



Community Engagement Commission Agenda

Thursday, October 9, 2014

6:30 p.m.

City Council Chambers

- 6:30 p.m. **1. Introductions/Roll Call**
2. Approve Agenda
3. Approval of September 11 Minutes
4. Public Comment on Items Not on Agenda
- 6:45 p.m. **5. Old Business**
a. Work Group G: Operations Committee (Completed or Nearly Complete/Responsibility of Other Commissions and/or Staff)
b. Work Group D: Neighborhoods
c. Work Group C: Community Communications
d. Items Set Aside from Work Group A and E: Community Outreach and Council/Commissions/Staff in the Community
- 8:05 p.m. **6. Chair and Committee Reports**
a. Chair's Report (Chair Grefenberg)
b. Website Redesign Committee
i. Current Status of Civic Engagement Module (Lead Commissioner Becker)
- 8:15 p.m. c. Staff Report on Current Status of Main Website Redesign
- 8:30 p.m. **7. New Business**
a. Commission Consideration of Mayoral Request to NextDoor to Allow Residents to Opt-In for Directing concerns to City Staff
- 8:45 p.m. **8. Staff Report**
a. Upcoming Items on Future Council Agendas
b. Other Items
- 8:45 p.m. **9. Commission Communications, Reports, and Announcements**
10. Commissioner-Initiated Items for Future Meetings
11. Recap of Commission Actions This Meeting
12. 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@ci.roseville.mn.us or 651-792-7028.

46 She McCormick also stated advised the Commission that the City notification problems with
47 ~~noticing in the City has~~ had a long history; she added that ~~and~~ Councilmember Laliberte has
48 suggested this could be something the ~~CEC~~ Commission could work on and find ways to
49 improve.

50
51 Commissioner Ramundt stated the Commission would be looking at neighborhood groups next
52 month and one of the possible recommendations is neighborhood associations. This is a high
53 priority for Chair Grefenberg and she appreciated the input from Ms. McCormick.

54
55 Commissioner Theresa Gardella asked if Ms. McCormick ~~had~~ what materials or information
56 ~~available that~~ would be helpful in forming neighborhood associations; Gardella also asked that
57 Ms. McCormick and forward that information to the Commission so that it would have that when
58 ~~they~~ it ~~discussed~~ this topic.

59
60 Mc. McCormick stated that some cities do help with the cost of the first mailings ~~regarding the~~
61 ~~formation of~~ forming a new neighborhood association, ~~membership~~ and this support would be
62 helpful. She offered to share the neighborhood association information she had created.

63
64

65 5. OLD BUSINESS: WORK GROUP REPORTS

66
67 Chair Grefenberg ~~stated there seemed to him~~ indicated that there seemed to ~~had been come~~ some
68 confusion on the differences between policies and strategic recommendations. The Commission
69 had adopted ~~rules~~ instructions for the Work Groups; which said the Commission should address
70 both policies and strategic recommendations; however, in some of the reports received the focus
71 had been more on strategic recommendations. ~~The Commission will try to muddle through and~~
72 ~~As everyone goes~~ each Work Group goes through its recommendations, it would be interesting
73 necessary to know if there ~~is~~ was a recommendation ~~to of deletion delete or revision of~~ revise a
74 policy or if the ~~item~~ recommendation is focused solely on strategic recommendations.

75
76 Also as the Commission goes through each report he ~~would~~ said that the process would be that
77 if there were any objections to a particular recommendation that could not be resolved quickly
78 ~~and if there are, due to the time restrictions, those that items~~ item would be set aside to be
79 discussed later in the meeting ~~for or~~ at a future meeting. Since meeting time was limited the
80 intent was to get at least some of ~~this~~ these recommendations approved.

81

82 a. **Work Group F: Operations Committee (“Low-Hanging Fruit”)**

83
84 Chair Grefenberg stated this report comes from the Operations Committee ~~and~~ whose members
85 are ~~Chair Grefenberg~~ himself, Vice Chair Becker, and Commissioner Gardella. He asked if
86 anyone had discussion on items 2.0 and 2.1.

87

88 It was the consensus of the Community Engagement Commission to accept the Operations
89 Committee recommendation to keep Items 2.0 and 2.1 as policy statements.

90

91 Chair Grefenberg stated Item 2.1.b was a strategic recommendation. The Operations Committee
92 is recommending changing the language of the 2012 Task Force Recommendation by changing
93 the word “formalized” to “encourage” future Councils to continue [the mayor’s current practice](#)
94 [of recognizing members of the public during city council meetings both on items not on the](#)
95 [agenda as well as items on the agenda.](#) The reason for this was that each [City](#) Council adopts its
96 own policies [and rules, and one council cannot bind another.](#)

97
98 [There being no objection, the Chair ruled](#) it was the consensus of the ~~Community Engagement~~
99 Commission to accept the Operations Committee recommendation for the revision of Item 2.1.b
100 and keep ~~this~~ [it](#) as a strategic recommendation.

101
102 Chair Grefenberg stated the Operations Committee recommended Item 2.1.c (*Have commission*
103 *meetings follow these same rules and procedures as the city council, and as described above*) be kept.
104 ~~remain a strategic recommendation, but there was no need for action at this time since the~~
105 ~~Commission has approved this at its May meeting. He clarified the Commission would not need~~
106 ~~to act on this item at this time because it had been approved by the Commission in May~~

107
108 [The Work Group had recommended that the timeline on this recommendation be contingent](#)
109 [upon when Council takes up the Uniform Standards for Commissions.](#)

110
111 [As to whether there was anything missing from this strategic recommendation, the Work Group](#)
112 [had made the following recommendation:](#)

113
114 [The practice of a few Commissions does not make clear that public input can occur during its meeting.](#)
115 [Once approved by the Council, the City Manager should advise all Commissions to provide for public](#)
116 [comment before and during its meetings. Public comment during a meeting should occur before a](#)
117 [Commission takes action on an agenda item.](#)

118
119 [Grefenberg](#) also [noted that as currently written](#) this strategic recommendation does not include the
120 Housing and Redevelopment Authority’s Board. The Commission may wish to consider including this
121 board in its recommended strategies [at a later time.](#)

122
123 ~~He noticed that it was not clear that public input could occur during meetings not just before the~~
124 ~~Housing and Redevelopment Authority Board is not included in this recommendation. In order~~
125 ~~to expedite discussions he limited the recommendation to keeping the strategic recommendation~~
126 ~~and adding language that the City Manager advises all Commissions to provide for public input~~
127 ~~during meetings not just at the beginning. He stated he had problems with the Finance~~
128 ~~Commission providing time for public input during there meetings.~~

129
130 [There being no objection the Chair ruled](#) it was the consensus of the ~~Community Engagement~~
131 Commission to keep Item 2.1.c as a strategic recommendation and once approved by the
132 Council, the City Manager should advise all Commissions to provide for public comment before
133 and during their meetings.

134

135 The next strategic recommendation the Work Group reviewed was as follows:
136 *2 additional, .2 Other: Direct contact info for each commission and its leadership be on it web*
137 *page and printed materials such as brochures.*
138

139 Chair Grefenberg stated the ~~Operations Committee~~ Work Group would recommend revising (as
140 indicated above) and adopting a this strategic recommendation ~~for direct contact info for each~~
141 ~~Commission and its leadership on its webpage and printed materials.~~ It was also recommended
142 to ~~add this to the Commissions 2014 Recommendations and~~ incorporate it this position into the
143 Commission’s recommended Uniform Standards for Commissions.

144 Grefenberg noted that the City Council thought this item was significant enough to add it to the
145 City Manager Goals for 2014, referring to a July 14, 2014, City Council action.

146
147 There being no objection the Chair ruled it was the consensus of the ~~Community Engagement~~
148 ~~Commission to accept the Operations Committee recommendation to add adopt~~ this revised
149 recommendation language to ~~Item 2 addl 2 Other for contact information for Commissions and~~
150 ~~its leadership to be on the webpage and printed materials.~~

151
152 The next 2012 recommendation the Work Group reviewed was a Policy which read: *The City*
153 *should widely publicize openings on all commissions and ad hoc groups, and encourage residents to*
154 *apply.*
155

156 The Work Group recommended two changes and the adoption of this policy to read as follows:
157 ~~revised Policy Chair Grefenberg stated Item 2.2 is a Policy and the Operation Committee would~~
158 ~~suggest changing the wording to read “...and ad hoc advisory groups...” and adding the sentence~~
159 ~~“the City should also consider adding some schedule flexibility to the interview process so more~~
160 ~~residents can be interviewed.”~~

161 *2.2 Policy: The City should widely publicize openings on all commissions and ad hoc advisory*

162 *groups, and encourage residents to apply. The City should also consider adding some*

163 *schedule flexibility to the interview process so more residents can be interviewed.*
164
165 There being no objection the Chair ruled it was the consensus of the Community Engagement
166 Commission to accept the recommendations ~~of the Operations Committee~~ regarding Policy ~~for~~
167 ~~Item 2.2.~~
168
169 The next item the Work Group reviewed was Chair Grefenberg stated the recommendation for
170 strategic recommendation 2 additional, .3 Other, which it recommended be revised and adopted
171 as follows: ~~Other would be to replace the word “tweak” with “in so far as feasible” and add~~
172 ~~“Also prior to interviews Commission websites should be updated to make sure the information~~
173 ~~remains relevant and the time commitment required of a Commissioner is clear.”~~ The
174 ~~Operations Committee also recommended adding strategic recommendation 2 addl 4 Other:~~
175 ~~Explore alternative methods to reach minority groups and others who are not normally involved~~
176 ~~in civic affairs.”~~

177 *2 addl 3 Other ~~Tweak~~ In so far as feasible improve the Commission interview process to make*
178 *certain applicants are aware of interviews and consider providing alternative dates if necessary.*

179 Also prior to interviews Commission web sites should be updated to make sure the information
180 remains relevant and the time commitment required of a Commissioner is clear.

181
182 There being no objection the Chair ruled i it was the consensus of the Community Engagement
183 Commission to accept revised strategic recommendation 2 ~~add~~ additional, .3 Other.

184

185 The Work Group’s next recommendation regarded strategic recommendation 2 additional 1, .4 :
186 Explore alternative methods to reach minority groups and others who are not normally involved in civic
187 affairs.

188

189 Other Commission Gardella suggested changing 2 ~~add~~ 4 Other from the language *minority*
190 *groups* to *underrepresented groups*. Commissioner Ramundt suggested removing “minority
191 groups and other” and leave at “those who are not normally involved...”

192

193 After some discussion the Chair ruled that it was the consensus of the ~~Community Engagement~~
194 Commission to accept strategic recommendation 2 ~~add~~ additional, .4 Other, as amended to read
195 “Explore alternative methods to reach ~~minority groups and~~ others who are not normally involved
196 in civic affairs.” There was no objection to the Chair’s ruling.

197

198 Chair Grefenberg ~~stated~~ said the ~~Operations Committee is~~ Work Group F was recommending
199 adding a new policy ~~2.x:~~ two new strategic recommendations, and a timeline as follows:

200 ~~The City should provide opportunities for residents to learn about commissions, and strategic~~
201 ~~recommendation 2.x.1: Prior to the annual announcement of Commission openings or at the~~
202 ~~same time, the City and the Commission should sponsor an open workshop to learn about~~
203 ~~Commissions, how and why they operate, the role of individual Commissioners, and other~~
204 ~~information on Commissions, general and specific; and strategic recommendation 2.x.2: The~~
205 ~~organization and scheduling of this workshop should be closely coordinated with Staff sot that~~
206 ~~the workshop itself should be seen as an integral part of the City’s process of advertising and~~
207 ~~filling Commission vacancies.~~

208 **2.x Policy:** The City should provide opportunities for residents to learn about Commissions.

209 **Strategic Recommendation 2.x.1:** Prior to the annual announcement of Commission openings or
210 at the same time, the City and the Commission should sponsor an open workshop to learn about
211 Commissions, how and why they operate, the role of individual Commissioners, and other
212 information on Commissions, general and specific.

213 **Strategic Recommendation 2.X.2:** The organization and scheduling of this workshop should be
214 closely coordinated with Staff so that the Workshop itself should be seen as an integral part of the
215 City’s process of advertising and filling Commission vacancies.

216 **Timeline:** Planning and concurrence of staff and Council should be achieved by the end of
217 February, 2015, so this workshop can be seen as a pilot project incorporated into the spring
218 process for filling Commission vacancies.

219

220 He [Grefenberg](#) reviewed the suggested timeline and explained the reason the deadline was
221 February 2015 was because the Commission openings are announced at the end of February to
222 ~~early March~~ [at that time](#).

223

224 [After some discussion the Chair ruled that](#) it was the consensus of the Community Engagement
225 Commission to accept the Operations Committee recommendation to Add Policy 2.a, ~~and~~
226 strategic recommendations 2.x.1 and 2.x.2, [and the timeline as presented](#).

227

228 ~~Chair Grefenberg reviewed the Operations Committee~~ [The next Work Group](#) recommendation to
229 ~~add~~ [concerned 2012](#) Policy 2.3 which reads *The City should develop and enforce an absence*
230 *policy for Commissions* and add [the following language](#) *or for those few Commissions who meet*
231 *less often an equivalent maximum of missed meetings”* ~~to strategic recommendation 2.3.a. He~~
232 ~~pointed out that the way it is currently written the strategic recommendation does not include the~~
233 ~~Housing and Redevelopment Authority Board.~~

234

235 [The Work Group also recommended the following:](#)

236 [SUGGESTED TIMELINE: Contingent upon when Council takes up the Uniform Standards for](#)
237 [Commissions.](#)

238

239 [ANYTHING MISSING? We may need to clarify that the current practice of some Commissions](#)
240 [of allowing excused absences will not be allowed if this recommendation is accepted by the](#)
241 [Council.](#)

242

243 [It may important be important to note that our recommendation does not state that a](#)
244 [Commissioner missing more than the maximum will be removed from office, only that staff will](#)
245 [report to the Council; thus the final decision remains with the Council, the original body who](#)
246 [made the appointment.](#)

247

248 [Also as currently written this strategic recommendation does not include the Housing and](#)
249 [Redevelopment Authority’s Board. The Commission may wish to consider including this board in](#)
250 [its recommended strategies.](#)

251

252 Commissioner Ramundt stated 2.3.a could be changed to “misses more than 25% of the
253 meetings.” [Chair Grefenberg said that a few commissions meet only four times a year, and thus](#)
254 [such an attendance requirement would be more restrictive than the recommended requirement.](#)

255

256 ~~Commissioner Grefenberg suggested excluding discussions about including the HRA at this~~
257 ~~time.~~

258

259 [There being no objection, the Chair declared](#) it was the consensus of the Community
260 Engagement Commission to accept the Operations Committee recommendation to add Policy 2.3
261 and strategic recommendation 2.3.a as written and revised.

262

263 The next item recommended by the Work Group, Chair Grefenberg ~~stated~~ said, was [the](#)
264 [following Strategic Recommendation:](#) ~~Operation Committee recommended adopting strategic~~
265 ~~recommendation 2 additional, .1 1 Other: In so far as possible Staff to advise Commissions on~~

266 ~~items on Council agenda which fall under their purview according to City Ordinance. They also~~
267 ~~recommended adding this to the Commissions 2014 Recommendations on Uniform Standards~~
268 ~~for Commissions.~~

269 2 addl additional, .1 Other: In so far as possible staff to advise Commissions on items on
270 Council agenda which fall under their purview according to City Ordinance. (Adopted by CEC
271 05-08-2014)

272
273 *TIMELINE: Contingent upon when Council takes up the Uniform Standards for Commissions*
274 *ANYTHING MISSING? Possibly a brief rationale to the effect that a Commission function is to*
275 *serve as an advisor to the Council, and as such it requires advance notice of a Council's*
276 *deliberations in order to give timely advice.*
277

278 There being no expressed objection, the Chair ruled it was the consensus of the ~~Community~~
279 ~~Engagement~~ Commission to adopt strategic recommendation 2 addl additional, .1, Other and add
280 this to the Commissions 2014 recommendations on Uniform Standards for Commissions.

281
282 The next Work Group Policy recommendation was as follows:

283 **4.0 Policy:** Provide Public Participation Support, Training, ~~and Resources,~~
284 and Recognition

285 The Work Group had added the following comment to this recommendation:

286 *We recognize and appreciate that this year City Staff and Council have provided more support and*
287 *training to new Commissioners than previous administrations. The orientation session for new*
288 *Commissioners and the materials then-provided, as well as the City Attorney's briefing of new*
289 *Commissions, were examples of this renewed attention to the role of City Commissions.*

290
291 Chair Grefenberg stated the Operations Committee suggested adding “and recognition” to Policy
292 4.0. Commissioner Ramundt suggested adding “for Commissioners” at the end of the sentence.
293 She would expect that this would be something done by the Volunteer Coordinator. ~~Chair~~
294 ~~Grefenberg stated this would go to the City and they can assign it to whomever they want.~~

295
296 There being no objection, the Chair ruled it was the consensus of the Community Engagement
297 Commission to adopt Policy 4.0 as revised with the addition of “for Commissioners.”

298
299 The next Work Group recommendation was to revise and adopt the following Strategic
300 Recommendation as shown below:

301 4 addl1 Other: The City should consider other ways of recognizing and honoring its
302 Commissioners, such as each year the City should hosting a picnic for all commissioners and
303 staff liaisons, possibly in connection with Rosefest.

304
305

306 The Work Group had also noted in its report the following:

307 Over the past year there has been a noticeable effort at increasing the City's recognition of the
308 value of Commissioners, such as Council members swearing-in of new Commissioners and
309 Council referrals to Commissions before they take action on some proposals. This asking for
310 Commission advice itself may be the most important reinforcement for Commissioners in fulfilling
311 their duties.

312
313 The Work Group had also noted that it's the forwarding of this recommendation to the Council could
314 await further study and consideration of other means of reinforcing and recognizing the volunteerism of
315 City Commissioners.

316
317 ~~The next Work Group recommendation was Commissioner Ramundt suggested removing this~~
318 ~~strategic recommendation at this time.~~ 4 add 1 Other: The City should consider other ways of
319 ~~recognizing and honoring its Commissioners, such as each year hosting a picnic, for all~~
320 ~~Commissioners and Staff Liaisons possibly in connection with Rosefest.~~

321
322 There being no objection, Chair Grefenberg stated ruled that Policy Item 4 as amended ~~add 1~~
323 ~~Other~~ would be set aside without prejudice and not included in the final motion for approval.

324
325 The Work Group had also considered the following recommendation: ~~He reviewed 4 add 1 (2)~~
326 ~~Other: Reimburse Commissioners for direct costs incurred by them in the performance of their~~
327 ~~duties in the same manner and rates as City employees. At this time, however, the Operations~~
328 ~~Committee would was recommending deferring consideration of this item at this time.~~

329
330 There being no objection, the Chair ruled it was the consensus of the Community Engagement
331 Commission to defer action on Item Strategic Recommendation ~~4 add 1 Other and 4 add 1~~
332 additional 1 (2) Other.

333
334 Chair Grefenberg stated Item 6.4.b (Automatically forward messages sent to the City Council's single
335 email account to these new public addresses for council members) had already been achieved and does
336 not need to be included in the policies and procedures any longer.

337
338 There being no objection it was the consensus of the Community Engagement Commission to
339 recognize Item 6.4.b has been achieved ~~but not~~ and therefore not necessary to be incorporated
340 into the Commissions 2014 Recommendations.

341
342 The next Strategic Recommendation considered by the Work Group was 6.4.c which read as
343 follows: Create a group email account for each commission and automatically forward messages sent to
344 each commission to the respective commission members.

345
346 Chair Grefenberg stated most Commissions are currently following ~~Item 6.4.c: Create a group e-~~
347 ~~mail account for each Commission and automatically forward messages sent to each~~
348 ~~Commission to the respective Commission members. this process. The Operations Committee~~
349 ~~Work Group recommended recognizing this has as having been achieved and remove it from the~~
350 2014 listing of policies and recommendations.

351
352 There being no objection, it was the consensus of the Community Engagement Commission to
353 accept the ~~Operations Committee~~ Work Group recommendation and recognize on Item 6.4.c had
354 been achieved and remove it from the 2014 listing of policies and recommendations.

355
356 The next Work Group recommendation ~~Chair Grefenberg stated the Operations Committee~~ was
357 recommends adopting and to adding to the 2014 recommended strategies Item a Strategic
358 Recommendation 6, ~~add~~ additional .1, Other, which reads as follows:

359
360 Allow each Commission control over their webpage and Face Book entries, with proper
361 disclaimer and controls for elimination of whatever Staff worries about. If Necessary include a
362 disclaimer and/or time lag for Staff Liaison to review.

363
364 The Work Group report on this recommendation included as rationale the following:

365
366 Commissions should be trusted with their own web page and Facebook postings. The web page
367 and Facebook design would follow the format of the new web design. If deemed necessary by
368 staff, safeguards such as outlined above can be added. This would be another example of
369 changing the culture at City Hall, emphasizing collaboration rather than control.

370 Commissioner Jonathan Miller suggested not limiting the reference to just Face Book and
371 recommended changing this to “social media presence.”

372
373 Staff Liaison Bowman stated the City Council would not support this item. Chair Grefenberg
374 said he disagreed with Staff Liaison Bowman that there was no support on the Council for this
375 item. ~~Staff Liaison Bowman stated~~ responded the Staff Liaison is responsible for maintaining
376 the Commission web pages and the Council would view this as Staff’s responsibility.

377
378 Commissioner Mueller suggested changing the recommendation’s language so the Commission
379 would be able to have a say on what was on ~~the~~its web page.

380
381 Staff Liaison Bowman stated the Commission has this ability currently. Chair Grefenberg ~~stated~~
382 said in the past it had been difficult and time-consuming to get changes to the web site.

383
384 Commissioner Mueller stated this is strong language. In response Chair Grefenberg suggested
385 changing it to “Allow each Commission input to their web page.”

386
387 ~~Staff Liaison~~ Garry Bowman stated this wording would have more City Council support.

388
389 Chair Grefenberg stated the Commission’s role is ~~making~~ to give its advice and
390 recommendations to the Council, and should not ~~make them~~ decline to give its advice because of
391 fear that the Council they not be approved may not follow it. ~~The Commission is suppose to~~
392 ~~give advise.~~

393

394 ~~Commissioner Ramundt stated the City needed to maintain a consistent look on the website and~~
395 ~~this may not be possible if each Commission controls their own web page. The Commission has~~
396 ~~input and can work with Staff Liaison Bowman regarding any changes.~~

397

398 ~~Staff Liaison Bowman stated~~ commented that Chair Grefenberg felt he had problems in the past
399 but he did not believe this was a current problem.

400

401 Commissioner Ramundt recommended changing it to the Commission may have input.

402 Commissioner Desiree Mueller ~~stated~~ also said she did not approve of the language as ~~it was~~
403 ~~currently~~ written. ~~for Item 6 add 1 Other.~~

404

405 ~~Staff Liaison Bowman stated this language may get approved because how it is written now the~~
406 ~~City Council would not support it.~~

407

408 ~~Chair Grefenberg asked Staff Liaison Bowman how many City Council members he had talked~~
409 ~~to about this particular item.~~

410

411 Chair Grefenberg stated he would ~~not~~ agree with changing the language ~~but~~ if the Commission
412 feels strongly about it. ~~he would agree with allowing each Commission input to its webpage.~~ He
413 asked Commissioner Miller if the language should be changed to include all social media even
414 though he did not believe there would be many Commissioners Commissions that would use
415 these.

416

417 Commissioner Miller explained Face Book was just one type of social media and if this policy is
418 expected to be in place long-term then it should all current and future social media outlets.

419

420 Staff Liaison Bowman stated if the Commission felt there was something important they wanted
421 out, Staff would be open to posting it to its social media accounts.

422

423 Chair Grefenberg suggested changing ~~Item~~ Strategic Recommendation 6 ~~add~~ additional,
424 .1 Other to read as follows: ~~Allow each Commission input to its webpage and social media.~~

425

426 Allow each Commission ~~control over their~~ input to its webpage and ~~Face Book entries~~ social
427 media, with proper disclaimer and controls for elimination of whatever Staff worries about. ~~If~~
428 ~~Necessary include a disclaimer and/or time lag for Staff Liaison to review.~~

429

430 There being no objection to this revised Strategic Recommendation, the Chair ruled it was the
431 consensus of the ~~Community Engagement Commission to accept~~ approve the revised language
432 Strategic Recommendation for ~~Item 6 add~~ additional, .1, Other.

433

434 The next Work Group recommendation regarded a 2012 Task Force recommendation setting a
435 time line on City staff responses to comments or requests from the public. Chair Grefenberg
436 stated the Operations Committee recommended this strategic recommendation be revised and
437 adopted by the Commission as follows:

438 7.2.c: Create and publish a policy for staff to respond to residents’ requests and comments within
439 ~~2-three (3)~~ (3) business days/, and where applicable, include in staff response ~~inform~~ information
440 ~~residents~~ of any relevant Roseville mailing (or emailing) lists ~~they~~ a resident can join for updates
441 on issues of concern.

442 He Grefenberg clarified the last part had been badly written and suggested changing it to “...and
443 where applicable, include in Staff response information of any relevant Roseville mailing (or
444 emailing) lists a resident can join for updates on issues of concern.”

445
446 The Operations Committee recommended adopting this language and keep Item 7.2.c as a
447 strategic recommendation.

448
449 Commissioner Gardella asked what the different methods were for residents to reach the
450 Commission.

451
452 Chair Grefenberg stated the Commission’s website, when notifications are sent out there is a line
453 for written input, phone calls and emails to Department heads. One reason for recommendation
454 7.2 c ~~this recommendation was~~ Item 7.2.c is to ensure people know their message was received.

455
456 Commissioner Gardella asked if there were problems responding in the two (2) day time limit.
457 ~~Staff Liaison~~ Garry Bowman ~~stated~~ responded there were no real problems but it would be
458 beneficial to have the extra day.

459
460 Commissioner Mueller stated three (3) days is reasonable. She asked if the City used auto
461 response for emails. ~~Staff-Liaison~~ Bowman answered that he was not sure if this was set up on
462 the current web platform but it would be used with the launch of the new website.

463
464 ~~Chair Grefenberg stated~~ added the Operations Committee had earlier recommended ~~if-that when~~
465 the Community Engagement Commission module is added to the new website it should include a
466 means for residents to track the current status of any questions or comments, including ~~and~~
467 which department has the responsibility of responding.

468
469 There being no opposition, Chair Grefenberg ruled it was the consensus of the Community
470 Engagement Commission ~~the~~ to adopt the Operations Committee recommendation to revise 7.2.c
471 to three (3) days and the additional language he had proposed.

472
473 The adopted recommendation thus reads as follows:

474 7.2.c: Create and publish a policy for staff to respond to residents’ requests and comments within
475 three (3) business days/, and where applicable, and where applicable, include in Staff response
476 information of any relevant Roseville mailing (or emailing) lists a resident can join for updates on
477 issues of concern.”

478
479 Chair Grefenberg stated any Work Group or Committee recommendation ~~is a motion and~~ does
480 not need a second. It is automatically on the table as a motion for a vote.

481

482 The Operations Committee, Work Group F (aka Low-Hanging Fruit), motion is to approve [the](#)
483 Policies and Strategic Recommendations outlined above, namely 2.0, 2.1, 2.1.b, 2.1.c, 2 addl 2
484 Other, 2.2 with the recommended revision, 2 addl 3 Other, 2 addl 4 Other with the recommended
485 changes, 2.x, 2.x.1, 2.x.2, 2.3, 2.3.a, addl 1 Other, 4.0, 6 addl 1 Other as amended, 7.2.c as
486 amended, and removing policies and strategic recommendations 6.0, 6.4.b, and 6.4.c.

487
488 There being no further discussion Chair Grefenberg called the motion to a vote. **The motion**
489 **carried unanimously.**

490
491 **b. Work Group B: Education/Awareness**
492

493 [The presentation on this Work Group's recommendations were given by Commissioners](#)
494 [Ramundt and Gardella. A copy of Work Group B's report is attached to these minutes and made](#)
495 [a part of this record.](#)

496
497 [The first recommendation of this Work Group was to reassign Strategic Recommendation 4.3 b,](#)
498 [ii, to Work Group G.](#)

499
500 Work Group B also recommended keeping Policyies 1.1, 4.2, and 4.3, which read as follows:

501 **Policy 1.1:** The City should work to enrich and strengthen civic engagement at city hall, and
502 encourage employees and elected officials to appreciate civic engagement as an asset.

503 **Policy 4.2:** The City should invest in civic engagement training for public officials and city staff
504 to foster a climate of public participation.

505 **Policy 4.3:** the City should develop educational and information resources for citizens to learn
506 how best to participate in civic issues.

507 Commissioner Gardella stated the Work Group recommended two (2) new [or revised](#)
508 recommendations as follows:

509 1.) Host annual training/conference on the latest trends, technologies and tools used to
510 engage citizens. City Staff [and residents should jointly](#) plan and publicize the event in
511 collaboration with the CEC; and

512
513 2.) The City should develop and/or strengthen opportunities for residents to learn and
514 participate in the civic process, including Roseville University.

515
516 Both of these recommendation have [include](#) a supporting role for the CEC ~~because~~ although
517 Staff is taking on this work. The recommendation would be to work with Staff to achieve these
518 ~~duties.~~ [recommendations.](#)

519
520 Chair Grefenberg ~~stated~~ [commented that](#) some Council members thought the City should resume
521 Roseville University this year but that had not been done. [He said](#) City Manager Trudgeon had
522 stated this was on ~~the~~ [staff's](#) work scope but there was no timeline [yet](#) established.

523

524 Commissioner Gardella stated the ~~Community Engagement~~ Commission could suggest a
525 timeline or wait for Staff to determine when they want to take this project on and be accessible to
526 assist with the project.

527
528 Chair Grefenberg stated the time line seems aggressive because these recommendations have not
529 been presented to the City Council. The earliest this could be presented to them would be
530 November and having these programs by the end of the year would not be feasible. He clarified
531 he is not objecting to these substance of these recommendations but rather advising that the
532 Commission could not proceed until they get City Council approval and agreement.

533
534 Commissioner Gardella stated the time line is not set, but 2015 would not be too ambitious. The
535 2014 date was just a meet with Staff to discuss these and establish a working relationship with
536 them for possible implementation in 2015.

537
538 Commissioner Ramundt suggested removing references to dates at this time and leave the
539 recommendations. The dates can be determined later.

540
541 Chair Grefenberg repeated the motion of Work Group B: Education /Awareness ~~motion is~~ to
542 approve keeping Policies and Strategic Recommendations 1.1, 4.2, 4.3; remove ~~policies and~~
543 Strategic Recommendations 1.1.d, 4.2.a, 4.3.a, 4.3.b.i, and 4.3.b.iii; and adopt new Strategic
544 Recommendations 1 and 2, with no reference to time lines, and reassign Item 4.3.b.ii to Work
545 Group G: Completed/Responsibility of Other Commissions.

546
547 There being no further discussion Chair Grefenberg called the motion to a vote. **The motion**
548 **carried unanimously.**

549
550 **c. Work Group A & E: Community Outreach and Council/Commissions/Staff in**
551 **the Community**

552
553 Commissioners Ramundt and Mueller gave their report to the Commission. A copy of Work
554 Group A & E is attached and included as part of this record.

555
556 Commissioner Ramundt clarified that although not explicit in their report they were
557 recommending keeping Policies 2.0,2.1, 7, and 7.1.

558
559 ~~recommend keeping policies 2.0, 2.1, 7, and 7.1,~~ Commissioner Ramundt continued the Report
560 by noting their Work Group was recommending reassigning ~~Item~~ Strategic Recommendation
561 7.2.d to the ~~Community~~ Communication Work Group C and ~~reassign~~ Strategic Recommendation
562 7 ~~add~~ additional .1, Other, to the Completed/Responsibility of Other Commissions Work Group
563 G.

564
565 Chair Grefenberg stated he ~~would not agree~~ had concerns with reassigning 7 addl 1 Other to the
566 Completed/Responsibility of Other Commission because this would fall under zoning
567 notification ~~from the Zoning~~ which he believed was under the Neighborhood Work Group.

568 Commissioner Ramundt stated ~~corrected Chair Grefenberg by indicating that the issue of~~
569 ~~notification is the responsibility of another Commission and Work Group G is responsible for~~
570 ~~looking at these types of recommendations and referring them to the proper Commissions.~~

571
572 Chair Grefenberg recalled that that the ~~issue of~~ notifications were ~~was~~ under the Neighborhood
573 Work Group.

574
575 Commissioner Gardella explained there were several recommendation about notifications that
576 were reviewed and should go to Planning. Work Group G is reviewing these and will make
577 recommendations on what Commission should be responsible for the recommendation, she said.

578
579 Chair Grefenberg removed his concerns.

580
581 Commissioner Ramundt stated there had been several recommendations pertaining to meetings.
582 The Work Group is recommending replacing 1.1.b, 4.1.c, 7.1.a, and 7.1.b with two (2) new
583 recommendations as follows:

584 1.) The City Council will hold one regularly scheduled town hall style meeting each year,
585 with topics solicited from the eight (8) Commissions; and,

586 2.) Each Commission will be encouraged to hold community meetings.

587 ~~She~~ Ramundt clarified that the bullet points ~~with~~ listed under each of these two
588 recommendations ~~are~~ were not part of ~~the~~ their Work Group's recommendations for Commission
589 approval.

590 The Work Group also recommended removing Strategic Recommendations 2.1.a, ~~and~~
591 ~~recommendations~~ 1.1.c, 2.2.b, 7.1.c, and 5.1.c since they have been achieved by the creation of
592 the Community Engagement Commission. ~~and~~ In addition recommendations 1.1.a.i and 4.1.b
593 have been achieved by through actions taken by the City Council.

594
595 Chair Grefenberg expressed concern ~~and issues~~ with the recommendations marked as completed
596 as a duty and function of City Council actions, ~~specifically~~ focusing on the Work Group is
597 ~~recommending~~ recommendation that the City Council drop their current practice of forming Task
598 Forces to assess significant issues. He noted the first bullet under this recommendation

599
600 Commissioner Ramundt clarified the Work Group was not recommending the Council drop its
601 practice of creating task forces but rather this does not need to remain as a recommendation
602 because it was something that had been put into practice. The ~~Community Engagement~~
603 Commission can decide to keep this item as a listed strategic recommendation to encourage the
604 Council to continue their practice of establishing resident task forces as needed.

605
606 Chair Grefenberg stated he preferred to have this listed as a strategic recommendation as
607 reinforcement to the City Council to continue ~~its~~ this practice.

608
609 Commissioner Ramundt stated the Work Group is only ~~designated~~ designating this
610 recommendation as achieved and would not require any further review by the Commission.

611
612 Chair Grefenberg suggested keeping this strategic recommendation because there are often
613 ~~incidences or uses~~ issues that affect more than one Commission or ~~there were~~ did not fall under
614 any Commission's jurisdiction ~~that an item applies to. He did not understand why the Work~~
615 ~~Group would remove it.~~

616
617 Commissioner Ramundt ~~stated~~ commented the recommendation could be left in. The Work
618 Group was not saying that this should not be done but rather that it was being done.

619
620 Commissioner Miller asked what the rationale was for marking Items 1.1.c and 2.2.b as
621 completed.

622
623 Commissioner Ramundt explained Items 1.1.c, 2.2.b, 7.1.c, and 5.1.c do not need to be listed as
624 specific recommendations because these were part of the specific duties and functions of the
625 ~~CEC Commission and these are the purpose of the Commission.~~ It is redundant to show these as
626 both duties and recommendations.

627
628 Commissioner Gardella asked if these were included in the Commission's ~~Charter~~ Ordinance.
629 Commissioner Ramundt stated these are specific in the ordinance that these are things the CEC is
630 responsible for.

631
632 Chair Grefenberg explained he had a problem with this, and ~~wants~~ recommended these items be
633 set aside. He saw ~~this~~ these items as the policies and recommendations of the Community
634 Engagement Commission. By removing these, it could be misconstrued ~~or misunderstood~~ as
635 dropping pursuing outreach efforts aimed at under-represented groups. He thought the
636 Commission should recognize progress had been made by the Council's establishment of the
637 ~~CEC~~ Commission, but there was still work to do to ~~achieve the~~ implement these
638 recommendations.

639
640 Commissioner Ramundt stated it was ~~the view of~~ the Work Group's view that it would be
641 redundant to have these as recommendation when it was the purpose of the Commission ~~and as~~
642 ~~stated in the Ordinance. Chair Grefenberg stated everything they have reviewed is~~ falls under the
643 ~~purpose of the CEC.~~

644
645 Commissioner Ramundt ~~stated~~ added there is language specific to the CEC that includes
646 outreach efforts to underrepresented groups. This exact language is in the Commission's
647 ~~Charter~~ Ordinance. If the Commission wants to leave these in as strategic recommendations,
648 then ~~the~~ her Work Group would not object.

649
650 Commissioner Miller stated there is some confusion because he understood that these
651 recommendations would ~~become~~ a guiding document for the Commission's work, but then there
652 has ~~also~~ been discussion that this is what the Commission would be presenting to the Council.

653
654 Chair Grefenberg said he had noticed this as well. He ~~stated~~ thought these recommendations
655 were primarily meant to be the Commission's ~~policies and strategic recommendations to the City~~

656 ~~Council~~ guidelines. He would hope, however, that the Council would eventually adopt some of
657 these recommendations and policies.

658
659 Grefenberg added his primary problem with this series of recommendations was categorizing
660 them as “completed”. To define these task as completed because the Commission had been
661 created also seemed to be self-congratulatory. ~~the Commission would need to have a work plan~~
662 ~~based on these policies and recommendations that would factor in timelines~~. He would regret
663 losing some of the specific recommendations even though they are in the Commission’s charge.
664 Items 7.1.c and 5.1.c are not in the Commission’s charge. ~~and he does not understand the Work~~
665 ~~Group’s classification of “Completed as a duty and function of CEC” because these items are not~~
666 ~~completed.~~

667
668 Commissioner Ramundt ~~told him~~ advised the Commission to set them aside ~~then~~ for further
669 discussion.

670
671 There being no objection, Chair Grefenberg ~~stated the Chair~~ ruled Items 1.1.c 2.2.b, 7.1.c, and
672 5.1.c would be set aside for further discussion.

673 Chair Grefenberg stated there were two items in the “Completed as part of City Council actions.”
674 The Commission has determined to keep Item 1.1.a.i (*The Council should its practice of forming*
675 *resident task forces to assess significant issues and make recommendation to the City council or city*
676 *manager*) but there has been no discussion yet on 4.1.b: Create a new City executive position to
677 support volunteerism and effective public engagement.

678 Commissioner Ramundt explained the Work Group viewed the City Council’s action to create
679 the Volunteer Coordinator position and the Community Engagement Commission as achieving
680 this particular recommendation.

681 Chair Grefenberg stated he ~~had strong feelings regarding this because~~ strongly believed it would
682 be premature to drop this strategic recommendation because it had ~~consider this recommendation~~
683 been achieved. When the City Council developed the Volunteer Coordinator position they
684 ~~exclusively~~ specifically excluded ~~were not considering~~ civic engagement responsibilities. The
685 fast of the situation is that there may still be a need for an executive position and he suggested
686 language that would delete the word “volunteerism.” He ~~wanted~~ recommended this item be set
687 aside for further discussion.

688 Commissioner Gardella explained the Work Group recommended removing Item 2.1.a because
689 this would be addressed by the recommendations of the Education and Awareness Work Group.

690 Chair Grefenberg clarified the Work Group was not recommending no further action on this item
691 and the concept is not being dropped, but rather it ~~is~~ should be addressed by another Work
692 Group.

693 Vice Chair Becker clarified what was being dropped was the notion of Council meetings where
694 actions would be taken because they are difficult to do outside of City Hall because there are not
695 a lot of locations that could accommodate the cable television coverage. The City Council would
696 still be encouraged to be out in the public and hold town hall meetings.

697 Chair Grefenberg stated this needed to be very clear because this would ~~provide allow the~~
698 community to understanding that this [recommendation](#) ~~is item~~ is being removed due to the
699 ~~difficult difficulty with of~~ providing for cable television coverage, and not because the
700 Commission is against being ADA compliant.

701 Commissioner Ramundt stated the ~~documentation provided~~ [Work Group Report](#) clearly stated, ~~as~~
702 [a bullet under 2.1.a](#), “the structure of City Council and Commission meetings are not effective
703 method to foster participation, and complying with the meeting requirements would be difficult.”

704 Chair Grefenberg stated he knew this but his experience has been with handicapped groups ~~and~~
705 ~~others~~ and individual residents who have a disabled person in their family get really upset when
706 something like this is said. He is personally fine with no further action required because the
707 minutes will show the reason for this was to foster meetings in the community which, he added,
708 he hoped would be ADA-compliant.

709 The Community Outreach and Council/Commissions/Staff in the Community Work Group’s
710 motion is to: recommend reassigning 7.2.d to Work Group C: Community Communications,
711 reassign 7 addl 1 Other to Work Group G: Completed/Responsibility of Other Commissions;
712 keep Policies 2.0, 2.1, 7 and 7.1; the bullet points under the recommendations were not part of
713 the motion, remove 2.1.a from the CEC strategic recommendations; set aside Items 1.1.c, 2.2.b,
714 7.1.c, and 5.1.c; keep recommendation 1.1.a.i; set aside Item 4.1.b, and add two new
715 recommendations:

- 716 1.) The City Council will hold one regularly scheduled town hall style meeting each year,
717 with topics solicited from the eight (8) Commissions; and
718 2.) Each Commission will be encouraged to hold community meetings.

719 There being no further discussion Chair Grefenberg called the motion to a vote. **The motion**
720 **carried unanimously.**

721 [Commissioner Becker thanked the Commissioners who had developed these recommendations.](#)
722 [He also noted that the Commission should take a moment to recognize the achievements it had](#)
723 [made in addressing half of the Task Force recommendation, and congratulate itself.](#)

724 Chair Grefenberg stated if time allowed they ~~would~~ [could](#) discuss the items that had been set-
725 aside and he would like to be able to participate in the discussion for these items, especially the
726 ones he had expressed concerns with. He [also](#) asked if the Commission would need to have a
727 discussion on what are policies and what are strategic recommendations. [The consensus was that](#)
728 [this was no longer needed.](#) ~~He thought the Commission would want a separate meeting for this.~~
729

730 6. CHAIR AND COMMITTEE REPORTS

731 ~~Commissioner Gardella stated the Commission does not need to discuss this unless the next work~~
732 ~~groups to present had any specific questions.~~

733 ~~There being no questions Chair Grefenberg continued with the agenda.~~

734 a. ~~Chair’s Report (Chair Grefenberg)~~

735 i. ~~Scope of Next Few Months Work~~

736

737 Chair Grefenberg provided an updated work schedule for the Commission and asked to have this
738 included in the meeting materials. [\(See attachment.\)](#) The Commission ~~was~~ [had](#) not [been](#) able to

739 deal with the civic engagement module and they have not yet met with the Volunteer
740 Coordinator. The “Discover Your Parks” report had been moved to the October meeting. The
741 insights from this project would be valuable [for future planning](#) and he would like them
742 submitted in written ~~down~~ [form](#).

743

744 Commissioner Gardella asked if the joint meeting with the City Council in November would be
745 considered a City Council meeting or a Commission meeting.

746

747 Staff Liaison Bowman explained ~~the~~ [that](#) Commissions attend the City Council meeting.

748

749 Chair Grefenberg stated the Commission would need to get a date confirmed and would request
750 a date later in November during one of ~~their~~ the Council’s [regularly](#)-scheduled meetings.

751

752 **ii. Other Items**

753

754 Chair Grefenberg stated he had received an email through the website from a resident expressing
755 concerns with Next Door’s reaction to a City-wide recommendation. He provided a copy for the
756 Commissioners to review.

757

758 Commissioner Ramundt stated Next Door would be having a meeting regarding the
759 communications the resident is referencing. This meeting is scheduled for September 19 at 7:00
760 p.m. at J Arthurs Café. There are people in Roseville that want to discuss the topic of elder care
761 in Roseville. This will be an informal meeting for anyone interested and Christopher Johnston
762 from Johnston and Martineau has offered to cover the cost of the first few meetings. Part of this
763 meeting would also include discussion about what Next Door can and cannot do.

764

765 Chair Grefenberg moved, seconded by Vice Chair Becker, to assign the correspondence to the
766 work group dealing with Next Door and to have this reported on at the October meeting. **The**
767 **motion carried unanimously.**

768

769 Chair Grefenberg stated he would respond to the resident and let her know the Commission
770 recognizes there is a meeting scheduled and the matter has been assigned to the work group.

771

772 **b. Website Redesign Committee**

773 **i. Current Update (Staff Liaison Bowman)**

774

775 Staff Liaison Bowman stated the latest changes from the [staff departmental](#) committee had been
776 received; [the staff committee](#) ~~and they are~~ [was](#) getting close to a more finished look for the
777 design. This had been received ~~on~~ [last](#) Wednesday and was shared with the internal Committee,
778 the ~~CEC~~ [Commission](#), and the City Council. He requested feedback by [next](#) Monday morning.
779 The feedback would then be provided to Civic Plus so they could make any changes and make it
780 a working site. He explained they were still in the design mode.

781

782 Chair Grefenberg asked if the City Council would have this on their agenda ~~as a discussion~~
783 ~~item~~ [to review](#).

784

785 Staff Liaison Bowman stated the City Council would not have this as a discussion item on their
786 agenda. He stated he would need ~~the~~ feedback in order to get it to Civic Plus so they can roll it
787 into a functioning website so further testing could be done. Any changes that have occurred on
788 the City's current website since July would need to be backfilled once the new site goes live.

789
790 There would be changes to the menu structures and the information available once the site is
791 live. He explained this would be a work in progress for the next few months. He explained the
792 current menu structure is more of a mega menu structure and the City would need to continue to
793 analyze what pages within each department get hit and what ones they could remove and also
794 determine what additional information should be added.

795
796 Chair Grefenberg ~~stated~~ said the issue he continues to have ~~is going~~ goes back to the
797 Commission meeting in June when the Commission ~~had been~~ was told they would get a site
798 demo; ~~of the site and~~ at the last meeting there were also various ~~comments~~ questions about when
799 the ~~CEC~~ Commission would get a chance to assess the site's functionality ~~site~~, not just look at
800 pictures. He asked when the ~~CEC~~ Commission's departmental input would occur, referring to
801 the departmental input Bowman had earlier referred to.

802
803 Staff Liaison Bowman stated the CEC could have input at any time and once there was a demo
804 site available, it would be provided to the Commission for additional input. He would like to
805 have the demo available in the next week or two but he does not have a specific date.

806
807 Chair Grefenberg ~~stated~~ reminded the Commission that Commissioner Ramundt had mentioned
808 at the last meeting having people who are not computer_savvy test the site. He expressed
809 concerns ~~that the Commission be able to participate and provide organized feedback on the~~
810 website. He noted the Commission had earlier approved holding a special meeting to review the
811 website. ~~and this did not occur~~.

812
813 Staff Liaison Bowman explained there had not been a website available for the Commission to
814 review.

815
816 Chair Grefenberg stated he ~~appreciated~~ understood this ~~and believed Staff Liaison Bowman~~ but
817 he was saying that it seemed the Commission may still want to hold a special Committee or
818 Commission meeting so ~~the~~ that the Commission ~~can~~ could provide formal and organized advice.
819 This meeting would be open to the public and any Commissioner who wished to attend and the
820 recommendation is part of the record from the last meeting.

821
822 Vice Chair Becker asked what the target date would be for Commission access to the demo site.

823
824 ~~Staff Liaison~~ Mr. Bowman explained once Staff has received ~~the~~ feedback they are currently
825 requesting they would forward this to Civic Plus. Once Civic Plus has the information and
826 makes the changes they would provide a demo site for the City and once the site is launched
827 changes can be made as needed. He would not be able to provide a specific date at this time.

828
829 Chair Grefenberg asked Staff Liaison Bowman to keep in mind that Vice Chair Becker would be
830 out of town for two weeks and he requested Staff Liaison Bowman push to get a demo site
831 sooner rather than later.

832
833 Vice Chair Becker stated the Commission could hold a meeting without him [if necessary](#) ~~in order~~
834 to review the website.
835

836 Chair Grefenberg stated he would like to have someone who had continuity and background in
837 this area, such as Commissioner Miller and Vice Chair Becker, at the Committee meeting to
838 review the website. He would also like Commissioner Ramundt to attend [because of her](#)
839 [experience in designing web sites](#).

840
841 Commissioner Gardella suggested scheduling the meeting and if Commissioners can make it
842 they would.
843

844 **ii. Current Status of Committee Work (Vice-Chair Becker)**

845
846 Commissioner Becker stated since the last meeting the Committee has formalized the
847 documentation around the Commission's criteria for the CEC module and this information had
848 been give to Staff Liaison [Mr.](#) Bowman to provide to the vendors. He clarified the Commission
849 would not be doing a request for proposal (RFP) but rather a request for information (RFI) ~~and~~
850 [where possible](#) ~~the~~ vendors are asked to provide information in the form of an essay.

851 852 7. OLD BUSINESS

853
854 Chair Grefenberg stated [some](#) ~~residents~~ have been reading the minutes and there has been some
855 concern [expressed](#) on the Talking Points. The Commission had requested the Outreach and
856 Communication Committee to come back with a redraft ~~with~~ including the changes ~~discussed~~
857 [requested at the last Commission meeting and including](#) the new language the Commission had
858 ~~agreed on~~ [added](#). He would like to see this ~~added to on~~ the next meeting agenda. He clarified a
859 [Communications](#) Committee meeting may not be necessary to make these changes but the
860 Commission [itself](#) should review these again [prior to finalizing them](#).

861 862 8. NEW BUSINESS

863 There was no new business.

864 865 9. STAFF REPORT

866 **a. Upcoming Items on Future Council Agendas**

867
868
869 Chair Grefenberg [noted he](#) had provided a work schedule for the Commission to use for the
870 items to be discussed at the next Commission meeting.

871 **b. Other Items**

872
873
874 Staff Liaison Bowman stated the next City Council meeting would be a work session and he
875 encouraged everyone to attend. The work sessions are informal and provide for open dialogue
876 with residents. This work session would be focused on Twin Lakes.
877

878 On September 22, Staff would be providing the Council with an update on [the](#) communications
879 division, including ~~the~~ changes and progress that has been made.

880

881 10. COMMISSION COMMUNICATIONS, REPORTS, AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

882

883 Chair Grefenberg officially recognized receipt of an email from Linda Owen relating to Next
884 Door.

885

886 11. COMMISSIONER-INITIATED ITEMS FOR FUTURE MEETINGS

887

888 Chair Grefenberg asked if there were any other items not on the work scope he had provided the
889 Commission would like added to the agenda.

890

891 Commissioner Ramundt suggested an update regarding the Next-Door meeting on Elder Care.
892 This may provide some insight into things the Commission could work on.

893

894 Chair Grefenberg stated the [Roseville](#) Volunteer Coordinator had scheduled a series of Open
895 Houses for Roseville resident. He encouraged residents interested in volunteering to contact the
896 City Volunteer Coordinator Kathy O'Brien.

897

898 He [Grefenberg also](#) suggested the Communications Work Group meet this week. He also
899 ~~suggested~~ [raised the issue of whether](#) based on the current workload, the Commission would
900 consider ~~move~~ [moving](#) their next meeting from October 9 to later in the month.

901

902 Staff Liaison Bowman stated he would not be available October 16 but could [do](#) October 15.
903 Vice Chair Becker stated October 15 was the Human Rights Commission meeting.

904

905 Commissioner Mueller stated if the Commission pushed their meeting out this would give them
906 less time to prepare for the joint meeting with the City Council.

907

908 Commissioner Gardella stated that once all the recommendations have been reviewed, the
909 Commission would have to put together a formal document and review it prior to meeting with
910 the City Council.

911

912 Commissioner Ramundt suggested leaving the meeting as scheduled for October 9.

913

914 ~~Chair Grefenberg stated if the Work Groups could produce their work a week before the October~~
915 ~~9th meeting, then they might not need a second meeting in October but he would like to have the~~
916 ~~feasibility of the Operations Committee to meet on one of the open dates.~~

917

918 Commissioner Mueller stated she would prefer to keep the schedule consistent, as this is how she
919 has arranged her schedule.

920

921 It was the consensus of the Community Engagement Commission to hold the next meeting as
922 ~~schedule for~~ [scheduled on](#) October 9, 2014.

923

924 12. RECAP OF COMMISSION ACTIONS THIS MEETING

925

926 Commissioner Ramundt stated the Neighborhoods Work Group would be meeting.

927

928 Commissioner Gardella stated a Website Committee meeting may be held to collect feedback on
929 the demo website.

930

931 Vice Chair Becker stated Work Groups C, D, and G would be presenting in October.

932

933 Chair Grefenberg stated Commissioners Ramundt [and Mueller had agreed to](#) ~~would~~ provide a
934 report from “Discover Your Parks” program.

935

936 Commissioner Mueller stated the Outreach and Communications Committee would revise the
937 talking points and present those to the Commission.

938

939 13. ADJOURNMENT

940

941 Commissioner Ramundt made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Gardella to adjourn. **The**
942 **motion carried unanimously.** The meeting was adjourned at 8:39 p.m.

943

944

Attachment: Work Group B Report
Education/Awareness

945
946
947 **WORK GROUP B: EDUCATION/AWARENESS**

948 **Participants: Kathy Ramundt and Theresa Gardella**
949 **(revised recommendations as of September 5, 2014)**

950
951 **These are the results of our review of the recommendations assigned to this work group.**

952
953 **Assign to another work group:**

954 **We propose that the following recommendation be assigned to Work Group G (Completed**
955 **/Responsibility of Other Commissions):**

956 4.3.b.ii Expand on its successful Roseville U program by offering a “graduate” course that focuses
957 entirely
958 on the city’s budgeting process, as this is critical information for engaged citizens to understand.

959
960 **Revised Recommendations:**

961 **There were multiple recommendations related to trainings. We propose the replacing these with new**
962 **recommendations. We propose that the following recommendations be replaced:**

963 **1.1 Policy:** The City should work to enrich and strengthen civic engagement at city hall, and
964 encourage employees and elected officials to appreciate civic engagement as an asset.

965 1.1.d Sponsor an annual training/conference on the latest trends, technologies and tools used to engage
966 citizens. City staff and residents should jointly plan and publicize the event, and be encouraged to participate.

967 **Policy 4.2:** The City should invest in civic engagement training for public officials and city staff to
968 foster a climate of public participation.

969 4.2.a Offer periodic (annual at a minimum) training to city officials and staff on civic engagement
970 principles and best practices, including leadership and public participation

971 **Policy 4.3:** the City should develop educational and information resources for citizens to learn how
972 best to participate in civic issues.

973 4.3.a Expand on the information available to citizens re: how a city council and/or commission
974 meeting is run and what procedures citizens need to know in order to testify. This may be in the
975 form of a “how to” video tutorial sharing some basic information, such as how to sign up for email
976 alerts, how to locate the agenda on the city’s website, how to prepare your comments for public
977 testimony, etc. [Some of this has already been achieved, such as the printed materials available at
978 the entrance to the Council chambers and the Planning Commission’s web site.]

979 *Roseville University*

980 4.3.b.i Expand on its successful Roseville University program by offering collaborative workshops
981 specifically focused on civic engagement for residents both new to and seasoned in public
982 participation.

983 4.3.b.iii Expand on its successful Roseville U program by offering more flexible scheduling or
984 informal one evening seminars so that individuals who can't make the full seven-week commitment
985 can still participate.
986

987 **We propose these new recommendations for consideration by CEC:**

988 1. Host annual training/conference on the latest trends, technologies and tools used to engage
989 citizens. City staff plan and publicize the event, in collaboration with CEC.

990 • Meet with city staff before the end of 2014. Commit to a date for the first training to be
991 held in 2015.

992
993 2. The City should develop and/or strengthen opportunities for residents to learn and participate
994 in the civic process, including Roseville U.

995 • In 2014 meet with city staff to determine current opportunities or resources, and do
996 external research on other cities efforts.

997 • Present recommendations for implementation in 2014.
998
999
1000
1001

Attachment: Work Group A & E Report

1002
1003
1004
1005
1006
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

Work Group A & E: Community Outreach & Council/Commissions/Staff in the Community

Participants: Desiree Mueller and Kathy Ramundt

These are the results of our review of the recommendations assigned to this work group.

Assign to another work group:

We propose that the following recommendation be assigned to Work Group C (Community Communications):

7.2.d Reinstate the “Welcome Packet” for new residents of Roseville and Incorporate information needed to foster volunteerism and effective civic engagement in the “Welcome Packet”. If printing costs are prohibitive, the city might offer these resources online and provide a postcard to new residents inviting them to visit the web link or request a printed packet.

We propose that the following recommendation be assigned to Work Group G (Completed /Responsibility of Other Commissions):

7 addl 1 Other: Establish communication links with Condos and Senior Residences.

Revised Recommendations:

There were multiple recommendations related to Community meetings. We propose the replacing these with new recommendations. We propose that the following recommendations be replaced:

2.0 Policy: Increase Effective Public Participation in City Council and Commissions

2.1 Policy: The City should foster public participation at both the Council and Commission level.

1.1.b Host two or three general community meetings per year in various locations (outside of city hall) to talk with citizens about issues of concern, update citizens on upcoming events and development proposals, and build trusting relationships within the community. We encourage the city to seek cosponsors for such meetings if there are neighborhood associations in those areas.

4.1.c Provide opportunities for City staff, council members, and commissioners to discuss key issues with citizens, including the City’s progress on increasing civic engagement (such as occurred at the March 13, 2012 Task Force meeting with City Manager Bill Malinen and City Planner Bryan Lloyd).

7) Enhance Overall City Communication

7.1 Policy: The City should go beyond the legal requirements for public notification and provide information on issues critical to Roseville’s development

7.1.a Organize/host an open house or community meeting for projects that pose issues of substantial community or neighborhood-wide impact to engage in dialogue before the Council or any commission takes any formal action. This would allow the city or commission to explain the project, answer any questions, identify pros and cons, and get a feel for residents’ viewpoints.

1043 7.1.b Aggressively communicate these open house opportunities meetings in local media, as well
1044 as through existing communications systems and networks.
1045

1046 **We propose these new recommendations for consideration by CEC:**

- 1047 3. The City Council will hold one regularly scheduled town hall style meeting each year, with topics
1048 solicited from the eight Commissions.
- 1049 • The town hall style is intended to allow for give and take between the City Council and
1050 residents.
 - 1051 • Topics would be solicited from Commissions because the commissions should be in aware of
1052 what is happening within the city their areas of expertise and this would provide
1053 opportunity to include a broad spectrum of topics. The City Council and Commissions may
1054 also choose to solicit topics from residents.
 - 1055 • The meeting would be regularly scheduled so residents will have confidence that this will be
1056 an ongoing opportunity.
 - 1057 • If it is possible, and practical (e.g. accessible and complies with any meeting requirements),
1058 the meetings should be held at varying sites within the community to foster the impression
1059 that the meetings are part of the community as a whole.
 - 1060 • Together with City Staff, the CEC would be responsible for coordinating the meeting.
 - 1061 • The first meeting would be held in 2015.
- 1062 4. Each Commission will be encouraged to hold community meetings.
- 1063 • This will set the expectation that each commission has responsibility to interact with the
1064 community.
 - 1065 • This will increase the number and variety of community meetings held each year.
 - 1066 • The commissions will be aware of topics which are timely and of greatest interest to the
1067 community.
 - 1068 • Unlike the City Council Town Hall meeting, these meetings will be focused on each
1069 commission’s mission to allow more in depth discussion.
 - 1070 • This will increase awareness of the existence and purpose of the Commissions.
 - 1071 • The CEC would be responsible coordinating the scheduling of the meetings. If possible, and
1072 practical the meetings will be scheduled at various sites within the community.
 - 1073 • CEC will advise and support the other Commissions as to the format and content of the
1074 meetings.
 - 1075 • The CEC will make recommendations as to the number of frequency of these meetings.
1076

1077 **Remove. No further action required:**

1078 **We recommend that no further action be taken on this recommendations**

- 1079 2.1.a Schedule occasional city council and commission meetings in neighborhoods provided that
1080 meeting locations are well publicized, ADA-compliant, and accommodate cable television coverage.
- 1081 • **The structure of city council and commission meetings are not effective method to foster
1082 participation, and complying with the meeting requirements would be difficult.**
1083

1084 **Completed as a duty and function of CEC:**
1085 **We are pleased to report the following recommendations have been addressed by the City Council**
1086 **through the creation of the CEC. These recommendations are part of the ongoing duties and functions**
1087 **of the Commission:**

1088 1.1.c Recognize and reach out to the changing demographics of Roseville (increasing communities of
1089 color, aging population, and other marginalized groups) in order to understand how best to keep
1090 them informed and involved.

1091
1092 2.2.b Pursue outreach efforts aimed at underrepresented groups.

1093
1094 7.1.c Encourage staff to consult with community and neighborhood leaders on issues critical to
1095 Roseville’s development.

1096
1097 5.1.c Work with Nextdoor.com or other appropriate non-profits to find ways to include residents
1098 without computer access in community-building and communications.

1099
1100 **Completed as part of City Council actions:**
1101 **We are pleased to report that these two recommendations have been completed through actions**
1102 **taken by the City Council:**

1103 1.1.a.i Continue its practice of forming resident task forces to assess significant issues and make
1104 recommendations to the city council or city manager.

1105 • **In 2014, the City Council has recently created two new commissions, for a total of 8. The**
1106 **commissions are intended to fulfill this function, and they can recommend formation of a task**
1107 **force if needed to support their work.**

1108
1109 4.1.b Create a new city executive position to support volunteerism and effective public engagement
1110 across all departments. This position would direct and coordinate volunteer opportunities and
1111 neighborhood and community relations; he/she could develop procedures and methods to provide
1112 clear and consistent two-way communication between city government and residents and
1113 businesses (improve communication and find opportunities for more effective civic engagement).

1114 We recommend that this position report to the City Manager and Council.

1115 • **In 2014, the City hired a Volunteer Coordinator and the City Council created the CEC which is**
1116 **tasked with public engagement.**

1117
1118
1119

Attachment: Work Scope for Next Few Months
As of September 11, 2014

Commission Work Scope for Next Few Months

Subject to Change

As of September 11, 2014

✓ August

1120 Work Group Process and Topics for Assessment of 2012 Task Force Recommendations and
1121 Consideration of New Commission Initiatives

1122 Outreach & Community Engagement Committee present Talking Points and preliminary audience grid
1123 analysis for marketing and communications

1124 Overview of 2014 Community Survey focusing on ‘Sense of Community’ Questions

1125 Current Status Update on City Website Redesign

1126 Site Demo on Website Redesign (?)

✓ September

1127 ~~Recommendation from Website Redesign Committee on a civic engagement module to recommend to
1128 Administration Department~~

1129 ~~Meeting with new Roseville Volunteer Coordinator~~

1130 Work Group Reports for Commission Review and Approval:

1131 Work Group A & E (Community Outreach & Council/Commissions/Staff in the Community)

1132 Work Group B (Education/Awareness)

1133 Work Group F/Operations Committee (‘Low-Hanging Fruit’)

1134 [Discover Your Park Committee Report as outlined at July 10th Commission meeting](#) POSTPONED

1135

October

1136 ~~Discussion with Advocates for Human Rights on Chapter 7 of 2014 Report *Moving from Exclusion to*
1137 *Belonging*, dealing with civic engagement and political participation by immigrants~~ RECOMMENDED
1138 DELETION FOR CONSIDERATION AT 09-11-2014 MEETING

1139 Work Group Reports for Commission Review and Approval:

1140 Work Group C (Community Communications)

1141 Work Group D (Neighborhoods)

1142 Work Group G/Operations Committee (Completed /Responsibility of Other Commissions or
1143 Staff)

Community Engagement Commission Minutes

September 11, 2014 – *Draft Minutes*

Page 29 of 29

1152 Outreach & Community Engagement Committee present for Commission review and approval the final
1153 audience grid analysis for marketing and communications

1154 [Discover Your Park Committee Report as outlined at July 10th Commission meeting \(ORIGINALLY](#)
1155 [SCHEDULED FOR SEPTEMBER\)](#)

1156
1157 Preparation for Joint Meeting with Council

1158 **November**

1159 Joint Meeting with City Council to recommend strategies to achieve purpose and goals of City Ordinance
1160 establishing Commission.

1161

23 RECOMMENDATION: At its September 11th meeting the Commission approved this Strategic Recommendation
 24 with the deletion above as part of the Work Group A & E Report. No further action necessary.
 25

26 1.1.a.i Make the budget process more transparent and understandable to residents, and utilize other resources
 27 such as a Roseville U course on budgeting, neighborhood workshops, and/or webinars to engage residents in
 28 budgeting well before the budget is finalized. (Also see Recommendation 6.1 d.)
 29

30 *Background:* The original 2012 Task Force language had included a referral to an Edina Website for further information.
 31 This reference was not included in the original redrafting for the Commission's 2014 assessment.
 32

33 In addition, the reference to Recommendation 6.1 d does not exist in the final 2012 Task Force Report. I assume that in
 34 2012 the Task Force dropped this strategic recommendation, but this earlier reference was not caught and corrected.
 35 Therefore I propose the Work Group treat this recommendation as it originally appeared and with the reference to 6.1.d
 36 deleted.

37 During the same Commission meeting, the Commission also approved transferring the following recommendation from
 38 Work Group B to our Work Group:

39 4.3b.ii Expand on its successful Roseville U program by offering a "graduate" U course that focuses entirely on
 40 the City's budgeting process, as this is critical information for engaged citizens to understand.

41 This Strategic Recommendation was intended to implement Policy 4.3: *the City should develop educational and information*
 42 *resources for citizens to learn how best to participate in civic issues.*

43 Work Group G recommends **combining these two Strategic Recommendations into one.** This will require some revisions
 44 which also appears as follows. I also recommend that the combined recommendation be located under Policy 4.3 (*The City*
 45 *should invest in civic engagement training for public official and city staff to foster a climate of public participation*).
 46

47 In order to correct these misleading references and omissions and to combine them into one strategy, the Work
 48 Group recommends the following:
 49

50 RECOMMENDATION: 1.1.a.i ~~Make~~ Encourage that the City budget process be more transparent and
 51 understandable to residents, and utilize other resources such as a Roseville U short course on budgeting,
 52 neighborhood workshops, and/or webinars to engage residents in budgeting ~~well~~ before the budget is finalized.
 53 (~~Also see Recommendation 6.1 d.~~ See Edina Civic Engagement web page *Public Participation in the Budgeting*
 54 *Process.*) We recommend that City staff involve Roseville residents experienced in the city budget process,
 55 including the Finance Commission, in the planning and execution of these educational efforts.
 56

57 SUGGESTED TIMELINE: Request Council consideration of the short U course when the City makes the decision to
 58 resume Roseville U. Other 'such as' actions mentioned above to be considered early in the budget process of
 59 2015 and 2016.
 60
 61

62 **Anything Missing?** In response to *Is there anything missing, both in the policies and strategic*
 63 *recommendations? Question #4*, I suggest we consider the topic of Volunteerism as missing for the
 64 following reasons:

65 ~~Volunteer Coordinator~~ **Volunteerism**

66 *Background: Volunteerism was not thoroughly covered by the 2012 Civic Engagement Task Force; at that time the emphasis*
 67 *was on creating a Civic Engagement staff position as some cities have. Relatively late in developing our Task Force*
 68 *recommendations, we added to Policy 4.1 which then read "The City should make available administrative support to foster*
 69 *more effective and public participation" the term volunteerism, and added the same term to Strategic recommendation*
 70 *4.1.a, the recommendation which originally called for the City to create a new city executive position to support effective*
 71 *public engagement.*

72
 73 *When the Council in the spring of 2014 passed the ordinance establishing the Commission it added under Duties and*
 74 *Functions, subsection B, which has the following language:*

75 *Recommend strategies for and actively promote and encourage effective and meaningful volunteerism as well as*
 76 *participation on advisory boards, task forces, commissions, and other participatory civic activities.*

77
 78 *Note that this Function also combined volunteerism and "participatory civic activities".*

79 *So since the Council clearly believes we should play a role in promoting and encouraging Roseville volunteerism we should*
 80 *add a policy statement to this effect. Future strategic recommendations promoting and encouraging a culture of*
 81 *volunteerism may be added later. This future effort will need to be closely collaborated with the City Volunteer Coordinator.*

82 The Work Group therefore recommends adding the following policy:

83 **RECOMMENDATION:**

84 Adopt New Policy:

85 **10.0 Policy:** The City should promote and encourage effective and meaningful volunteerism as part of a
 86 vibrant civic culture in Roseville.

87 4.1.a Create and promote more volunteer opportunities for citizens to actively contribute to the Roseville
 88 community.

89 **RECOMMENDATION:** DELETE Strategic Recommendation 4.1.a.

90 **Rationale:** This statement is more of a policy than a strategic recommendation. If the Commission agrees to
 91 establish a new policy, as recommended above, we recommend 4.1 be dropped, and the following sections be
 92 renumbered accordingly.

93 4.1.b Create a new city executive position to support volunteerism and effective public engagement across all
 94 departments. This position would direct and coordinate volunteer opportunities and neighborhood and
 95 community relations; he/she could develop procedures and methods to provide clear and consistent two-way
 96 communication between city government and residents and businesses (improve communication and find
 97 opportunities for more effective civic engagement). We recommend that this position report to the City
 98 Manager and Council.

99 *Note: The creation of a Volunteer Coordinator has been achieved this year, but not a Civic Engagement Coordinator. . The*
 100 *public engagement responsibilities, however, are not included in the job description of the Volunteer Coordinator, nor were*

101 *they considered by the Council in establishing this position. The Commission needs to separate out the civic engagement role*
 102 *from the Volunteer Coordinator, and keep that a separate item under Outreach (Community Involvement).*

103
 104 *This strategic recommendations remains a separate issue which the Commission has not yet resolved. At its September 11,*
 105 *2014, the Commission set this item aside for further discussion at a later meeting.*
 106

107 8.3. a Compile, maintain, and make readily available a list of meeting places for Roseville residents to use when
 108 organizing neighborhood meetings.

109
 110 This Work Group makes the following recommendation:

111 **ASSIGN TO Work Group D: Neighborhoods**

112
 113 ***New Item:** Utilize the life experiences and skills of our Senior Community to volunteer in areas where their*
 114 *contributions are needed, applicable, and useful.*

115 This Work Group makes the following recommendation under new section 10.0 Volunteerism, as follows:

116 **RECOMMENDATION. Adopt new Strategic Recommendation:**

117 **10.1 Utilize the life experiences and skills of our Senior Community to volunteer in areas where their**
 118 **contributions are needed, applicable, and useful.**

119 **SUGGESTED TIMELINE: Allow new Volunteer Coordinator adequate time to establish her program first before**
 120 **the Commission makes any other Strategic Recommendations.**

121

122 **Planning/~~HRA~~ Department and Commission:**

123 *Comment: As shown above, delete the Housing and Redevelopment Agency (HRA) since it has no relation to the*
 124 *goals of this specific section which relate to zoning and planning issues. The Commission may wish to consider in*
 125 *the future the HRA's role in community engagement and achieving the goals and policies of the Community*
 126 *Engagement Commission as found in City Ordinance.*

127

128 **3.0 Policy:** Engage Roseville renters and non-single Family Homeowners.

129 **3.1 Policy:** the City should engage renters as it does homeowners.

130 Background: The above policy language (3.1) was part of the 2012 Task Force Recommendations. It seems to have been
 131 overlooked when the 2012 recommendations were translated into our current 2014 reassessment process. All Work Group
 132 language was reviewed but we find no mention of Policy 3.1. or Strategic Recommendation 3.1.a. My recommendation is
 133 that this work group deal with this policy and strategic recommendation as originally written.

134 **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

135 **(1) We keep Policy 3.0 as originally and as revised with the clarifying language *such as condominiums and***
 136 ***coops and as it does single family homeowners.* The revised policy would then read as follows:**

137 *Policy 3.0: The City should engage renters and non-single family homeowners, such*
 138 *as condominiums and coops, as it does single-family homeowners.*

139 (2) Keep Strategic Recommendation 3.1.a as found in the original 2012 Task Force Recommendations,

140 *Strategic Recommendation 3.1.a: Include renters/leasers (both residential and*
 141 *business) and residents of co-ops and assisted living facilities in any communications*
 142 *initiatives (such as the recent adoption of Nextdoor, a neighborhood networking tool)*
 143 *to facilitate their engagement.*

144 (3) and add as a Rationale Statement the language found in the 2012 Report:

145 **Rationale:** According to the 2010 census, almost 1/3 of Roseville residents are renters and pay for city
 146 services through their rent, yet appear underrepresented in civic engagement efforts. Other communities,
 147 such as Hopkins, have programs targeted specifically to engage renters in city government (for more
 148 information about Hopkins' Engaging Raspberry Renters program, ~~go to~~
 149 ~~<http://hopkins.patch.com/topics/Engaging+Raspberry+Renters>~~). See attachments

150 Editorial Note: Before finalizing these strategic recommendations there are numerous press and League of Minnesota
 151 Cities reports on civic engagements, including but not limited to renters' engagement, which would be useful to us. These
 152 can be added later when time permits.

153 3.1. b: Include renters/leasers (both residential and business) and residents of co-ops and ~~assisted living facilities~~
 154 condominiums in the notifications process pertaining to zoning changes and planning issues (as with property
 155 owners). Community Communications Work Group requested this Strategic Recommendation be transferred to
 156 this Work Group. Transfer approved by Operations Committee on September 16, 2014, via Gardella E-mail.

157 RECOMMENDATION: (1) Keep, revise, transfer, and make Strategic Recommendation 3.1.b into Policy 9.2: The
 158 City should engage renters, businesses both leased and owned, and non-single-family family homeowners as it
 159 does homeowners, in its notification procedures.

160 (2) Keep Strategic Recommendation 3.1.b but transfer and adopt as Strategic Recommendation 9.2 where all
 161 other Notification issues are raised.

162 **7.1 Policy:** The City should go beyond the legal requirements for public notification and
 163 provide information on issues critical to Roseville's development.

164 7.1. b Aggressively communicate these open house opportunities meetings in local media, as well as through
 165 existing communications systems and networks.

166 *Note: The open house opportunities referred to herein only occur in the Planning Department as required by the*
 167 *City's Zoning Ordinance.*

168 RECOMMENDATIONS: KEEP Policy 7.1 and revise and adopt as Strategic Recommendation 7.1.b
 169 the following:

170 7.1. b: .1.b aggressively communicate these open house opportunities meetings in local media, as well
 171 as through existing communications systems and neighborhood networks.

172
 173
 174 7 addl 1 Other: Establish communication links with Condos and Senior Residences

175 *Editorial Note: Transferred from Work Group A by Commission action on September 11, 23014.*

176 *The above Strategic Recommendation*

177 RECOMMENDATION: Strategic Recommendation 7 addl 1 Other is adequately covered in the
178 Strategic Recommendation 9.1.c, below on lines 216- 2018.

179 **9.0 Policy:** Improve the Notification Process

180 Notes: The Notification Process referred to herein is the responsibility of the Planning Department and
181 Commission.

182 **9.1 Policy:** The city should expand the notification area and methods for informing
183 residents and businesses, including leased businesses, of developments that have greater
184 impact and/or involve issues of probable concern to the broader community.

185 RECOMMENDATIONS:

186 KEEP both policies but REVISE Policy 9.1 for clarity and in order to include businesses that
187 lease their premises. Revisions to Policy 9.1 are indicated above.

188

189 The 2012 Task Force Report went into great detail in its Strategic Recommendations for
190 Policy 9.1. For example, the first recommendation under Policy 9.1 was as follows:

191 9.1.a.i Expand the notification radius for projects reaching a threshold of having significant impact,
192 based on those proposals that meet certain criteria. We recognize developing such criteria is challenging
193 and therefore recommend the following as a starting point: Environmental impact including any use
194 that will generate air emissions beyond normal heating and cooling or restaurant exhaust; and noise
195 that may be heard beyond a 500 foot radius or at any distance from the property before 7:00 am or
196 after 5:00 pm weekdays or anytime on weekends and holidays; any proposal requiring a mandatory
197 Environmental Assessment Worksheet (EAW) or a proposal that would require an EAW on its own if an
198 Alternative Urban Area-wide Review (AUAR) had not been prepared.

199 RECOMMENDATION: For the purposes of this exercise, the Work Group recommends that
200 the specific Strategic Recommendations under Policy 9.1 be replaced by adding the
201 following language referring to these specific recommendations as advisory and by the
202 following new Strategic Recommendation:

203 9.1.a: The Council should form a joint task force of Community Engagement and
204 Planning Commissioners, plus at-large members, to assess these notification
205 recommendations and prepare a joint plan for both Commissions and for Council
206 approval. Staff assistance shall be provided by the Planning Department.

207

208 The specific Task Force Strategic Recommendations under 9.1 are suggested for
209 consideration by this joint task force as a starting point in their deliberations. For
210 purposes of reference only these Task Force Recommendations are included in
211 Attachment A.

212

213
 214 RECOMMENDATION: ADD a new Strategic Recommendation 9.1.b and Rationale to read
 215 as follows:

216
 217 9.1.b: Co-host with the proper governing board or association open houses in the community to display
 218 renderings, drawings and maps of the proposal and set aside time to respond to residents' questions and
 219 concerns. -Reports on these open houses shall include the names and addresses of all who participated, and
 220 should be prepared by a neutral third party, such as Planning Department staff.

221 **Rationale:** Current Planning Department practice allows the developer to draft Open House reports which are
 222 distributed to the Planning Commission and eventually to the City Council. My experience has been that often
 223 these reports reflect the bias of the developer. If only to avoid the appearance of a conflict of interest, these
 224 reports should be developed by a neutral party.

225
 226 RECOMMENDATION: KEEP Strategic Recommendation 9.1.c which reads as follows:

227 9.1.c : Work with governing associations of condominiums and townhomes to notify residents, and advise
 228 neighborhood groups and associations of pending development issues as soon as legally-allowable and solicit
 229 their input.

230
 231 [Recently there has been some public and Council discussion on the accessibility and](#)
 232 [understanding of City zoning notices to the general public. \(See Attachment C.\)](#)
 233

234 RECOMMENDATION: Add a new Policy 9.2, a corresponding Strategic Recommendation
 235 9.2.1, and Rationale to read as follows:

236 **9.2 Policy:** The City should reassess its zoning notices so as to increase public
 237 understandability.

238 9.2.1: The City should reassess the notification language and format so as to maximize
 239 understandability and convey their importance as official local governmental notices with
 240 potential impact upon the recipient's property and neighborhood.

241 **Rationale:** To assure that recipients understand what they are being notified of and the
 242 impact of any zoning change, variance, change in the zoning code, or related proposal,
 243 terms such as interim use permit, conditional use, variance, should not be relied upon to
 244 convey the intent of the notice, and every effort should be made to use language which is
 245 easily understood by a high school graduate.

246

247

248

249

ATTACHMENT A

2012 Neighborhood & Community Engagement Task Force Strategic Recommendations under Policy 9.1

The City should expand the notification area and methods for developments that have greater impact and/or involve issues of probable concern.

9.1.a.i Expand the notification radius for projects reaching a threshold of having significant impact, based on those proposals that meet certain criteria. We recognize developing such criteria is challenging and therefore recommend the following as a starting point: Environmental impact including any use that will generate air emissions beyond normal heating and cooling or restaurant exhaust; and noise that may be heard beyond a 500 foot radius or at any distance from the property before 7:00 am or after 5:00 pm weekdays or anytime on weekends and holidays; any proposal requiring a mandatory Environmental Assessment Worksheet (EAW) or a proposal that would require an EAW on its own if an Alternative Urban Area-wide Review (AUAR) had not been prepared

9.1.a.ii Expand the notification radius for projects reaching a threshold of having significant impact, based on those proposals that meet certain criteria: Any proposal requiring a change to the Comprehensive Plan or an interpretation of the intent of the Comprehensive Plan

9.1.a.iii: Expand the notification radius for projects reaching a threshold of having significant impact, based on those proposals that meet certain criteria. We recognize developing such criteria is challenging and therefore recommend the following as a starting point: Any proposal requiring a rezoning for a site of more than one acre.

9.1.a.iv: Expand the notification radius for projects reaching a threshold of having significant impact, based on those proposals that meet certain criteria. We recognize developing such criteria is challenging and therefore recommend the following as a starting point: any subdivision creating more than 20 residential lots or more than 40 residential dwelling units.

9.1.b: Require notification for such proposals be provided to any established neighborhood organization any part of which falls within 500 feet of the proposal and to all residents and businesses within 1500 feet of the proposal and solicit their input. Highway and freeway rights of way shall not be included in the measured radius and the city will liberally interpret this notice criteria.

9.1.d: Co-host (with the proper) informal public communications meetings in the community to display renderings, drawings and maps of the proposal and set aside time to respond to residents' questions and concerns. [\(These meetings are explicitly referred to as Open Houses in the City's Zoning Ordinance and Planning Department.\)](#) These should include site plans, landscaping plans, lighting plans with off-site impacts shown, and in the case of buildings higher than 35 feet, site cross-section drawings showing the relationship of the proposed buildings to existing adjacent buildings.

293 9.1.e: Provide administrative and communications supports for the above mentioned information
294 meetings, such as maintaining an attendance list and taking notes; providing information on the
295 proposed schedule, future public meetings, and review and decision processes; and informing the public
296 on how to access staff reports and other information regarding the proposal.
297

ATTACHMENT B

298

299



300

west metro

301

Hopkins reaches out to get renters involved in city

302

- Article by: LAURIE BLAKE , Star Tribune

303

- Updated: August 25, 2009 - 7:05 PM

304

About 60 percent of the city's housing units are rentals.

305

The city of Hopkins is reaching out to its renters.

306

Because 60 percent of Hopkins housing is rental, the city hopes to encourage renters to stay longer and take part in the community by bringing them more information about what the city has to offer.

307

308

309

An engaged resident is more likely to read the city newsletter, watch City Council meetings, go to neighborhood meetings, call 911 when there is a problem, and vote, said Hopkins City Manager Rick Getschow.

310

311

312

Engaging renters ranks at the top of city priorities, along with making it easy to walk throughout the city and promoting the city's small-town feel.

313

314

Because city newsletters go out in utility bills and apartment complex renters don't necessarily receive a utility bill, reaching renters takes a more concerted effort, Getschow said.

315

316

In an experiment that may be extended to other apartment complexes in the future, the city this year has made Hopkins Plaza Apartments the focus of stepped-up city communication.

317

318

"All cities try to get as much information to residents as possible," Getschow said. "The fact that we are 60 percent rental means that we have to do it in a more unique way."

319

320

Since the start of the year, city staff has presented a program at the apartment complex nearly once a month.

321

322

"One month we had a presentation on city parks and trails," Getschow said.

323

They heard from renters who said they'd never realized they live just two blocks from a major regional trail. The Southwest LRT trail runs through the city.

324

325

"At another event we had information about youth programming" and heard renters say they didn't realize the city had a coffee house and skate park for youths, Getschow said.

326

327 "I think it was a very good project and it has been very positive for us," said Felicia Jamerson,
328 assistant manager of the Plaza Apartments. After learning who city leaders are and where to go
329 for services, parks and shopping, people feel more a part of the community, and "you tend to
330 stay," Jamerson said. " I thought it was really nice that they got to meet the mayor and got to
331 talk with him."

332 Getschow said the effort is aimed at encouraging renters to stay longer.

333 "The longer you stay in a community, the more engaged you are likely to be in the community."

334 Programs will continue at the Hopkins Plaza complex into next spring. It's difficult to measure
335 results, but "we are getting calls asking for us to do their complex next," Getschow said.

336 Laurie Blake • 612-673-1711

337

338

ATTACHMENT C

339
340 Tue 9/16/2014 5:13 PM

341 From: mccormickl@aol.com

342 Re: Follow-up of 9/11's Community Engagement Commission meeting

343 In follow-up of 9/11 CEC meeting:

344
345 Gary,

346

347 I'm writing to follow-up on a couple points made at the commission yesterday I attended last week.
348 Because I was unable to stay for the remainder of the meeting, I watched it online. It's always interesting
349 to watch yourself on video and for me it was quite enlightening. As I watched myself, I could see that I
350 was still unsettled and upset from some disturbing information I had received from the City just prior to my
351 coming to the meeting. I regret not being more settled and clear when making comments and responding
352 to questions.

353 In particular, one issue deserves follow-up. I don't know the gentlemen's name, it may have been Gary
354 Bowman, but when I made the comment about receiving two notices about the water meters, he made
355 the statement "so you do get notices". This was a missed opportunity to delve more deeply into what is
356 perhaps the more important aspects of the issue about the notices.

357 I did receive multiple letters about the meters, so yes, I did get those. However, what I didn't say was that
358 I opened them only after a neighbor asked me about them and I got another one. When mailings are
359 redundant, they become less useful. Personally, I doubt I read everything I get from the City. I've gotten
360 mailings that don't apply so I likely assumed that most mailings are just mass mailings and more likely
361 than not to be more junk mail. [Perhaps they could consider a color system or some way to distinguish
362 certain types of information from more general or generic information?]

363 But, in any case, the issue I was referring to about notices, was the "how" and "what" that is sent out. As I
364 have been reviewing past agendas, issues, etc., I've seen the problem of insufficient notice brought up.
365 Currently, they send out postcards. These are easy to miss and I suspect may get buried in other open
366 flyers, etc. (I know since I started watching for them they've gotten put or stuck in other flyers that
367 happened to get delivered that day.) Why not a letter form for these as well like they did the water
368 meters? Better yet, perhaps they could utilize a system (different colored envelopes for different types of
369 notices?) to distinguish certain types of information from general or generic information.

370

371 And even if people do receive them, if they contain terminology unfamiliar to the general public, they are
372 not very useful. Looking to my recent experience as an example, I was again contacted by a neighbor
373 who called and asked me to explain what a particular notice about an "interim use permit" meant for the
374 neighborhood. As I talked with other neighbors, I heard from some that told me they received the
375 postcard about the recent application for an interim use permit, but with short notice and with a busy
376 schedule, they interpreted the terminology of "interim use" to mean it was a "temporary" situation, almost
377 like a sort-term rental of sorts. Had they known the building was being purchased and the plan was
378 ultimately to rezone to make it a permanent use, they would have made more of an attempt to attend the
379 upcoming open house.

380 Granted, the public has to bear some responsibility for taking the time to look for, read what is sent and
381 ask questions if they don't understand. In some ways my comments should have been prefaced to better
382 reflect what I consider to be of primary importance – namely, taking a big picture look at the entire
383 process to see how it might be done better. Concurrently, I think that as I'm seeing as my neighborhood
384 organizes, attitudes such as apathy and complacency are coming to light and being looked at. After
385 making attempts to be involved, asked questions, etc., many neighbors concluded that items underlying
386 these notices were already a "done deal" and their comments were not welcomed or acted upon. In
387 time, they have paid less and less attention to them.

388 I am encouraged by this council, the recent changes in staff, and the formation of this commission. I
389 hope that this indicates greater acceptance and willingness to involve residents in decision-making

390 concerning the city/residents. To return to the issue of notice, I suspect that to simply change the form of
391 notices from say, a postcard to a letter, is unlikely to yield significant benefit unless attitudes are also
392 changed – on the part of both government, staff, and neighbors.

393 Since our neighborhood has started to become more organized, I'm seeing people open up, become
394 willing to suspend doubt and their interest in what's happening in Roseville become reenergized. It is my
395 hope that through collaboration with the city and this commission, the message that citizens' input is
396 welcomed and valued by the City will spread and through this process, more respectful, dynamic
397 interactions could develop as the norm, facilitating growth and making Roseville an even better place to
398 live.

399

400

Work Group D: Neighborhoods Recommendations

Participants: Community Engagement Commissioners Gary Grefenberg, Desiree Mueller, and Kathy Ramundt

Instructions & Questions Addressed

1. Should the 2012 policies and strategic recommendations stay?
2. Should any be revised?
3. What's needed to accomplish this?
4. Is there anything missing, both in the policies and strategic recommendations?
5. What's the suggested timeline for addressing these?

Note: Items within red blocks are this Work Group's recommendations for Commission action.

D. NEIGHBORHOODS

5.2 Policy: The City should include pertinent information and stories related to civic engagement and neighborhoods in its print communications.

5.2a Include information related specifically to neighborhoods and their activities in the Roseville City News.

Relocated from Community Communications Work Group.

RECOMMENDATION: KEEP as Policy and Strategic Recommendation

7.0 Policy: Enhance Overall City Communication

7.1.a Organize/host ~~an open house~~ neighborhood or community meetings for projects that pose issues of substantial community or neighborhood-wide impact to engage in dialogue before the Council or any commission takes any formal action. This would allow the city or commission to explain the project, answer any questions, identify pros and cons, and get a feel for residents' viewpoints.

RECOMMENDATION: KEEP as policy. REVISE Strategic Recommendation 7.1.a as shown above. ADD a new Strategic Recommendation as follows:

7.1.d: Explore other ways to engage and communicate with residents on projects that pose issues of substantial community or neighborhood-wide impact, such as surveys, social media, an interactive website dialogue, and other means.

33 **7.2 Policy:** The City should emphasize communications utilizing existing systems more
34 proactively and effectively with the intention of engaging residents.

35 7.2.a: Connect Nextdoor neighborhood leads to facilitate communication between them on issues of
36 city-wide significance. ~~This will need the cooperation of Nextdoor.~~

37 RECOMMENDATION: KEEP Policy. REVISE Strategic Recommendation 7.2.a as indicated above. ADD a
38 new Strategic Recommendation as follows:

39 7.2.b: Devise a process for identifying, maintaining, and updating Nextdoor neighborhood
40 leads. Consider ways the City could support the efforts of NextDoor leads in disseminating
41 information necessary for neighborhood-building efforts.

42
43 7.2.b: Use neighborhood networks such as homeowner associations and neighborhood associations,
44 such as SWARN (SouthWest Area of Roseville Neighborhoods), the Lake McCarron's Neighborhood
45 Association, the Twin Lakes Neighborhood Association, and ~~possibly the City's Neighborhood Watch~~
46 ~~block captain system~~ other neighborhood networks to supplement existing information systems and
47 to invite residents' responses. [When a City Department organizes an informational meeting it should](#)
48 [seek out an association or neighborhood group with which to collaborate and organize said meeting.](#)

49 **Rationale:** By utilizing various neighborhood networks and organizations to disseminate information
50 relevant to the city and its neighborhoods, the City will assist these groups in providing value to their
51 members and neighbors. The City will also gain increased coverage of news and notifications to its
52 residents

53 RECOMMENDATION: RENUMBER and REVISE Strategic Recommendation 7.2.b as indicated above.
54 Some of the changes recommended are simply updates, others, such as the added sentence (in blue
55 font above) are additions. ADD former Strategic Recommendation 8.2.b as rationale for this strategic
56 recommendation.

57 **8.0 Policy:** Foster and Support Vibrant Neighborhoods

58 **8.1 Policy:** The City should support residents' efforts to build community within their
59 neighborhood.

60 8.1.a: Support the creation of resident-defined neighborhoods. ~~The City, in asking residents to adopt~~
61 ~~NextDoor.com as their online neighborhood networking tool, established neighborhood boundaries.~~
62 *(See Edina Name Your Neighborhood at edinamn.gov/category/neighborhood, an example of allowing residents to*
63 *determine their neighborhoods names and boundaries.)*

64 RECOMMENDATION: KEEP Policies. REVISE Strategic Recommendation 8.1.a as indicated above. ADD
65 parenthetical statement.

66

67 8.1.b: Monitor and evaluate the success of Nextdoor.com and include goal-related metrics and use
68 satisfaction such as its overall effectiveness in building community. Solicit input from residents on their
69 satisfaction with the tool as it pertains to community building within pre-defined neighborhoods.

70 RECOMMENDATION: REVISE Strategic Recommendation 8.1.b. as indicated above.

71

72 8.1.c: Provide materials to support neighborhood gatherings throughout the year, similar to the Night
73 to Unite materials offered through the Neighborhood Watch Program.

74 RECOMMENDATION: KEEP Strategic Recommendation 8.1.c.

75

76 ~~8.1.d: Create a neighborhood profile column in~~ Utilize City News to communicate news and items of
77 interest to neighbors and neighborhoods. Solicit ~~comment~~ input and contributions from residents and
78 neighborhood groups.

79 *Relocated from Community Communications Work Group.*

80 RECOMMENDATION: REVISE Strategic Recommendation 8.1.d as indicated above.

81

82 ~~8.1.e Explore opportunities to use Cable 16 to promote neighborhoods.~~

83 *Relocated from Community Communications Work Group.*

84 RECOMMENDATION: DELETE Strategic Recommendation 8.1.e as indicated above.

85 **8.2. Policy:** The City should support residents in developing more formalized
86 neighborhoods and/or neighborhood organizations.

87 RECOMMENDATION: KEEP Policy 8.2. as stated.

88

89 ~~8.2.a.i Provide residents wishing to formalize their neighborhood or neighborhood organization with~~
90 ~~the following: definition of a neighborhood, network, and association.~~

91 8.2.a.ii Provide residents wishing to wishing to formalize a neighborhood network or association with
92 the following: definition and examples of a neighborhood network or association, a clear process to
93 formalize such groups, and City recognition and benefits to officially-recognized groups. (See
94 <http://www.stlouispark.org/neighborhoods/neighborhood-associations.html>)

95 RECOMMENDATION: DROP 8.2.a.i as duplicative. RENUMBER Strategic Recommendation 8.2.a.ii
96 appropriately and KEEP. ADD new Strategic Recommendation 8.3 b (or whatever number is
97 appropriate) as follows:

98 ADD Strategic Recommendation 8.3.b to read as follows:

99 City recognition of Neighborhood Associations should be premised on the assumption
100 that neighborhood boundaries are inclusive and not exclusive.

101
102 ~~8.2.a.iii Provide residents wishing to formalize their neighborhood or neighborhood organization with~~
103 ~~the following: clear process to formalize a neighborhood, network, association~~

104 RECOMMENDATION: DELETE as duplicative.

105
106 ~~8.2.a.iv Provide residents wishing to formalize their neighborhood or neighborhood organization with~~
107 ~~the following: recognition of neighborhoods, networks, and associations.~~

108 RECOMMENDATION: Delete as duplicative the above Strategic Recommendations 8.2.a.iii and 8.2.a.iv.

109
110 8.2.a.iv.1 A page on city's website with the neighborhood's name, boundaries, characteristics, events,
111 and contact person. (Example at <http://www.stlouispark.org/wolfe-park.html>).

112 RECOMMENDATION: RENUMBER accordingly and keep as indicated above.

113
114 8.2.a.iv.2 The City should consider adding signage in the physical neighborhood when neighborhood
115 names are identified and commonly accepted.

116 RECOMMENDATION: REVISE and RENUMBER appropriately and KEEP.

117
118 ~~8.2.b By utilizing various neighborhood networks and organizations to disseminate information~~
119 ~~relevant to the city and its neighborhoods, the City will assist these groups in providing value to their~~
120 ~~members and neighbors.~~

121 RECOMMENDATION: TRANSFER to 7.2.b as rationale for that Strategic Recommendation. (See lines 56-
122 59 above.) RENUMBER accordingly.

123
124 8.1.c: Provide materials to support neighborhood gatherings throughout the year, similar to the Night
125 to Unite materials offered through the Neighborhood Watch Program.

126 RECOMMENDATION: RENUMBER appropriately and KEEP.

127
128 ~~8.1.e Explore opportunities to use Cable 16 to promote neighborhoods.~~

129 *Relocated from Community Communications Work Group.*

130 ~~8.2.a.iv Provide residents wishing to formalize their neighborhood or neighborhood organization with~~
131 ~~the following: recognition of neighborhoods, networks, and associations.~~

132 RECOMMENDATION: DELETE as duplicative.

133 ~~8.2.a.iii Provide residents wishing to formalize their neighborhood or neighborhood organization with~~
134 ~~the following: clear process to formalize a neighborhood, network, association~~

135 RECOMMENDATION: DELETE as duplicative.

136

137 8.3. a Compile, maintain, and make readily available a list of meeting places for Roseville residents to use when
138 organizing neighborhood meetings.

139 ASSIGNED TO Work Group D: Neighborhoods recommended by Work Group G: *Completed*
140 *or Nearly Complete.*

141

142

1 Work Group C: COMMUNITY COMMUNICATIONS

2 Participants: Scot Becker, Michelle Manke, Jonathan Miller

4 **General**

6 **Policy 2.2:** The city should widely publicize openings on all commissions and ad hoc
7 groups and encourage residents to apply.

8 2.2. a: Fully utilize existing print and electronic means to announce openings on city commissions and
9 task forces. Such means include but are not limited to the Roseville City News, Roseville Patch,
10 Roseville Review, Roseville Issues Forum, [various social media](#), and the neighborhood network
11 NextDoor.

12 *Jonathan Miller: I would specifically add social media to this list. (from 1st round of Excel Evaluations.)*

14 **Policy 5.1:** The city should continue to disseminate information via printed material,
15 keeping in mind that many residents rely solely on print media for news and information.

17 5.1.b ~~Print any electronic updates pertaining to~~ **Make** City Council decisions **readily available in print format for**
18 **residents at City Hall upon request** ~~in Roseville City News~~ so that people without email are able to access this
19 information.

20 *Our thinking was that it would be hard to print all City Council actions in the City News given its size and*
21 *that if you only printed select ones, who would decide which ones to print. If the goal is to have this*
22 *information available for those without a computer then having them available on request at city hall*
23 *would fulfill this goal.*

25 **Policy 5.2:** The City should include pertinent information and stories related to civic
26 engagement and neighborhoods in its print communication.

27 5.2.c: Invite ~~volunteer~~ residents to **generate story ideas** ~~advise~~ **for the** city staff on items of interest for
28 City News and possibly other communications such as the biweekly electronic newsletter. ~~For instance,~~
29 ~~the City should consider establishing a Residents' News Advisory Committee to serve in this capacity.~~

30 *SAB: I like the intent, but am not sure another committee is the answer. Could we reword*
31 *to something like: have regular column space in City News for either the volunteer*
32 *coordinator and/or the CEC to provide content, updates, etc.*

34 **Website/Electronic**

35 *Grefenberg Comment: Although the Website Redesign Committee is currently developing a Community*
36 *Engagement module for the redesigned website, the Work Group should assess the 2012 policies and strategic*
37 *recommendations as to their relevance, whether revisions are needed, and possible timelines. I suggest this*
38 *comment applies to all website policies and strategic recommendations. See instructions above.*

39 **6.1 Policy:** The City should continuously improve its website to make it more user-
40 friendly, thereby fostering civic engagement.

41 6.1.a Improve the organization and presentation of content so the website is easy to use.

42
43 ~~6.1.b Improve the search feature to yield more relevant keyword matches. (Underway)~~

44 SAB: Remove above two recommendations assuming new site will complete these.
45 Keeping the policy in place allows us the ability to add future recommendations based on
46 the new site and its issues, if any.

47
48 **6.2 Policy:** The city should maximize two-way communications technologies ~~(Web 2.0)~~
49 to facilitate timely public participation and engagement.

50 6.2.a: Make use of existing electronic communications channels and networks (website, community
51 engagement module, email alerts, Roseville Community Forum, Nextdoor, ~~Patch~~ Social Media, etc.) to
52 connect with and actively engage Roseville citizens with an emphasis on two-way communication.

53 *GRG comment: When this was originally written Patch was focused on local community news. Since then it has*
54 *let go of its local staff and is now metro-wide and rarely covers Roseville. Therefore I suggest the above revision*
55 *(deletion) for your consideration.*

56
57 6.2.c: Create an area of the website (or web-based communications) focused specifically on public
58 engagement information and resources for citizens, including two-way communication (see Edina's
59 Citizen Engagement blog as an example).

60
61 6.2.b: Continue to explore new media channels ~~(Facebook, YouTube, blogging, etc.)~~ to connect with
62 and actively engage Roseville citizens with an emphasis on two-way communication.

63 **6.3 Policy:** The City should ~~enhance~~ make readily available ~~access to~~ City Council and
64 commission agenda items, minutes, and recorded meetings through its website and CTV
65 cable television.

66 6.3.a: Publish approved city council and commission meeting minutes on the city website in a timely
67 manner, such as within one week of approval.

68 6.3.aa: If public meeting minutes are not approved in a timely manner, such as within one month,
69 publish draft minutes on its website until minutes are finalized.

70
71 6.3.b.: Offer the full text of meeting agendas in the body of email alerts and meeting notices rather
72 than requiring the extra step to click a link to learn of the full agenda.

73 Revisit after the new site is live.

74

75 6.3.c: Include a link to the specific recorded televised city meeting on the same page as the meeting
 76 minutes and/or agenda. ~~Currently it takes at least 8 clicks through 2 different websites to access a~~
 77 ~~specific recording, and these links are difficult to find.~~

79 ~~6.3.d: Ensure online video streaming is optimized for citizens at average connectivity.~~

80 *Grefenberg Comment: may already be achieved since this recommendation was made in 2012.*

81 **6.4 Policy:** The City should foster direct and efficient email communication with public
 82 officials.

83 6.4.a: Create and publish public, city-domain email addresses for city council members and
 84 commissioners to directly receive email from and send email to citizens on public matters without
 85 requiring city staff to manually forward such messages. (The online contact form may still be useful for
 86 individuals without email.)

87 *GRG Note: Policy currently under consideration by City Council. May no longer be applicable, or may simply need*
 88 *our reinforcement.*

90 **New Item** for Work Group Consideration submitted by Grefenberg:

91 6.4.e: Department heads and other key staff members ~~City employee office e-mail~~ addresses should be
 92 listed in the City Staff Directory and on the City redesigned website under their department or division.

93 *Rationale: Currently the web site does not list employees e-mails. A resident is either forced to call an employee or*
 94 *to use the current contact form which does not allow attachments, cc's, or saving a copy for the resident's future*
 95 *use.*

96 *On September 14, 2014. NextDoor Fairview Southwest transmitted this posting: Isn't it amazing how the people who*
 97 *are on our (citizen's) payroll can have unlisted email addresses! What do they have to hide? Running from work? Wonder what*
 98 *"official answer" the city comes up with in response as to why can't I email people I pay? Bet there will be a lot of responses to*
 99 *this post!!!!!! (Pat Smith, Central Park NextDoor)*

101
 102 **Print**

103 **5.1 Policy:** The City should continue to disseminate information via printed material and
 104 other means, keeping in mind that many residents rely solely on print media.

105 5.1.a: Continue to disseminate Roseville City News and ensure all residents including renters and those
 106 living in non-single family homes receive the paper.

107 *GRG Note: First need to determine how or whether City News is disseminated in apartment buildings. Ramundt*
 108 *believes it is not; Bowman insists it is.*

109 Reassigned to this Work Group at the Commission's September 11th meeting, upon the recommendation of the
 110 Community Outreach Work Group

111 5.1.a Reinstatement of the “Welcome Packet” for new residents of Roseville and Incorporate information needed to
112 foster volunteerism and effective civic engagement in the “Welcome Packet”.
113

114 Formerly 7.2.d Moved to here because it is related to print items, so it seemed like it fit better in this section

115 GRG Comment: Drop last sentence beginning *If printing costs are prohibitive....* The Welcome Packet is in the
116 HRA’s proposed 2015 budget, has Council support, and so it is not necessary.
117

118 **5.2 Policy:** The City should include pertinent information and stories related to civic
119 engagement and neighborhoods in its print communications.

120 5.2.a: Include information related specifically to neighborhoods and their activities in the Roseville City
121 News.

122 Move to the group working on neighborhood issues

123 ~~5.2.b: Include information related specifically to commission activities and civic engagement~~
124 ~~opportunities in the Roseville City News.~~

125 Not needed because it is covered by 5.2.c above

126 **7) Enhance Overall City Communication**

127 **7.1 Policy:** The City should go beyond the legal requirements for public notification and
128 provide information on issues critical to Roseville’s development.

129 **7.2 Policy:** The City should emphasize communications utilizing existing systems more
130 proactively and effectively with the intention of engaging residents.

131 ~~Reassigned to this Work Group at the Commission’s September 11th meeting, upon the recommendation of the~~
132 ~~Community Outreach Work Group~~

133 ~~7.2.d Reinstatement of the “Welcome Packet” for new residents of Roseville and Incorporate information needed to~~
134 ~~foster volunteerism and effective civic engagement in the “Welcome Packet”. If printing costs are prohibitive,~~
135 ~~the city might offer these resources online and provide a postcard to new residents inviting them to visit the~~
136 ~~web link or request a printed packet.~~

137 ~~GRG Comment: Drop last sentence beginning *If printing costs are prohibitive....* The Welcome Packet is in the~~
138 ~~HRA’s proposed 2015 budget, has Council support, and so it is not necessary.~~
139

140 **8) Foster and Support Vibrant Neighborhoods**

141 **8.1 Policy:** The City should support residents’ efforts to build community within their
142 neighborhoods.

143 8.1.e: Explore opportunities to use Cable 16 to promote neighborhoods.

144 8.1.d Create a neighborhood profile column in the City News. Solicit content from residents and
145 neighborhood groups.

146
147 8.1.e Explore opportunities to use Cable 16 to promote neighborhoods.

148 Note: This may also be discussed under Neighborhoods section below, since

149 *All of policy 8 reassigned to the workgroup working on Neighborhood issues.*

150 3.1.b Include renters/leasers (both residential and business) and residents of co-ops and assisted living
151 facilities in the notifications process pertaining to zoning changes and planning issues (as with property
152 owners).

153 *Moved to workgroup G*

154 ***GRG Recommendation:***

155 *Transfer to Work Group G. COMPLETED or NEARLY COMPLETE/RESPONSIBILITY OF OTHER*
156 *COMMISSIONS AND/OR STAFF, under Planning Department and Commission. At September 11th*
157 *Commission meeting a similar strategic recommendation was reassigned to Work Group G (7 addl 1:*
158 *Establish communications links with Condos and Senior Residences.)*
159 *It's up to you, however.*

160

161

Date: October 3, 2014

Re: Suggested Revisions to SET-ASIDES for Work Group A & E: *Community Outreach & Council/Commissions/Staff in the Community*

Per action of the Community Engagement Commission on September 11, 2014

From: Gary Grefenberg

At our last meeting the Commission set-aside the following Work Group A & E Recommendations for further review. At the invitation of Commissioner Ramundt we met and agreed to the following revisions for the Commission's consideration for adoption at its October 9th meeting.

1.1.c ~~Recognize and reach out to the changing demographics of Roseville (increasing communities of color, aging population, and other marginalized groups)~~ in order to understand how best to keep them informed and involved.

2.2.b ~~Pursue outreach efforts aimed at underrepresented groups.~~ Encourage community engagement and civic participation across all demographic lines.

7.1.c Encourage staff to communicate and consult with community and neighborhood leaders on issues ~~critical~~ important to Roseville's development.

5.1.c ~~Work with Nextdoor.com or other appropriate non-profits~~ Explore various options to find ways to include residents without computer access in community-building and communications.

4.1.b Repurpose an existing or create a new city executive position to support volunteerism and effective community and civic engagement across all departments. This position would ~~direct and~~ coordinate ~~volunteer opportunities and~~ 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 ~~improve communication~~ and find opportunities for more effective civic engagement. We recommend that this position ~~report to the City Manager and Council~~ also work with the Community Engagement Commission.

Timeline for Strategic Recommendation 4.1.b: Council consideration of a new staff position should await the 2016 budget process at the earliest. Repurposing an existing position to include such duties could occur sooner.

To: Community Engagement Commissioners

From: Gary Grefenberg, Chair

Re: Agenda Item # 7a for October 11, 2014, Meeting

At the City Council meeting of September 22nd during the Council's discussion of Garry Bowman's report on the Communications Division past and current activities, two Council members (Roe and LaLiberte) raised an issue regarding the current inability of NextDoor to allow its member to direct issues or complaints directly to City Staff.

Garry's answer was that he would take up this issue with Kathy Ramundt. I also believe the full Commission should also take a position on the recommendation found in Mayor Roe's follow-up e-mail to me and Kathy.

Note that one of the recommendations contained in the Neighborhood Work Group Report, found on lines 67-69, is as follows:

8.1.b: Monitor and evaluate the success of Nextdoor.com and include goal-related metrics and use satisfaction.

A complete copy of the Mayor's e-mail is as follows.

September 23, 2014, E-Mail

Gary and Kathy,

Since I have been copied on this, my 2 cents is that we suggest to NextDoor an "opt-in" possibility on postings, so that folks could, if they choose, "carbon copy" the city on a single posting. I suppose responders to that posting could also have the option to have their responses copied to the city...

I agree that it is difficult to find whom to communicate with at the city about various issues, but why not give people the shortest possible route? If they choose to say something on NextDoor, why not save them the trouble of having to go elsewhere to figure out who at the city to contact? Why not just allow them - at their option - to know that their posting (just that one) would be seen by someone at the city who could see that the information get to the right person at the city? I also agree that the notion of the city not monitoring all postings is a key part of NextDoor, and I would not want to change that.

This was my "suggestion box idea" expressed at the meeting last night, in a nutshell.

Regards,

Dan Roe
Roseville Mayor