

**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 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

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 the process, but noted that it  
73           varied depending on the 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. 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

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

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

144  
145 Mr. Bilotta noted that staff would be serving in two roles: part of the  
146 technical advisory committee (e.g. engineers, staff, Ramsey County,  
147 watershed districts, MnDOT, and other agencies) and also assisting with  
148 the public input process to inform that process in a timely and effective  
149 manner, while making sure the broadest geographical spread is available  
150 to ensure neighborhood involvement and input.

151  
152 At the request of Chair Becker, Mr. Bilotta confirmed that part of the  
153 consultant budget involved their facilitation of and leading of those  
154 meetings and the organizational structure of those meetings which would  
155 be ultimately subject to City Council approval as to the final process and  
156 schedule. Mr. Bilotta noted that most expenses for the RFP process and  
157 solicitation of the outside consultant will occur later this year; but advised  
158 that those cost estimates would need to be penciled in by May of 2016 to  
159 facilitate the 2017 budget cycle prior to City Council approval of that  
160 budget.

161  
162 For the purpose of full disclosure, Commissioner Grefenberg advised that  
163 he had contacted Mr. Bilotta several weeks ago and suggested that the  
164 previous steering committee, to which he had been appointed, be allowed  
165 to comment on the last Comprehensive Plan process in order to inform the  
166 new process by learning from its past mistakes and successes.  
167 Commissioner Grefenberg noted, for example, that from his perspective  
168 one of the mistakes eight years ago was that land use changes didn't go  
169 back to the affected neighborhood, creating subsequent problems with  
170 those neighborhoods unaware of those changes. Commissioner  
171 Grefenberg recommended the new process be organized to provide that  
172 neighborhood review when such land use changes became apparent but  
173 before they were adopted.

174  
175 Commissioner Grefenberg also said he had asked staff to early in the  
176 process indicate why this new Comprehensive Plan was important for  
177 Roseville residents. From his perspective, he opined that much of the  
178 information in the Comprehensive Plan would be of little interest to most  
179 residents, but land use changes and possibly other issues ,such as  
180 community vision and goals, would be of importance to residents.

181  
182 Commissioner Grefenberg suggested that the previous Comprehensive  
183 Plan terminology "steering committee" not be so named this time, as it

184 gave an indication that the 2006-2008 steering committee was in charge.  
185 Commissioner Grefenberg expressed his personal appreciation that the  
186 community could go beyond the chapters required in the System  
187 Statement.  
188

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

200 Commissioner Grefenberg further expressed his hope that staff organized  
201 meetings with the consultant be open to the “steering committee” or  
202 whatever other citizen advisory group was formed. Commissioner  
203 Grefenberg expressed his trust in Mr. Bilotta and Mr. Paschke; and  
204 thanked them for the opportunity for the CEC to look at the process before  
205 putting out the RFP, since he felt that was the Commission’s role. Chair  
206 Becker sought direction for the CEC from the City Council on their intent  
207 for community visioning, and if that was intended as an additional section  
208 or chapter.  
209

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

222 Mr. Bilotta further reviewed historical chapters with the last  
223 comprehensive plan update, including the demographic analysis that rolled  
224 into the housing chapter, then into the map, and subsequently into  
225 decision-making. Mr. Bilotta estimated that approximately 90% of the  
226 comprehensive plan, from a land use perspective, was done in areas of  
227 decline or changing uses needing review and upgrading.  
228

229 At the request of Commissioner Manke, Mr. Paschke advised that staff  
230 will initially review which chapters need to be addressed and by whom;  
231 but eventually each chapter will need to be somehow addressed, and  
232 refreshed with new goals and objectives.  
233

234 Mr. Bilotta advised that staff would initially read through the  
235 comprehensive plan to determine what remained valid or what is no longer  
236 needed prior to moving toward the consultant review. He reiterated,  
237 however, the importance of community input early on whether as a broad  
238 overview or as a first step to identify any issues that needed to be  
239 addressed. After that initial input, Mr. Bilotta advised that the input would  
240 then be consolidated with previous assumptions, and become more  
241 focused as it moved through the process. Mr. Bilotta opined that he  
242 anticipated 3-4 major issues at the end of the process on which the  
243 community will need to focus.  
244

245 Commissioner Manke asked where the citizen group fit in. Bilotta  
246 responded that their input would be needed at the beginning, in the middle,  
247 and at the end in order to provide a broad citizen perspective. At that  
248 point, Mr. Bilotta suggested some type of citizen advisory committee or  
249 task force may then be or remain actively involved in the whole process,  
250 and/or a geographic advisory commission; with each group having their  
251 own specific role and their own level of detail or involvement. Mr. Bilotta  
252 clarified that the technical committee made of mostly staff and various  
253 agencies (e.g. Ramsey County, MnDOT, and similar agencies) would use  
254 their expertise to look at infrastructure issues and any problematic areas.  
255

256 Commissioner Grefenberg noted that there was a brief subsection on  
257 community engagement in the 2030 comprehensive plan approved in  
258 2008.  
259

260 Mr. Bilotta concurred, while noting that the Plan focused on regionally  
261 mandated pieces. However, Mr. Bilotta stated that the comprehensive  
262 plan can be a tool used to direct a city's future, while recognizing that it  
263 isn't the only report ever produced, but may suggest various aspects. Mr.  
264 Bilotta noted that some documents will be referenced in the  
265 comprehensive plan, but not be a part of it (e.g. detailed housing studies,  
266 identified redevelopment areas, and/or future individual exercises to  
267 address specific areas such as the Park Master Plan document). By  
268 referencing those existing documents, Mr. Bilotta noted the need to avoid  
269 starting from scratch in the comprehensive plan.  
270

271 Commissioner Grefenberg questioned if the community visioning should  
272 be done first in order to coordinate the Plan's development.  
273

274 Specific to a potential timeframe, Mr. Bilotta responded that each  
275 community’s visioning process for its comprehensive plan update differed,  
276 with some having a process and others not having one. From that  
277 perspective, Mr. Bilotta expressed the need to not get bogged down with  
278 the details of the comprehensive plan, but utilize a visioning process  
279 where everyone sits back and thinks where the community will be in the  
280 future, not specifically reviewing individual lots citywide.

281  
282 Mr. Bilotta noted that eventually the comprehensive plan process will get  
283 into that level of detail, but after the foundational visioning and public  
284 understanding and agreement with the vision. Mr. Bilotta noted that this  
285 may be as simple as one paragraph or up to a few pages in length.

286  
287 Mr. Bilotta suggested the first step would be reviewing the existing vision  
288 and determining if it remained relevant and adequate enough to allow the  
289 Comprehensive Plan update to be built on that same vision, if it needed  
290 tweaking, or needed to be totally revised. Mr. Bilotta opined that was a  
291 key decision point to determine if the community wanted to stick with the  
292 previous vision or pursue an entirely separate process.

293  
294 Chair Becker referenced the City Council’s suggestion on Monday night  
295 to simply refresh the vision and keep it relatively short via a bulleted list.

296

297 **6. Old Business**

298

299 **a. Continue Discussion on Neighborhood Associations**

300 Since the St. Louis Park presenter was not yet present, Chair Becker  
301 adjusted the agenda accordingly.

302

303 **ii. Discussion of Next Steps**

304 Chair Becker briefly reported on his meeting with the City Council on  
305 Monday night, and his sense that they were eager to get pending  
306 recommendations from the CEC sooner rather than later. Specific to  
307 the neighborhood association recommendation, Chair Becker asked  
308 commissioners what if anything they felt was still missing; what  
309 additional learning was needed by the CEC; and whether or not the  
310 CEC was prepared to complete its analysis before making its final  
311 recommendation to the City Council.

312

313 At the request of Commissioner Manke, Chair Becker noted that the  
314 CEC had reviewed the minimum requirements expected by the city  
315 from neighborhood associations receiving city support or assistance.  
316 Chair Becker noted that the Commission has covered a lot of  
317 information to-date; but anticipated a concise and fluid set of  
318 recommendations rather than a rigid recommendation in a long,

319 drawn-out report. Chair Becker suggested a set of recommendations  
320 and context for them in order to guide the City Council on this effort  
321

322 Chair Becker clarified that it was the charge to the CEC to provide the  
323 recommendations, whether or not the City Council nixed some right  
324 away, sought additional input, or tweaked some items at its initial  
325 review.  
326

327 Chair Becker noted City Manager Trudgeon's offer to sort out the first  
328 cut of those recommendations.  
329

330 City Manager Trudgeon concurred, stating that he was happy to help  
331 assemble the document and get it into the appropriate format for the  
332 full CEC to look at prior to their presentation to the City Council.  
333 Given the amount of time the City Council had been awaiting this  
334 recommendation, Mr. Trudgeon suggested that review, including  
335 looking at old reports, meeting minutes and other background  
336 information and materials, could be helpful to the Commission in  
337 making their final decision as well as moving the process along.  
338

339 Commissioner Grefenberg thanked City Manager Trudgeon for that  
340 offer, recognizing that it represented a time-consuming on his part.  
341 Commissioner Grefenberg asked that both he and Chair Becker be  
342 allowed to participate in that review since both had been directly  
343 involved in in bringing the Neighborhood Association  
344 recommendations this far.  
345

346 Chair Becker asked commissioners if they were aware of any further  
347 analysis or discussion needed, remembering that the focus was to  
348 remain at a higher level rather than providing details. Chair Becker  
349 asked if commissioners felt the CEC was ready to compile its  
350 recommendations for review as a complete set.  
351

352 Commissioner Manke opined she was ready to compile the  
353 recommendations in order to have something tangible in front of the  
354 CEC and tweak it as necessary; and then move onto the next project.  
355

356 Commissioner Grefenberg cautioned that there may be some  
357 additional issues raised with the St. Louis Park presentation that  
358 needed to be addressed. Therefore, Commissioner Grefenberg stated  
359 that he wasn't yet ready to provide a final answer to Chair Becker  
360 since St. Louis Park provided an excellent example of how  
361 neighborhood forums are held, an issue that remained unclear to him,  
362 and how to deal with the issue of determining neighborhood  
363 association boundaries



364 Discussion ensued regarding how the city’s website would be  
365 available to existing neighborhood associations or affiliated  
366 associations. It was clarified that this issue had been covered in the  
367 material support discussion at the last Commission meeting.  
368

369 Chair Becker added that at the last CEC meeting the initial  
370 recommendations had been that the boundaries could not overlap nor  
371 could they be too large or too small. Chair Becker reiterated that the  
372 specific method should remain a City Council decision as they discuss  
373 their approval of boundaries and the process depending on the specific  
374 situation. Chair Becker noted that the City Council could determine if  
375 they wanted to delegate that to the City Manager or make that decision  
376 as an elected body and suggested that the CEC not get bogged down in  
377 those details.  
378

379 Depending on how quickly staff is able to view background materials,  
380 and assist the working group of Becker and Grefenberg in developing  
381 the initial draft recommendations followed by full Commission  
382 review, Chair Becker opined that conservatively he anticipated that the  
383 final version could come to the CEC by April of 2016 and be placed  
384 on the next available City Council agenda. Chair Becker noted his  
385 impression that the City Council was more than eager to see the  
386 recommendation; and expressed his eagerness to move onto other  
387 work for 2016.  
388

389 **i. Presentation from St. Louis Park**

390 Chair Becker welcomed St. Louis Park Community Liaison Breanna  
391 Freedman who provided brief personal biography and a history of  
392 neighborhood associations in St. Louis Park. Ms. Freedman  
393 distributed numerous handouts during the discussion and referenced  
394 that material as well as other items she volunteered to provide city  
395 staff for dissemination to the Commission if not available on the St.  
396 Louis Park website.  
397

398 Ms. Freedman touched upon how neighborhood associations were  
399 initiated in St. Louis Park by citizens who found the City Council in  
400 favor of and open to their formation; a map (trail map) identifying and  
401 highlighting boundaries for those associations, how they started and  
402 where the process was at now; and the geographic area and the number  
403 of dwelling units in each neighborhood. St. Louis Park had originally  
404 been divided into 35 areas during previous neighborhood revitalization  
405 efforts. Now there were 26 associations whose boundaries were  
406 determined by using major highways, natural boundaries, or  
407 commercial areas, resulting in each unique and specific neighborhoods  
408 Additional discussion included the St. Louis Park Community  
409 Development Department initially partnering with and hosting

410 neighborhood meetings based on the relationship within the  
411 community; drawing of neighborhood boundaries after they were  
412 surveyed, and the huge engagement part of that process.

413  
414 At the request of Commission members, Ms. Freedman reviewed the  
415 type and frequency of support offered associations by the city: funding  
416 and city staff performing the first initial post card mailing expressing  
417 interest of the neighborhood in organizing mailed to every household  
418 and apartment in that identified boundary without releasing that  
419 mailing list, but providing information on the meeting (e.g. time, date,  
420 etc.) with a representative usually working with Ms. Freedman; space  
421 provided for that meeting at city hall or a park building at no charge;  
422 and continued meeting space at no fee for all future meetings.

423  
424 Ms. Freedman reviewed the City of St. Louis Park's use of grants  
425 through its Neighborhood Revitalization Grant Program, funded by  
426 city tax dollars from housing rehabilitation monies, and in place since  
427 1996. This grant program provided up to \$30,000 in grant funds  
428 distributed among neighborhoods. The grant application process ran  
429 from May through April of the following year; the process included  
430 eligibility requirements which served to help determine if a  
431 neighborhood is a valid association and eligible for city grant funds.

432  
433 Chair Becker asked Ms. Freedman to summarize what hadn't worked  
434 as if St. Louis Park could start the program over again; and what  
435 challenges she saw or what her city had learned.

436  
437 Ms. Freedman prefaced her comments by acknowledging that she had  
438 not been employed by the City of St. Louis when the program was  
439 initiated. However, Ms. Freedman opined that she found the key was  
440 communication and maintaining a supportive role to continuously  
441 encourage each association as it got going. Ms. Freedman also noted  
442 the need for all parties to have clear expectations of what is expected  
443 and their role and place in the City.

444  
445 Ms. Freedman added that her staff role was huge in keeping that daily  
446 communication going, attending a number of meetings as needed; and  
447 while not seeing it necessarily as a challenge, it required that the staff  
448 position have some flexibility that could be depended upon as a  
449 consistent resource to keep associations on track and answer their  
450 questions.

451  
452 At the request of Chair Becker, Ms. Freedman advised that she was  
453 full-time in this role; but also served as Human Rights Commission  
454 liaison for the St. Louis Park Police Department, part of their  
455 community outreach efforts. By having the Police Department

456 involved, Ms. Freedman noted that it helped keep them involved in  
457 neighborhoods and what was happening in each area of the  
458 community. Ms. Freedman advised that her outreach team attended  
459 various events and tried to maintain as much public contact as possible  
460 by spending face-to-face time with the community, including working  
461 with annual National Night Out efforts, with 139 different registered  
462 parties in 2015 requiring a considerable amount of coordination in  
463 having a Police or Fire Department presence in each neighborhood.

464  
465 Commissioner Grefenberg asked if St. Louis Park required a set of  
466 bylaws for each neighborhood and whether it had examples bylaws to  
467 help associations get started.

468  
469 Ms. Freedman advised that the City of St. Louis Park provided two  
470 model bylaw templates for developing an association's specific  
471 bylaws, not specifying if one or the other needed to be used, but  
472 providing options of what those bylaws could look like. Ms.  
473 Freedman noted that it was helpful if a neighborhood had organized in  
474 the past, with those bylaws being provided and the association  
475 membership voting on changes for new bylaws going forward versus  
476 starting from scratch.

477  
478 Commissioner Manke asked what type of structure St. Louis Park  
479 asked of associations.

480  
481 Ms. Freedman responded that at a minimum the City of St. Louis Park  
482 required a Chair or President, and a Vice Chair, basically two roles;  
483 with some deciding they wanted a Secretary or Treasurer office as  
484 well; Others may choose a detailed programming committee, others  
485 may wish to have a volunteer coordinator. Thus the organizational  
486 structure could range anywhere from 3 to 10 officers or leaders,  
487 depending on the size, function, and kind of neighborhood involved.

488  
489 Commissioner Grefenberg noted the population of St. Louis Park is  
490 45,000; and noted that the population couldn't determine the average  
491 size of neighborhood associations. Commissioner Grefenberg opined  
492 that was one issue the CEC was grappling with: should there be a  
493 maximum size for a neighborhood. He sought input from Ms.  
494 Freedman on this issue of whether there was an optimal minimal and  
495 maximum size of neighborhood population.

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

501

502 As addressed by Chair Becker, Ms. Freedman recognized that most  
503 associations resulted from block parties or smaller block groups  
504 naturally coalescing and not city dictated. Ms. Freedman advised that  
505 the City of St. Louis Park had a sworn Community Outreach Officer  
506 who worked directly with block captains, often someone who has  
507 stood out as a natural neighborhood leader and their desire to be  
508 involved in their neighborhood.

509  
510 Chair Becker asked if Ms. Freedman was aware of any other free-  
511 standing organizations not identified as an official neighborhood, who  
512 attempted to receive free city website space or free mailings.

513  
514 Ms. Freedman advised that this was not a problem; and that the  
515 incentive for becoming an official neighborhood association was the  
516 availability of City grant monies, opining that it didn't make sense to  
517 have an organization if not applying for support to fund it. However,  
518 Ms. Freedman noted that, even without that grant funding, a lot of  
519 those neighborhoods would continue to thrive as an informal  
520 association.

521  
522 Commissioner Manke asked what the grant funds could be used for.

523  
524 Ms. Freedman responded that the City allowed considerable flexibility  
525 and each neighborhood association varied, with some used for  
526 environmental efforts (e.g. compostable products, park improvements,  
527 park clean-up supplies) or insurance component for volunteers, among  
528 other uses.

529  
530 Ms. Freedman advised that until recently, they hadn't seen many  
531 businesses typically involved in neighborhood associations, but  
532 clarified that the city didn't have any policies in place if a  
533 neighborhood chose to be inclusive to businesses and left it up to them  
534 to determine the extent they wanted to be. However, Ms. Freedman  
535 advised that the city didn't encourage businesses being part of the  
536 neighborhood's steering committee, and preferred that be left to  
537 residents, whether single-family home owners or those in rental units.

538  
539 Chair Becker asked how and when renters participated in St. Louis  
540 Park.

541  
542 Ms. Freedman advised that typically they saw renters involved in  
543 organizing neighborhood associations, even though it could be  
544 challenging to get their involvement.

545  
546 City Manager Trudgeon asked how city businesses, land use decisions,  
547 street projects and other issues flowed into neighborhoods and how

548 those neighborhoods plugged into the City Council decision-making  
549 process. City Manager Trudgeon also asked how their city handled  
550 automatic mailing notifications and how that worked.

551  
552 Ms. Freedman advised that neighborhood meetings were a big deal for  
553 the City of St. Louis Park for those impacted; with the neighborhood  
554 association contact or chairperson used as the main point of contact to  
555 alert their neighbors. However, Ms. Freedman clarified that city staff  
556 ran those informational meetings, and sought input from the  
557 appropriate association as to the best location to hold these meetings  
558 and other logistics. The City's Planning Department hosted these  
559 meetings on a regular basis, and thus significantly involved  
560 neighborhoods, with attendance varying depending on how  
561 controversial an issue is.

562  
563 Ms. Freedman advised that City staff took those meetings very  
564 seriously and assured appropriate staff representation was available.  
565 For instance, Ms. Freedman noted that the Police Department was  
566 undertaking its second year of meeting with all neighborhoods, in its  
567 four different police districts (similar to wards) and inviting  
568 appropriate staff depending on what's happening in their neighborhood  
569 to respond to questions. Ms. Freedman noted that, as much as  
570 possible, the City used team resources to touch base with  
571 neighborhoods at every opportunity to gather their input and feedback.  
572 Ms. Freedman further noted that the City of St. Louis Park had a ward  
573 and at-large system for electing their six council members, with four  
574 wards and two at-large positions.

575  
576 Discussion continued regarding whether or not neighborhoods  
577 advocated for their residents at the City Council level or leaders  
578 spearheaded the efforts on various issues through listening sessions  
579 and direct engagement efforts, or through engaged individuals active  
580 in their neighborhood taking the initiative to pursue various concerns.  
581 Ms. Freedman added that attendance by St. Louis Park Council  
582 members at public open forums allowed them to hear directly from  
583 their residents which input often influenced their decision-making  
584 Commissioner Grefenberg asked Ms. Freedman if the City of St. Louis  
585 Park placed any specific expectations or responsibilities on  
586 neighborhood associations beyond an annual meeting and adopting  
587 bylaws, such as requiring annual election of officers to avoid the  
588 associations becoming insular with the same people getting elected  
589 repeatedly.

590  
591 Ms. Freedman responded that the City did require each association to  
592 had some method of transferring leadership from one year to the next  
593 in order to provide an opportunity for new leadership to step forward.

594 Ms. Freedman noted that it didn't have to occur at their annual  
595 meeting, but typically that made the most sense. As part of their  
596 requirements, Ms. Freedman also noted that the City of St. Louis Park  
597 requires that the City be advised of the annual meeting date, which  
598 was part of each association's grant application that serves to verify  
599 the date and also questions how they plan to encourage new residents  
600 to become involved in the steering committee. Ms. Freedman noted  
601 that one association's bylaws require election of a new president  
602 annually, which has proven successful for them; in her opinion, this  
603 provision allowed those associations and neighborhoods to thrive  
604 without the City dictating their governance model.

605  
606 At the request of Commissioner Manke, Ms. Freedman noted that  
607 there were also some associations that kept the same president year  
608 after year; and others that rotated that office among their steering  
609 committee.

610  
611 Commissioner Manke expressed her preference for term limits, which  
612 Ms. Freedman agreed with as more advantageous.

613  
614 Ms. Freedman further reported that, as part of the grant application and  
615 program, the City required neighborhood associations to provide  
616 evidence of how they engaged and incorporated neighborhood input;  
617 and to report on how their grant funds had been and were intended to  
618 be used. Ms. Freedman noted that this information could be obtained  
619 by each association in a variety of ways, including a suggestion box,  
620 paper surveys, online surveys, other broad and creative ways to help  
621 ensure all residents are given an opportunity to be engaged in the  
622 decision-making process as they desire. Ms. Freedman noted that this  
623 helped keep one person or group from monopolizing or taking over the  
624 neighborhood association.

625  
626 At the request of Commissioner Grefenberg, Ms. Freedman answered  
627 that she personally reviewed and approved each association's bylaws  
628 in her position as the St. Louis Park community liaison. Ms.  
629 Freedman noted that the current bylaws had to be submitted annually  
630 with the grant application; but were more closely scrutinized when a  
631 group was first organizing.

632  
633 Ms. Freedman advised that she retained a master contact list for each  
634 neighborhood association and/or their steering committee, and  
635 whenever a big event was coming up in St. Louis Park of interest to  
636 them, an email was provided to all steering committee members, not  
637 just the president, to ensure that everyone was included and invited.

638

639 Ms. Freedman further noted the annual leadership forum to which all  
640 neighborhood leaders were invited to attend, with an annual theme and  
641 speakers that may involve particular grant options or city leaders. Ms.  
642 Freedman advised that grant awards are presented and monies  
643 distributed at that meeting.

644  
645 Commissioner Grefenberg referenced the task force report suggesting  
646 setting up meetings of all affiliated neighborhood chairs or presidents  
647 with the City Manager 2-3 times each year.

648  
649 Chair Becker expressed his appreciation for Ms. Freedman’s reference  
650 to emailing the entire steering group as their point of contact rather  
651 than only one person (e.g. the president) filtering information. Chair  
652 Becker asked if Ms. Freedman was aware of any neighborhood  
653 associations violating rules or excluding renters, or any other  
654 problematic issues.

655  
656  
657 Ms. Freedman reported that she actually had neighborhood leaders  
658 coming to her seeking suggestions for contacting renters and getting  
659 them included, which always was a challenge. Ms. Freedman advised  
660 that she frequently referred them to property managers for posting  
661 event flyers to advertise their activities and encouraging them to  
662 become part of the process by providing input and ideas. Ms.  
663 Freedman noted that grant funds help further the community  
664 engagement attempt.

665  
666 Ms. Freedman reported only one problem she was aware of regarding  
667 Chair Becker’s concern regarding contacts and control of associations.  
668 Ms. Freedman noted a recent instance when a neighborhood resident  
669 asked that all email communications be sent to her directly, which  
670 raised flags whether her intent was to filter information. Ms.  
671 Freedman noted a neighborhood association may provide a sign-up  
672 sheet for email communications, with another role in having a  
673 newsletter editor and having them email any city communication from  
674 and to the editor and the city, or from the city to the steering  
675 committee to disseminate that information to their full email list. Ms.  
676 Freedman noted that the City of St. Louis Park also used  
677 NextDoor.com to disseminate that information.

678  
679 Commissioner Grefenberg asked Ms. Freedman to report on how the  
680 City of St. Louis Park ensured accountability beyond requiring an  
681 annual meeting per year or whether there were other ways to hold  
682 neighborhood associations accountable to their neighbors.  
683 Ms. Freedman stated that she hadn’t seen any issues with  
684 neighborhoods wanting to keep information to themselves, since a

685 required goal of each Association’s steering committee was to bring  
686 people in, adding that each association governing entity was advised to  
687 seek as many options as possible to engage their neighbors.  
688

689 Ms. Freedman noted that there hadn’t been that tension or need for the  
690 city to get involved if there were issues over an association’s  
691 accountability; she anticipated that could be part of her role as liaison  
692 if that problem ever became evident. In her conversation with peers  
693 and colleagues, Ms. Freedman reported that she had not heard of that  
694 being a problem elsewhere, especially when neighborhood  
695 associations aren’t necessarily formed around issues but created for the  
696 purposes of maintaining quality relationships between residents and  
697 allowing access to the City Council, city staff, and city resources. Ms.  
698 Freedman noted that this purpose, rather than issue-based, allowed  
699 promotion to be a good neighbor and addressed the general upkeep of  
700 neighborhoods and personal investment in their communities.  
701

702 Commissioner Grefenberg noted, as a recent example: The Twin  
703 Lakes Redevelopment Area where local impact seemed to be a  
704 sensitive issue overriding a citywide impact.  
705

706 Ms. Freedman referenced a similar situation when the City of St. Louis  
707 Park was redeveloping citywide, and the decision-making included  
708 how to establish project boundaries. Ms. Freedman suggested that one  
709 way to avoid negative issues was to recognize and highlight that each  
710 neighborhood was unique and different, while all may be experiencing  
711 similar issues. Ms. Freedman offered to do further research from  
712 meeting minutes from their city’s neighborhood revitalization  
713 committee and send that information to the Roseville CEC for their  
714 reference.  
715

716 Commissioner Grefenberg referenced his favorable impression with  
717 the City of St. Louis Park’s website which had information available  
718 on each neighborhood association and its organization, beyond just a  
719 map and contact people, but providing neighborhood characteristics  
720 and information on the association itself. Regarding authorship of that  
721 information, Commissioner Grefenberg asked Ms. Freedman if there  
722 were any problems or if she reviewed that input before it was added to  
723 the City’s website.  
724

725 Ms. Freedman reported that this information was in place before she  
726 was employed as by St. Louis Park as community liaison less than  
727 three years ago; and as referenced by Commissioner Grefenberg,  
728 provided neighborhood demographics and characteristics, and if in  
729 organized neighborhoods, their consent was sought before publication  
730 by the City. Ms. Freedman advised that she was only aware of minor



731 and infrequent issues with newsletter content, since the City supplied  
732 printing costs for newsletters, even though most are being done  
733 electronically now or gone from 4 pages to a single page and  
734 distributed more frequently. Ms. Freedman reported that the problem  
735 had been with some neighborhoods advertising political campaigns,  
736 creating a conflict of interest with the city supplying that resource and  
737 the neighborhood supplying the newsletter, and creating local political  
738 issues in wards. However, after the City created some newsletter  
739 policies, Ms. Freedman reported that these problems had been  
740 squelched.

741  
742 Ms. Freedman also noted that some associations used advertising as a  
743 revenue source for their newsletters, and of course, that was being  
744 taken advantage of at times, requiring the city to put a cap on some of  
745 those practices. Ms. Freedman further noted that local businesses had  
746 an opportunity to advertise, however, and this allowed neighbors to  
747 support those important resources in their community, and develop  
748 relationships with those businesses, thus allowing them to become  
749 involved and engaged with neighborhood associations, frequently by  
750 donating goods or services to the association for a special event.

751  
752 At the request of Commissioner Manke, Ms. Freedman advised that  
753 each neighborhood association put together their individual  
754 newsletters, which were in turn reviewed by her according to city  
755 policy; but clarified that the city did not mail it out. Ms. Freedman  
756 reported that typically the block captains or volunteers commit to  
757 distribute the newsletters. Ms. Freedman noted that this was part of  
758 the grant application process, with the neighborhood associations  
759 reporting on their in-kind match of city grant funds.

760  
761 Commissioner Manke asked if neighborhood associations had a link  
762 on city websites to their own websites if available.

763  
764 Ms. Freedman reported that she had seen that done, but noted that  
765 most neighborhood associations don't have a website, but typically use  
766 Facebook or shift to NextDoor.com.

767  
768 Commissioner Grefenberg noted that NextDoor.com had its own  
769 national prohibitions regarding political postings that was not subject  
770 to municipal authority. Mr. Grefenberg reported that approximately  
771 15% of Roseville residents were involved in NextDoor.com; leaving  
772 85% of its residents needing informed of decisions through another  
773 method of communication.

774  
775 Ms. Freedman stated that the City of St. Louis Park used every  
776 available social media to promote and inform residents about

777 neighborhood meetings. She recognized that a good portion of its  
778 residents didn't depend on social media; and therefore if possible  
779 meeting information was also included in the local newspaper or city  
780 newsletter, depending on timing. Ms. Freedman emphasized the  
781 importance of communication as the key to make contact with  
782 residents and encourage their involvement, further noting the  
783 importance of community and neighborhood leaders in assisting with  
784 those opportunities.

785  
786 Chair Becker thanked Ms. Freedman for the information; and Ms.  
787 Freedman offered to provide any other information as requested by the  
788 CEC.

789

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

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

796

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

807

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

819

820 Commissioner Grefenberg enquired whether Mr. Trudgeon knew that the  
821 Commission itself was neither aware of this specific proposal nor had it

822 approved the submission of the grant application. City Manager Trudgeon  
823 responded that he was aware of that.

824  
825 Since these events involve a more direct and hands-on approach, Mr.  
826 Trudgeon advised that he felt more comfortable, from the city's  
827 perspective, after the recent meeting with these groups. Mr. Trudgeon  
828 emphasized the CEC's role and that of the City of Roseville was to  
829 encourage community engagement rather than play an active role in  
830 shaping that engagement. Mr. Trudgeon noted that, in some shape or role,  
831 all residents, including city staff and council members, were welcomed to  
832 attend the learning sessions or seek other ways to become involved.

833  
834 Chair Becker noted that the Human Rights Commission (HRC) was  
835 definitely interested in engaging in those events as well, and suggested  
836 coordination with that advisory commission.

837  
838 City Manager Trudgeon advised that he would be explaining this  
839 particular grant award and process to the City Council at their February  
840 22, 2016 meeting; along with a representative of the Advocate group, the  
841 Lake McCarrons Neighborhood Association and the and the Community  
842 Engagement Commission.

843  
844 In response to Chair Becker's query as to whether any other Community  
845 Engagement Commissioners should attend, Mr. Trudgeon responded that  
846 he didn't feel it was necessary, since the Lake McCarrons Neighborhood  
847 Association and the Advocates group were the leading forces as part of  
848 their desire for outreach. Mr. Trudgeon opined that he didn't see a direct  
849 formal role for the CEC.

850  
851 In response to Commissioner Grefenberg's expressed desire for more  
852 information on the grant itself, City Manager Trudgeon advised that Lake  
853 McCarrons Neighborhood Association was listed as the grantee, and it  
854 would be their task and work to coordinate with those agencies previously  
855 mentioned in his opening comments for the three listening/learning  
856 sessions at various locations. Mr. Trudgeon advised that there was no  
857 direct role for the city, but rather more of a support role based on its strong  
858 interest in fostering these type of relationships. If there are some take-  
859 aways as a result of these sessions, Mr. Trudgeon noted that the city could  
860 be in a position to help, or ways to inform the broader community of these  
861 efforts. However, Mr. Trudgeon reiterated that, upon his meeting with the  
862 group, it served to confirm for him and the City Council that there was no  
863 direct role for the City.

864  
865 Commissioner Grefenberg opined that he wasn't totally sure that the CEC  
866 shouldn't play some role or at least be able to observe those listening  
867 sessions.

868  
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

Chair Becker agreed with City Manager Trudgeon’s comments that the sessions were open to anyone; he clarified that the role of the CEC as a body would be to determine how well this type of engagement tool worked. Chair Becker further noted the direction provided by the City Council reinforced the Commission’s understanding that their charge was focused more on policy recommendations than hands-on work. Chair Becker expressed his confidence in Commissioner Gardella to provide sufficient and accurate reporting and updates on the sessions.

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

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

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

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

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

Chair Becker noted that the feedback had been constant that Community Development Director Bilotta and City Planner Paschke were doing a great work supporting the task force.

913 City Manager Trudgeon noted the recent addition of signage on  
914 development or redevelopment sites, similar to that he'd seen done for  
915 another community he'd worked in. While that signage wasn't overly  
916 descriptive, Mr. Trudgeon noted that it did provide sufficient contact  
917 information and frequently prompted calls to city hall allowing for more  
918 detailed conversations.

919  
920 Commissioner Manke concurred, noting that the signage may not  
921 necessarily affect you as a resident, or you may not even live in Roseville  
922 and only commute through; but would allow the information to be  
923 available to anyone interested.

924  
925 Commissioner Grefenberg opined that signage was also another way to  
926 reach renters, along with the city staff's database of rentals and renters,  
927 with renters shown by unit and address, not by name but addressed to  
928 "occupant at apartment #" rental complexes.

929  
930 Commissioner Grefenberg expressed his positive impression and his  
931 respect for the cooperation and assistance provided by the City's  
932 Planning staff;. Commissioner Grefenberg asked that City Manager  
933 Trudgeon convey the Task Force's and his personal thanks for Mr. Bilotta  
934 and Mr. Paschke's collaboration.

935  
936 Commissioner Manke concurred, noting the value of being able to feed off  
937 their knowledge from their areas of expertise, as well as providing an  
938 opportunity to get to know them better and their role in the community.

939  
940 Chair Becker expressed his appreciation and anticipation that this would  
941 become the cooperative nature for the community moving forward.

942  
943 **Motion**

944 Commissioner Grefenberg moved, Commissioner Manke seconded, to  
945 acknowledge the Commission's receipt of the Joint Zoning Notification  
946 Task Force Report and Recommendations and to approve the report and  
947 its recommendations as submitted and as dated February 4, 2016.

948  
949 **Ayes: 3**

950 **Nays: 0**

951 **Motion carried.**

952  
953 **7. Chair, Committee and Staff Reports**

954  
955 **a. Chair's Report**

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

959  
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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Chair Becker clarified that he was not asking the CEC to adopt this document tonight, as revised, but wanted to allow them to digest it before considering formal adoption at its next meeting. The Commission could then determine a work plan as new commissioners are seated going

1005 forward. Chair Becker expressed his confidence that the CEC will make  
1006 good progress by focusing on making recommendations versus doing  
1007 activities.

1008  
1009 Commissioner Grefenberg referenced previous Commission discussions  
1010 that its work couldn't be effectively accomplished without the availability  
1011 of a part-time staff person similar to the role of Ms. Freedman with St.  
1012 Louis Park. Otherwise, Commissioner Grefenberg opined that this list of  
1013 priority projects was overwhelming and unrealistic.

1014  
1015 Chair Becker noted that Item 4 on the revised document did include a part-  
1016 time staff on Community Engagement, and noted that it could continue to  
1017 be considered as a long-term CEC request since he didn't anticipate it  
1018 happening this year.

1019  
1020 Commissioner Grefenberg opined that interns would also be valuable in  
1021 helping with this type of work, and referenced potential contact with the  
1022 Center for Urban and Regional Affairs.

1023  
1024 Chair Becker opined that with City Manager Trudgeon serving as the  
1025 CEC's latest staff liaison, he anticipated that would help expedite some of  
1026 the commission's staff needs.

1027  
1028 Chair Becker encouraged his colleagues to watch the February 8<sup>th</sup> City  
1029 Council meeting discussion for further information. Chair Becker noted  
1030 the City Council's clarification that the CEC's role in promoting  
1031 community visioning was to recommend community engagement options,  
1032 specifically within the context of the upcoming comprehensive plan  
1033 update.

1034  
1035 City Manager Trudgeon concurred, and further clarified that the City  
1036 Council's intent was to utilize previous community aspirations, with those  
1037 bullet points included on the City's website, and those goals from the  
1038 *Imagine Roseville 2025* community visioning process to inform the new  
1039 Comprehensive Plan update going forward. City Manager Trudgeon  
1040 reiterated that their intent was not to reinvent the wheel, but review past  
1041 documents and their relevancy.

1042  
1043 At the request of Commissioner Grefenberg, City Manager Trudgeon  
1044 further clarified that, from his perspective, the core direction from the City  
1045 Council didn't provide any more specificity for the CEC or any further on  
1046 the CEC's involvement in a visioning statement.

1047  
1048 Chair Becker reiterated that his interpretation from the City Council was  
1049 that the visioning was specifically related to the comprehensive plan  
1050 update process.

1051  
1052  
1053  
1054  
1055  
1056  
1057  
1058  
1059  
1060  
1061  
1062  
1063  
1064  
1065  
1066  
1067  
1068  
1069  
1070  
1071  
1072  
1073  
1074  
1075  
1076  
1077  
1078  
1079  
1080  
1081  
1082  
1083  
1084  
1085  
1086  
1087  
1088  
1089  
1090  
1091  
1092  
1093  
1094  
1095  
1096

Commissioner Grefenberg questioned whether the CEC soon needed to begin developing a vision statement as there wasn't one in the current Comprehensive Plan.

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

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

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

City Manager Trudgeon suggested further review of this draft document with the Uniform Commission Code and the specific CEC Ordinance to ensure uniformity. City Manager Trudgeon sternly encouraged that the CEC not formally adopt anything different or not in line with City Code, but instead use the City Council's Rules of Procedure as a guide and adjust according to the circumstances. In the meantime, City Manager Trudgeon advised that staff could work through a Uniform Rules of Procedures for all advisory commissions and seek City Council review and approval rather than separate operation procedures for individual advisory commissions. Chair Becker agreed with that process, advising that his intent was to avoid surprise agenda items by setting guidelines and avoid arbitrary issues. Chair Becker stated that he generally conducted the meetings in accordance with this interpretation of the City Council's Rules of Procedure and intended to continue doing so unless otherwise directed.

**b. Staff Report**

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

City Manager Trudgeon briefly reviewed upcoming City Council agendas and areas of interest to the CEC; he noted the CEC's need to elect a Chair and Vice Chair at their April meeting once commissioner



1097 vacancies had been filled, anticipating three new members would be  
1098 seated by then.

1099

1100

**ii. Other Items**

1101

City Manager Trudgeon announced the upcoming annual Ethics  
1102 training scheduled for April 6, 2016; with new commissioner training  
1103 immediately prior to that meeting.

1104

1105

Commissioner Grefenberg referenced the need for handouts to new  
1106 commissioners that could inform them of how Commissions operate  
1107 collegially as a unit, thus avoiding problems such as commissioners  
1108 operating individually and not collectively; he noted that recently this  
1109 mistaken assumption on the role of commissioners had caused  
1110 problems within the Commission

1111

Commissioner Grefenberg also noted that the 2014 Orientation  
1112 Handbook distributed to new Commissioners included a section entitled  
1113 the *Role of Commission Members*, with a subsection titled *Commissions*  
1114 *Act as a Group*; he indicated that he found that the information that  
1115 Commissioners must work together collegially very helpful in the  
1116 Commission's first months of organizing its work and in understanding  
1117 its role.

1118

City Manager Trudgeon reported that the City was developing an  
1119 official handbook for newly-appointed commissioners as a take away  
1120 from the training for their reference, and reminding all of their roles and  
1121 procedures. City Manager Trudgeon noted that Chair Becker's  
1122 suggested Rules and Procedures were a perfect addition to a future  
1123 iteration of that official handbook.

1124

1125

Commissioner Manke expressed her appreciation for that handbook for  
1126 reference.

1127

1128

Commissioner Grefenberg expressed his continuing concern in new  
1129 commissioners not realizing the commitment of hours required to serve  
1130 on an advisory commission, including time spent outside of  
1131 Commission meetings, and asked that staff convey that information to  
1132 new commissioners at orientation.

1133

1134

City Manager Trudgeon reported that the handbook talked about the  
1135 general breadth of activities, including reviewing meeting packets, and  
1136 the time spent by each commission member between meetings and  
1137 within the community, without being too specific regarding the hours  
1138 involved

1139

1140

Chair Becker noted that he had also conveyed that time commitment for  
1141 those approaching him with interest in serving.

1141

1142

1143 **8. Commission Communications, Reports, and Announcements**

1144 None.

1145

1146 **9. Commissioner-Initiated Items for Future Meetings**

1147 Chair Becker briefly reviewed potential items for future agendas, including:

- 1148 • Proposed revisions to 2016 Priority Projects
- 1149 • Draft recommendations for Neighborhood Association Guidelines
- 1150 • Draft Notification Task Force recommendations pending Planning
- 1151 Commission review and approval
- 1152 • Potential presentation and/or materials from the City of Edina on community
- 1153 engagement
- 1154

1154

1155 **Motion**

1156 Commissioner Grefenberg moved, Chair Becker seconded, expressing the CEC's  
1157 appreciation to Communications Manager Garry Bowman for his good work, and  
1158 valued assistance and advice over the last 1.5 years as staff liaison to the  
1159 Community Engagement Commission.

1160

1161 **Ayes: 3**

1162 **Nays: 0**

1163 **Motion carried unanimously.**

1164

1165 On behalf of Mr. Bowman, City Manager Trudgeon thanked the Commission for  
1166 its acknowledgement of Garry Bowman's service, and offered to pass on their  
1167 appreciation. City Manager Trudgeon reported that the CEC would continue to  
1168 see Mr. Bowman occasionally for updates as applicable.

1169

1170 **10. Recap of Commission Actions This Meeting**

1171 Chair Becker briefly reviewed actions at tonight's meeting.

1172

1173 **11. Adjournment**

1174

1175 **Motion**

1176 Commissioner Manke moved, Commissioner Grefenberg seconded, adjournment  
1177 of the meeting at approximately 9:12 p.m.

1178

1179 **Ayes: 3**

1180 **Nays: 0**

1181 **Motion carried.**

1182

1183 **Next Meeting – Thursday, March 10, 2016 at 6:30 p.m.**

1184

1185