging of items 1.a and 1.b on an as-needed basis. Chair  
1134 Becker opined that as the nature of what the CEC is doing becomes more  
1135 clearly defined for its role in policy development and recommendations,  
1136 things would become easier.

1137  
1138 Chair Becker clarified that he was not asking the CEC to adopt this  
1139 document tonight, as revised, but wanted to allow them to digest it ~~and~~  
1140 ~~before~~ considering formal adoption at ~~the-its~~ next CEC-meeting. ~~The~~  
1141 ~~Commission could then~~ ~~and-determine a work plan~~ as new commissioners  
1142 are seated going forward. Chair Becker expressed his confidence that the  
1143 CEC will make good progress by focusing on making recommendations  
1144 versus doing activities.

Formatted: F

Roseville Community Engagement Commission (CEC) Meeting Minutes  
Page 24 – February 11, 2015

1145  
1146  
1147  
1148  
1149  
1150  
1151  
1152  
1153  
1154  
1155  
1156  
1157  
1158  
1159  
1160  
1161  
1162  
1163  
1164  
1165  
1166  
1167  
1168  
1169  
1170  
1171  
1172  
1173  
1174  
1175  
1176  
1177  
1178  
1179  
1180  
1181  
1182  
1183  
1184  
1185  
1186  
1187  
1188

Commissioner Grefenberg referenced previous Commission discussions that ~~the CEC's~~ its work couldn't be effectively accomplished without the availability of a part-time staff person similar to the role of Ms. Freedman with ~~the City of~~ St. Louis Park. Otherwise, Commissioner Grefenberg opined that this list of priority projects was overwhelming and unrealistic.

Chair Becker noted that Item 4 on the revised document ~~included~~ did include a part-time staff ~~resource~~; on Community Engagement, and noted that it could continue to be considered as a long-term CEC request since; ~~but~~ he didn't anticipate it happening this year.

Commissioner Grefenberg opined that interns would also be valuable in helping with this type of work, and referenced potential contact with the Center for Urban and Regional ~~and Urban~~ Affairs.

Chair Becker opined that with City Manager Trudgeon serving as the CEC's latest staff liaison, he anticipated that would help expedite some of the commission's staff needs.

Chair Becker encouraged his colleagues to watch the February 8<sup>th</sup> City Council meeting discussion for further information. Chair Becker noted the City Council's clarification that the CEC's role in promoting community visioning was ~~into~~ recommending community engagement options, specifically within the context of the upcoming comprehensive plan update.

City Manager Trudgeon concurred, and further clarified that the City Council's intent was to utilize previous community aspirations, with those bullet points included on the City's website, and those goals ~~within~~ from the *Imagine Roseville 2025* community visioning process to inform ~~this~~ the new eComprehensive pPlan update going forward. City Manager Trudgeon reiterated that their intent was not to reinvent the wheel, but review past documents and their relevancy.

At the request of Commissioner Grefenberg, City Manager Trudgeon further clarified that, from his perspective, the core direction from the City Council didn't ~~indicate~~ provide any more specificity for the CEC or any further ~~expansion of~~ on the CEC's involvement in a visioning statement.

Chair Becker reiterated that his interpretation from the City Council was that the visioning was specifically related to the comprehensive plan update process.

Roseville Community Engagement Commission (CEC) Meeting Minutes  
Page 25 – February 11, 2015

1189 Commissioner Grefenberg ~~noted~~ questioned whether that the CEC soon  
1190 needed to begin with developing a vision statement as there wasn't one in  
1191 the current ~~e~~Comprehensive plan.

1193 Chair Becker referenced the City Council's "~~r~~Rules of Procedure"  
1194 (Attachment 7.a) recently revised at their annual organizational meeting.  
1195 Chair Becker suggested that the CEC review the section in formation of  
1196 agendas and public comment in particular and, in relationship with the  
1197 Uniform Commission Ordinance, He also suggested that the CEC may  
1198 want to adjust the formation and organization of its agendas and how it  
1199 operates accordingly. To facilitate discussion and consideration at a future  
1200 CEC meeting, Chair Becker drafted and provided a section specific to both  
1201 those areas (Attachment 7.a.i) for their review and consideration as  
1202 indicated. Chair Becker noted that this was essentially how the CEC  
1203 currently operated, but this would better codify things and allow the  
1204 organization of the CEC to move more quickly and smoothly without  
1205 getting bogged down in minutia.

1207 Commissioner Manke spoke in support of Chair Becker's draft.

1209 Discussion ensued regarding the length of time allowed by the City  
1210 Council for public comment, variables between the CEC and City  
1211 Council and comparisons with City Code.

1213 City Manager Trudgeon suggested further review of this draft document  
1214 with the Uniform Commission Code and the specific CEC Ordinance to  
1215 ensure uniformity. City Manager Trudgeon sternly encouraged that the  
1216 CEC not formally adopt anything different or not in line with City Code,  
1217 but instead use the City Council's Rules of Procedure as a guide and  
1218 adjust according to the circumstances. In the meantime, City Manager  
1219 Trudgeon advised that staff could work through a Uniform Rules of  
1220 Procedures for all advisory commissions and seek City Council review  
1221 and approval ~~versus~~ rather than separate operations procedures for  
1222 individual advisory commissions, ~~but an overall procedure.~~

1224 Chair Becker agreed with that process, advising that his intent was to  
1225 avoid surprise agenda items by setting guidelines and avoid arbitrary  
1226 issues. Chair Becker stated that he generally conducted the meetings in  
1227 accordance with this interpretation of the City Council's Rules of  
1228 Procedure and intended to continue doing so unless otherwise directed.

1230 **b. Staff Report**

1232 **i. Upcoming Items on Future Council Agendas**

1233 City Manager Trudgeon briefly reviewed upcoming City Council  
1234 agendas and areas of interest to the CEC; he noted the CEC's need to

Roseville Community Engagement Commission (CEC) Meeting Minutes  
Page 26 – February 11, 2015

1281 elect a Chair and Vice Chair at their April meeting once commissioner  
1282 vacancies had been filled, anticipating three new members would be  
1283 seated by then.  
1284

1285 **ii. Other Items**

1286 City Manager Trudgeon announced the upcoming annual Ethics  
1287 training scheduled for April 6, 2016; with new commissioner training  
1288 immediately prior to that meeting.  
1289

1290 Commissioner Grefenberg referenced the need for handouts to new  
1291 commissioners ~~–that could inform them of how Commissions operate~~  
1292 collegially as a unit, –thus and–avoiding problems such as  
1293 commissioners operating individually and not collectively; he noted  
1294 that recently this mistaken assumption on the role of commissioners  
1295 had caused problems within the Commission that having recently  
1296 occurred.  
1297

1298 Commissioner Grefenberg also noted that the 2014 Orientation  
1299 Handbook distributed to new Commissioners included a section entitled  
1300 the *Role of Commission Members*, with a subsection titled *Commissions*  
1301 *Act as a Group*; he indicated that he found that the information that  
1302 Commissioners must work together collegially very helpful in the  
1303 Commission’s first months of organizing its work and in understanding  
1304 its role.  
1305

1306 City Manager Trudgeon reported that the City ~~had was~~ developed  
1307 developing an official handbook for newly-appointed advisory  
1308 commissioners as a take away from the training for their reference, and  
1309 reminding all of their roles and procedures. City Manager Trudgeon  
1310 noted that Chair Becker’s suggested Rules and Procedures were a  
1311 perfect addition to a future iteration of that official handbook.  
1312

1313 Commissioner Manke expressed her appreciation for that handbook for  
1314 reference.  
1315

1316 Commissioner Grefenberg expressed his continuing concern in new  
1317 commissioners not realizing the commitment of hours required to in  
1318 serveing on an advisory commission, including time spent outside of  
1319 Commission meetings; and asked that staff convey that information to  
1320 new commissioners at orientation.  
1321

1322 City Manager Trudgeon reported that the handbook talked about the  
1323 general breadth of activities, including reviewing meeting packets, and  
1324 the time spent by work of each advisory commission–commission  
1325 member between meetings and within the community, without ~~too~~  
1326 being too much-specificity regarding the hours involved.

Formatted: F

Formatted: F

Formatted: F

Formatted: F

Formatted: F

Formatted: F

Roseville Community Engagement Commission (CEC) Meeting Minutes  
Page 27 – February 11, 2015

1373  
1374  
1375  
1376  
1377  
1378  
1379  
1380  
1381  
1382  
1383  
1384  
1385  
1386  
1387  
1388  
1389  
1390  
1391  
1392  
1393  
1394  
1395  
1396  
1397  
1398  
1399  
1400  
1401  
1402  
1403  
1404  
1405  
1406  
1407  
1408  
1409  
1410  
1411  
1412  
1413  
1414  
1415  
1416  
1417  
1418

Chair Becker noted that he had also conveyed that time commitment for those approaching him with interest in serving.

**8. Commission Communications, Reports, and Announcements**

None.

**9. Commissioner-Initiated Items for Future Meetings**

Chair Becker briefly reviewed potential items for future agendas, including:

- Proposed revisions to 2016 Priority Projects
- Draft recommendations for Neighborhood Association Guidelines
- Draft Notification Task Force recommendations pending Planning Commission review and approval
- Potential presentation and/or materials from the City of Edina on community engagement

**Motion**

Commissioner Grefenberg moved, Chair Becker seconded, expressing the CEC's appreciation to Communications Manager Garry Bowman for his good work, and valued assistance and advice over the last 1.5 years ~~in his role as staff liaison to the CEC~~ Community Engagement Commission over the last 1.5 years.

**Ayes: 3**

**Nays: 0**

**Motion carried unanimously.**

On behalf of Mr. Bowman, City Manager Trudgeon thanked the CEC Commission for ~~that its~~ acknowledgement of Garry Bowman's service, and offered to pass on their appreciation. City Manager Trudgeon reported that the CEC would continue to see Mr. Bowman occasionally for updates as applicable.

**10. Recap of Commission Actions This Meeting**

Chair Becker briefly reviewed actions at tonight's meeting.

**11. Adjournment**

**Motion**

Commissioner Manke moved, Commissioner Grefenberg seconded, adjournment of the meeting at approximately 9:12 p.m.

**Ayes: 3**

**Nays: 0**

**Motion carried.**

**Next Meeting – Thursday, March 10, 2016 at 6:30 p.m.**

1419

DRAFT

Community Engagement Commission's  
Recommendations regarding Neighborhood Associations

**Primary recommendation:** The Roseville Community Engagement Commission recommends to the City Council that the City assist, foster, and support the creation and continuance of neighborhood associations. This support is proposed to occur with the City providing staff assistance and financial resources towards creating and supporting Neighborhood Associations.

This recommendation is based on the work of the Neighborhood Association Task Force and the review and recommendation of the Community Engagement Commission. (See full report).

Based on the primary recommendation, the Neighborhood Association Task Force and the Community Engagement Commission have created specific recommendations under two categories; 1) *City Expectations of Neighborhood Associations*; and 2) *Neighborhood Associations Expectations of the City*.

City Expectations of Neighborhood Associations

- Neighborhood Associations' membership shall be inclusive to all residents (owners and renters). It is up to individual Neighborhood Associations to determine if businesses can be members.
- Neighborhood Associations shall not discriminate on the basis of race, creed, color, and national origin, place of residence, marital status, income, gender, sexual orientation, veteran status, pregnancy or age.
- Neighborhood Associations shall have bylaws, approved by City, that will among other things, include in its statement of purposes, the process of governance and election, membership requirements, standards of appropriate conduct, and require annual meetings of Neighborhood Associations.
- Neighborhood Associations shall hold annual meetings open to the public.
- Neighborhood Associations shall register with the City in order to be officially recognized. (Not all existing Neighborhood Associations need to register, but registration is required to receive communications directly from the city and receive material support). The Neighborhood Associations shall provide the following information to the City:
  - Association name and contact information
  - Approved association geographic boundary (process to establish boundary TBD)
  - Identification of method of communication to members of Neighborhood Associations
  - Draft bylaws for approval by City.

### Neighborhood Associations Expectations of the City

- The City will provide for a best practices tool kit that neighborhoods can utilize when exploring and organizing to form a Neighborhood Association.
- The City will provide space on City website with list of Neighborhood Associations, their boundaries, and contact information.
- The City will feature Neighborhood Association news in the City Newsletter.
- The City will allow Neighborhood Associations to reserve City Hall and park buildings at no cost based on availability and compliance with existing rental policy.
- The City will pay for and coordinate one (initial or annual?) mailing to members of each Neighborhood Association.
- The City will reasonably make staff and officials available to speak and provide information to Neighborhood Associations on issues of concern and interest to the Neighborhood Associations.
- The City will provide a staff liaison to assist neighborhoods in forming an association.
- The City will develop, maintain and provide information to Neighborhood Associations regarding grant and other funding opportunities for Neighborhood Associations.
- The City will establish grants or other funds to be used by Neighborhood Associations in City-approved projects and outreach.
- The City will provide a website or similar function where Neighborhood Associations can provide content.
- The City will formally integrate Neighborhood Associations into the normal notification process for activities occurring within its boundaries.
- The City will send out broadcast emails to Neighborhood Associations of upcoming City Council agendas
- The City will acknowledge notification of Neighborhood Associations in RCAs and include Neighborhood Associations comments within the RCA if applicable.
- The City shall host (quarterly or annual?) meetings between the City Manager (and other staff?) and the Neighborhood Associations.
- The City Council will, to the extent possible, explain the Neighborhood Association's public comments influenced the decision making process.
- The City Council will duly consider information provided to them and will consider additional discussion on topic as is warranted.



There were two unresolved items that the Neighborhood Association Task Force nor the Community Engagement Commission could make a final conclusion on. They were:

How Should Geographic Boundaries of Neighborhood Associations Be Determined?

- Pre-determined by City (approx. 1000 households in each area).

-or-

- Grass roots creation by interested persons in self-defined neighborhood

How Existing Neighborhood Associations Should Be Addressed?

- Lake McCarrons Neighborhood Association
- Twin Lakes Area Neighborhood Association
- Southwest Area Neighborhood Association
- Existing remain, independent of City Neighborhood Association Network
  - What is level of support by City for existing Neighborhood Associations?

-or-

- Existing Neighborhood Associations are folded into City Neighborhood Association Network

## Revised 2016 Priority Projects

1. Assist in the formulation of the 2017 Comprehensive Plan update process
  - a. Catalog types of engagement processes/tools and advise as to which to use in what circumstances
  - b. Define process for how to identify stakeholders
  - c. Evaluate community vision section(s) and suggest areas where it is “out of date” and could be updated
  - d. With an eye towards replicating what has worked in the past (i.e. not “reinventing the wheel”), evaluate Comprehensive Plan/Roseville 2025 organization and processes to recommend any needed changes
2. Recommend ways to expand city learning and engagement opportunities
  - a. Investigate (and potentially recommend) the implementation of a City "Open House" (e.g. in part a replacement of the Living Smarter Fair), including opportunities for learning about commissions, volunteering, the budget process, and other civic/community engagement topics
  - b. Recommend ways to re-establish some form of a welcome "packet"
  - c. Evaluate format/content of Roseville U, especially with respect to what is adopted via the above and recommend any changes
  - d. Drive additional engagement via the Rosefest Party in the Park
3. Form strategies for outreach to under-represented groups
  - a. Recommend ways the city can engage renters
  - b. Engage with the City Council’s ongoing SE Roseville strategic project(s)
    - i. Catalog current efforts and determine if all stakeholders are engaged and recommend additional stakeholders and strategies to get those stakeholders engaged
    - ii. Other related items as directed by the council
4. Implement additional Council suggestions
  - a. Conduct periodic check-ins with Volunteer Coordinator with respect to engagement, what has worked, and what hasn’t
  - b. Drive additional engagement “infrastructure” work, as needed
5. Advocate for select items from 2014 Community Engagement Commission Recommended Policies and Strategies (no changes from previously adopted version)
  - (Those that are not otherwise aligned with the above priorities)
  - 1.1: The City should work to enrich and strengthen civic engagement at city hall, and encourage employees and elected officials to appreciate civic engagement as an asset.
    - *b) The City Council should hold one regularly scheduled town-hall style meeting each year, with topics solicited from the eight City commissions.*

- 2.1: The City should foster public participation at both the council and commission level.
  - *a) Encourage each commission to hold community meetings.*
  
- 4.1: The City should make available administrative support to foster more effective volunteerism and public participation.
  - *a) Repurpose an existing or create a new City position to support effective community and civic engagement across all departments. This position would coordinate neighborhood and community relations; he/she could develop procedures and methods to improve, track, and provide clear and consistent two-way communication between City government and residents and businesses, and find opportunities for more effective civic engagement. We recommend that this position also work with the Community Engagement Commission.*
  
- 6.3: The City should make readily available City Council and Commission agenda items, minutes, and recorded meetings through its website and CTV cable television.
  - *a) Publish approved city council and commission meeting minutes on the city website in a timely manner, such as within one (1) week of approval.*
    - *i) If public meeting minutes are not approved in a timely manner, such as within one month, publish draft minutes on its website until minutes are finalized.*
  - *b) Offer the full text of meeting agendas in the body of email alerts and meeting notices rather than requiring the extra step to click a link to learn of the full agenda.*
  - *c) Include a link to the specific recorded televised city meeting on the same page as the meeting minutes and/or agenda*