



**Planning Commission – Comprehensive Plan Update Meeting  
City Council Chambers, 2660 Civic Center Drive  
Minutes – Wednesday, February 7, 2018– 6:30 p.m.**

**1. Call to Order**

Chair Murphy called to order the regular meeting of the Planning Commission meeting at approximately 6:30 p.m. and reviewed the role and purpose of the Planning Commission.

**2. Roll Call**

At the request of Chair Murphy, City Planner Thomas Paschke called the Roll.

**Members Present:** Chair Robert Murphy; Vice Chair James Bull; and Commissioners Sharon Brown, James Daire, Chuck Gitzen, Julie Kimble and Peter Sparby

**Staff/Consultants Present:** Senior Planner Bryan Lloyd, City Planner Thomas Paschke, and Community Development Director Kari Collins; and, Erin Perdu and Karina Heim, WSB Consultants

**3. Approval of Agenda**

**MOTION**

**Chair Murphy moved, seconded by Member Sparby to consider agenda item 6(a) after agenda item 6(d).**

Member Daire commented item 6(a) should precede the discussion of item 6(b). He also requested to move item 6(d) to 6(b).

Chair Murphy stated he made the motion because he believes item 6(a) will be an equity-focused discussion and may include a lengthy discussion.

**MOTION**

**Member Daire moved, seconded by Member Bull to amend the main motion to swap agenda items 6(d) and 6(a).**

Member Bull stated he agrees that the review of the open house under item 6(d) and the discussion of equity under item 6(a) should be covered ahead of discussion of item 6(b).

The Commission voted on the amendment to the main motion.

**Ayes: 7**

**Nays: 0**

**Motion carried.**

**MOTION**

**Member Daire moved, seconded by Member Bull to adopt the agenda as amended.**

**Ayes: 7**

**Nays: 0**

**Motion carried.**

**4. Review of Minutes**

*Commissioners had an opportunity to review draft minutes and submit their comments and corrections to staff prior to tonight's meeting for incorporation of those revisions in to the draft minutes.*

**a. January 3, 2018, Regular Meeting**

**MOTION**

**Member Daire moved, seconded by Member Kimble, to approve the January 3, 2018 minutes as amended.**

Member Bull referred to lines 224 and 311 and noted the minutes state, "In response to Member ...." but do not indicate what the Commission member was asking. He found this format difficult to understand and requested it not be used in the future. He also referred to line 456, and noted his inquiry was not captured accurately.

Member Kimble noted the correct spelling of her name.

**Ayes: 7**

**Nays: 0**

**Motion carried.**

**b. January 24, 2018, Comprehensive Plan Update Meeting**

**MOTION**

**Member Kimble moved, seconded by Chair Murphy, to approve the January 24, 2018 minutes as amended.**

Member Sparby referred to line 649 and commented his words were not accurately captured. He requested the phrase, "they are giving them preferential treatment" be replaced with "it can be construed as giving certain groups preferential treatment."

**Ayes: 7**

**Nays: 0**

**Motion carried.**

**5. Communications and Recognitions:**

**a. From the Public:** *Public comment pertaining to general land use issues not on this agenda*

None.

**b. From the Commission or Staff:** *Information about assorted business not already on this agenda, including a brief update on the 2040 Comprehensive Plan Update process*

Member Gitzen stated they have received the City Council Advisory Commission rules and procedures. He noted the three-minute limit for public comment is important to remember. He suggested they let the public know of the limit and that the Chair let the Commission know if he plans to allow more time.

Chair Murphy requested the Commission ask him what the time limit is if he forgets to state it ahead of time.

Senior Planner Lloyd noted they have scheduled an additional Planning Commission meeting on Thursday, February 15 at 6:30 p.m. in the Council Chambers. They plan to discuss the Resilience and Transportation Chapters of the Comprehensive Plan. These items will be emailed out to the Commission by Friday. Following this additional meeting, the next scheduled meeting will take place on Wednesday, February 28 at 6:30 p.m.

Member Gitzen inquired when the full Comprehensive Plan will be available for review.

Mr. Lloyd responded they have most of it available in draft form. They are still waiting for the Parks and Recreation chapter and the Transportation chapter still needs to be formatted. They plan to have the full draft available for public review in a couple of weeks.

Chair Murphy provided clarification on the approved order of this meeting's agenda.

**6. Project File 0037: 2040 Comprehensive Plan Update**

**d. Future Land Use Change Open House Feedback Report**

Erin Perdu, WSB Consultant, reported they held several open houses around the community to discuss proposed land use changes between the 2030 and 2040 land use maps. Staff and consultants were able to speak with residents that attended and provide summaries of those conversations. Most of the conversations focused around explanations of the Comprehensive Plan, zoning, and how it translates into what the residents could do with their property. There were also concerns with density, and those were addressed with follow-up emails. Overall, there was good attendance and no significant concerns that resulted in changing any of the proposed designations on the future land use map.

Member Sparby requested clarification with the corridor mixed-use requirement of 10 percent residential.

Ms. Perdu stated Member Sparby's comment was accurate for the entire corridor mixed-use and any other mixed-use districts. It is not 10 percent for each parcel but is 10 percent district wide.

Mr. Lloyd further clarified the zoning code will specify setback and height parameters applied to any of these cases. It may make some small sites unsuitable for multi-family housing.

Member Daire thanked staff for including emails and concerns from the public in the meeting packet. He noted there was some fear expressed by residents where land use designations were proposed to change to a higher density, and yet they do not intend to make any changes to these proposed designations. He inquired how they dealt with the residents on this issue and if they were satisfied with the changes.

Ms. Perdu responded not all fears were addressed. There is always apprehension around noise and traffic impacts when there is an increase in density or change in use in residential areas. When they begin to rewrite the zoning code and evaluating site plans, it will be important to include appropriate design standards so that new developments can be designed appropriately to mitigate impacts as much as possible. Overall, the way the future land use map is still appropriate and if adjustments still need to be made, it can be further discussed.

Mr. Lloyd commented at the meetings he was at, the people who were there were quite concerned with these issues. However, after a long discussion, some people realized the proposed changes were less than they were initially understanding them to be. In the proposed mixed-use districts, which used to be business districts, multi-family residential uses were always allowed, but were not promoted nor was there a 10 percent requirement for it. Some fears were relieved when they learned that high-density was previously allowed. Other people remained concerned with the potential impacts but understand that it is not required everywhere, and it will not work in some places. He invited residents to provide feedback on the zoning discussions in the coming year. Some residents also realized that the introduction of a requirement for multi-family housing in mixed-use districts is a direct function of the City's initiative to distribute high density housing to a broader cross-section of the community.

Member Daire expressed concern with the Edison proposal for 209 units. This would generate over 2,000 trips and if they occurred during rush hour when the streets are already loaded, there will be increased difficulty and would most likely affect the Level of Service numbers. He recently drove by County Road C and Dale and noticed the long-term residence that used to look out onto a wooded area is now looking in to the windows of five new houses, and this has made him more sensitive to this issue.

Mr. Lloyd referred to the Edison project, and noted there were people in attendance at the open house meeting at Sand Castle Park. It was not one of the proposed land use

changes that was up for discussion that particular evening, and the current update of the Comprehensive Plan does not include a change in designation for the proposed property location of the project. The proposed property for the Edison project is already properly zoned and they are conforming the project to that zoning.

Member Daire clarified he was not addressing the Edison project as such, but as merely a way to locate it for discussion.

Mr. Lloyd provided feedback on the open houses that were held regarding future land use changes. He noted someone at the Lexington open house on Tuesday, December 19 suggested they amend their summary to reflect that Greenhouse Villages have a 10 percent high density residential requirement. It is a valid point and they will indicate it is specifically high density. Also, there was a resident who felt disparaged that Greenhouse Village was identified by name. He felt that labeling it was a coded way to indicate that they are senior citizen condominiums. However, staff felt that Greenhouse Village was relevant to the feedback they had. Mr. Lloyd referred to another property that had traditionally been a greenhouse on Snelling Curve, and noted a resident expressed concern with the proposed change in guidance from medium density to low density. They had plans to acquire the property and redevelop it in the coming year. He is unsure how to address this since it is late in the process to change a land use designation. He noted that any development that is proposed before the land use changes are finalized qualify for review and approval under existing conditions. If plans come together after the low density residential designation is in place, they would have to seek an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan designation.

Chair Murphy requested more information on the City's plans on the southeast parcel of Cleveland Avenue and County Road D.

Mr. Lloyd responded plans are being developed for some type of park facility. It would be a passive space, and there are posters hanging in City Hall on what is being considered for that park.

Chair Murphy inquired if the City made an offer on property to the north for park property but was declined.

Mr. Lloyd confirmed the City explored the possibility of purchasing it but could not come to an agreement with the property owner.

Member Bull noted there was a Plan Your Park event that invited the public to consider a design for a park on the southeast corner.

Member Bull stated they hear a lot from residents regarding traffic concerns. They consider traffic patterns with all land use development projects, whether it is commercial or residential. It is a key factor they always consider, and they involve Public Works and sometimes the County or State in the discussion.

Chair Murphy stated they will enter a public review phase after the document is completed and encouraged residents to submit their feedback.

Mr. Lloyd noted there will be both informal and formal opportunities to view the document, along with a public hearing with the Planning Commission in March or April.

**b. Housing Chapter:** *Review of draft chapter based on previous Planning Commission Feedback.*

Ms. Perdu reported the draft provided to the Commission has revisions included in it and the City Council has also provided feedback on it.

Chair Murphy stated they should focus on significant disagreements in topics and editorial changes can be provided in written or email form.

Pages 1 through 7.

Ms. Perdu noted the Housing chapter begins with a significant data section describing the state of housing in Roseville. Data has been added related to new housing permits in Roseville in 2000, and more recent data from the Metropolitan Council was added on the affordability of new units built, along with a suggestion that the Maxfield study needed to be updated.

Member Bull referred to Figure 5-4 on page 3 and noted he cannot distinguish between the two colors for Multifamily (3 units or more) and Multifamily (5 units or more).

Ms. Perdu stated they will redo the graph in the style they are using to match the rest of the chapter.

Mr. Lloyd also referred to Figure 5-4 and pointed out somewhere in 2003 and 2005, the designation of the classification of unit numbers for Multifamily changed from 3 or more units to 5 or more units.

Pages 7 and 8.

Ms. Perdu commented additional detail was added to reflect the number of responses that were received through the focus groups and online survey.

Pages 9 through 14.

Ms. Perdu reported this section talks about the affordability of housing, public subsidized housing, and naturally occurring housing. Clarifications were made related to the data and more explanation was included around naturally occurring housing since it is a significant asset in Roseville. She noted the map on page 14 is required by

the Metropolitan Council and has been updated. The palest dots on the map are the owner-occupied homes that meet the affordability threshold.

Member Kimble inquired if there is still a gap in the target the Metropolitan Council has for affordable housing given that two-thirds of the City's housing is considered affordable.

Karina Heim, WSB Consultant, reported the Metropolitan Council considers current existing affordable housing in the City, the growth expected between 2020 and 2030, and future housing that is not yet there when they calculate the affordable housing requirement. In Roseville, there is still a requirement for affordable housing.

Member Kimble expressed concern if they are explaining this clearly enough for others to understand.

Chair Murphy summarized they would be meeting the Metropolitan Council's expectations if there was no growth; however, since growth is expected, and that is where the goals remain.

Ms. Heim agreed with Chair Murphy's summarization and stated in cities where no growth is expected in the coming decades, there is no affordable housing requirement.

Chair Murphy suggested they make this clear in the Housing chapter. He noted it is significant to point out how the City is doing on meeting its affordable housing goals.

Member Daire referred to the last paragraph on page 9 and noted the number of total housing units is wrong and should be roughly 15,747. He inquired if it changes the statements and percentages stated further in the paragraph.

Ms. Perdu stated the correct numbers are shown in the table on page 11 and she will update the document.

Member Daire noted in that same paragraph, they are talking in percentages of AMI and then it shifts to deal with households that have incomes that are less than \$25,740, which is the 30 percent AMI boundary. He would like to see the dollar figures associated with the gaps: 51 percent is \$43,760, 31 percent is \$26,798, and 50 percent is \$42,900. If someone works for minimum wage at \$11.00 per hour, they would have to work for 45 hours to meet this low affordability threshold and if the minimum wage is \$15.00 per hour, they would have to work 33 hours to meet it. In another part of the chapter, it talks about the declining number of average occupants per housing unit, and yet they are using a metric that is using a family of four. It seems like they are trying to respond to the generally good notion of providing affordable housing with no sense of what it means. He suggested they make it understandable.

Member Kimble commented they should correlate the percentages to the wages earlier.

Member Bull referred the first paragraph under Existing Housing Affordability on page 9, and stated it talks about 80 percent (\$76,040) and they have to calculate it. He also referred to the last paragraph under Online Survey on page 8 and stated it was confusing and unclear what the respondents were agreeing with.

Chair Murphy suggested they restate the question to clarify the response.

Member Gitzen referred to the first paragraph under Existing Housing Affordability on page 9, and suggested they change “regional planning authority” to the “Metropolitan Council.”

Pages 15 through 19.

Ms. Perdu noted a lot of this information is the same as before and is connecting back to the land use chapter. It describes how the future land use map is meeting the density requirements for affordable housing allocations. It is the numeric portion that demonstrates how the future land use map accommodates the provision of affordable housing through density.

Member Gitzen referred to the bottom of page 15 and read “...Roseville’s greatest share of cost-burdened households is in the lowest (<30% AMI) income tier.” He noted this reflects 11.4 percent of cost-burdened households and the two tiers below that adds up to 12.9 percent.

Ms. Perdu stated he is reading it correctly, but the 11.4 percent is larger than either of the other two separately, but not combined.

Member Gitzen inquired if they had considered affordable housing and how it ties in the transportation. If someone is spending less for transportation they can afford more for housing.

Mr. Lloyd stated it has not been discussed in a formal way but could be considered.

Ms. Perdu stated it is something worth mentioning but is unsure how it would factor into the data and cost-burden. The best measure of affordability for housing is 30 percent AMI.

Member Gitzen noted affordable housing is based on housing cost as well as on income. He inquired if they address raising income goals in the Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Perdu responded it is mentioned in the Economic Development chapter and was brought up earlier in the discussion. This presents an opportunity to tie it in with this chapter.

Chair Murphy noted the number of people who live and work in Roseville is relatively small and they need to look at a regional increase.



Member Bull referred to page 15 and inquired why they are relating AMI to cost-burdened in Roseville. AMI is area median income, on page 13 they talk about the Roseville area income, and here they are talking about cost-burdening. It should be that 30 percent of the Roseville median income would equal the cost-burden and at what levels they are. If they are using the area, it is a higher number and it distorts the figures. AMI is not appropriate in this entire section and it is all based on Roseville median income.

Ms. Heim stated this data comes from the Metropolitan Council and they are required to include this information. However, it sounds like they would like a more local, contextual basis for median income for Roseville rather than considering the area overall.

Member Bull stated the graph on page 15 is basing cost-burden on the area median income and not on Roseville median income. The number is distorted because the income level is different. 30 percent of the area is not the same as 30 percent of the Roseville area.

Ms. Perdu stated they do not have information on how much households are spending other than the data from the Metropolitan Council.

Member Bull commented they have income data for Roseville, they know what the ratio is between Roseville and AMI, as well as the thresholds for spending, so they should be able to calculate it.

Mr. Lloyd inquired if area median income is still a valid metric to help put Roseville's housing stock in the context of the regional housing market. They have housing values here, people might consider moving here and the affordability metric of the area median income would be a real consideration for them in addition to how Roseville's income compares to its housing stock prices.

Member Kimble inquired if it is possible to include both ways in the chapter.

Ms. Perdu stated they have to include what is already in the chapter, but they can add the other also.

Chair Murphy stated they can keep in what is required, but also include the context where they have the data.

Member Daire referred to the table on page 16 and noted it is good to compare Roseville to other northern suburbs. The lack of difference may be because they are also using an area wide metric.

Pages 19 through 25.

Ms. Perdu reported some specific goals were pulled out of the data presented in the chapter. They added data requested by the EDA, but the housing need goals are still the same. The table on page 19 is new and provides more information about the trends in types of Roseville households. She referred to page 20 and stated they had also discussed adding the “missing middle” style housing need goals and non-traditional housing. They may want to add wording about housing opportunities for the cultural diversity in the City. On page 23, in addition to the housing need goal of having housing opportunities near transit, they also included locating housing near employment and services.

Member Daire referred to the chart on page 19 and noticed that the 2015 number is a couple hundred households greater than in 2000. However, when compared with the chart on page 10 where the total number of housing units is 15,700 it reflects 1,000 more units. He inquired if those 1,000 units were vacant.

Ms. Perdu responded the year on page 10 in Figure 5-8 is from 2016.

Ms. Heim stated she believes it is referring to just the occupied houses.

Member Daire commented the growth in the number of households from 2000 to 2015 is less than 200. However, one year later, it is 1,000 units more. He suggested they explain why there is a difference.

Ms. Perdu commented the chart on page 19 is U.S. census data on households and the information on page 10 is Metropolitan Council data on housing units. Households and housing units have different definitions even though they are used interchangeably, and it needs to be explained.

Member Daire stated if the difference is vacant units, they should provide an explanation. If they are vacant units and falls within a particular price range, it changes the affordable housing goals.

Member Gitzen referred to page 21 and the housing need goal about maintenance assistance programs. He inquired why they are emphasizing redevelopment in the bullet point when they should be talking about maintenance.

Ms. Perdu clarified the housing need goal is grouped with the bullet point above it, not below it. It is a formatting issue and will be looked at further.

Member Gitzen referred to the first bullet point on page 23 inquired if there are opportunities on Interstate 35W and Highway 36 for transit-oriented development.

Ms. Perdu responded perhaps at the interchanges at Highway 36. There could also be opportunity if there was bus rapid transit or light rail in the future.

Mr. Lloyd pointed out there is a transit center a Rosedale that has busses that run on Highway 36 and off Interstate 35E there is a Park and Ride facility.

Member Gitzen referred to the last paragraph on page 24 and inquired if they would ever realistically partner with other counties besides Ramsey, or other HRAs.

Ms. Heim stated they can change it to reflect a singular county. However, while Ramsey County would be the County in which services are provided, there can be lessons learned from other counties and what its HRAs are doing.

Member Bull referred to the graph on page 22 and commented they do not provide much definition to what the requirements are to age in place. There is no analysis of the trends between 2000 and 2010 of people moving to another age bracket and what that means to the Roseville population. Based on the data, they need to explain if they are losing people at a certain age, if they are no longer residents of the City, or if they are no longer residents anywhere.

Ms. Perdu commented they need to show more information on in-migration and out-migration in these age groups as well as adding more information on what it means to age in place and the housing unit itself.

Member Bull noted by 2040, the five to 14 age group will be household occupants by the time this Comprehensive Plan is fully fulfilled. They need to be marketing to what the City's five-year olds need in the future.

Member Daire noted this shows what happened with the population from 2000 to 2010, and they need to consider the implications of this for 2040, how much of the population will come from in-migration and how much will come from natural growth. He noted that when seniors die off there may be a housing surplus with the smaller group coming in to Roseville. He inquired if that will have to be offset with in-migration.

Member Bull stated if people start living longer, it will create a new age bracket on the graph.

Member Kimble noted they are assuming that all the people in the five to fourteen age brackets are going to stay in Roseville.

Member Bull commented they should include an analysis on what aging in place has to bear on the City's housing versus all the other factors.

Member Daire requested an analysis on what the implications would be for 2040.

Pages 26 through 33.

Ms. Perdu reported housing matrix and tools have been refined. One change that has been made is the inclusion of the AMI intended target with each goal. Beginning on page 29, there is a more detailed narrative of the tools included in the chart. The City

is not obligated to use these tools, but they are available and could be used to meet its goals.

Member Kimble suggested they include a sentence that indicates the City and staff will continue to evaluate and look for new tools. They do not know what is going to happen between now and 2040 and a proactive awareness and attention to new tools is important as they develop.

Member Bull commented he does not feel qualified to evaluate this and he is depending on staff and other Commission members to guide this section.

Ms. Perdu noted she appreciated the amount of time staff spent on this section.

Member Daire referred to the paragraph about Tax Abatement on page 29. He inquired if the City would adopt a tax abatement policy for individuals similar to Habitat for Humanity.

Ms. Perdu responded she understands that it would be possible to use tax abatements for single family homes to support improvements. It would be subject to the City Attorneys review of the tax abatement policy and how it is written. However, they are not typically used in this way because there are more efficient ways to incentivize these types of repairs.

Mr. Lloyd reminded the Commission to pass along revisions to him that are not policy level conversations and they will work to make the text read more clearly and make these types of changes.

Member Bull requested a five-minute break.

The Commission recessed at 8:06 p.m. and reconvened at 8:15 p.m.

**c. Implementation Chapter:** *Review of draft chapter based on previous Planning Commission Feedback.*

Ms. Perdu reported on the updates to this chapter. She noted a description of the implementation matrix had been added. They have streamlined it by removing references to associated Commissions and the City Council. There is also a new column titled “ongoing” for strategies that have not been started or will be ongoing once it is implemented. She also noted they will include language that indicates they will also be examining new funding sources as they become available. The blanks at the end of the chapter are for the Resilience and Water Resources chapters which are being finalized.

Member Bull inquired if the Parks and Recreation Commission has looked at the implementations as well.

Ms. Perdu responded they have reviewed all the strategies but have not seen the matrix. They will have a chance to review the complete document.

Mr. Lloyd commented another consultant was working more closely with the Parks Commission on the Parks chapter. They will also be working with the Parks staff and Commission on filling in the matrix from their perspective. The Public Works staff was working on the transportation and utilities parts of the document.

Member Kimble noted she provided Mr. Lloyd with comments and suggestions that were not policy related.

Ms. Perdu confirmed she received those comments from Mr. Lloyd.

Member Daire referred to page 15 and the County Road C railroad bridge west of Victoria Street bridge replacement. He inquired if it was Lexington to Victoria where the road goes up and over.

Mr. Lloyd confirmed this.

Member Bull referred to the first goal on page 4 and stated he is unsure what “implementing placemaking principles” means and suggested they include language that is easier to understand.

Ms. Perdu stated the idea has to do with urban design and making sure things have an identity. It includes designing things to a human scale, making sure new development matches the character that is desired and that they are designed with a mix of uses and walkable.

Member Kimble noted “placemaking” is becoming a more common word. She suggested they leave it as is but include a definition somewhere.

Ms. Perdu noted they could define it in the Land Use chapter, which is where the goal comes from.

Chair Murphy suggested they include a footnote with the definition.

Member Bull referred to page 5 and noted the goals feel like they are geared toward the outdoors. The gathering places also need to be indoors.

Member Sparby referred to page 3, and suggested it be changed to “...associated City departments as follows:” along with a table of Commissions and corresponding departments.

Member Gitzen inquired what “planning horizon” was referring to on pages 1 and 2.

Ms. Perdu explained it is referring to the timeframe in which the document is looking forward, which would be the year 2040. She stated she can remove the wording and just include the year.

Member Bull inquired if Community Development Director Collins has looked at all the items that are tagged for that department.

Mr. Lloyd stated they have not yet gone through the list with Ms. Collins, but plan to do so. They will also do this with the housing and economic development goals as well.

Member Bull pointed out all the ongoing goals are cumulative once they start.

Ms. Collins noted the next big task for the Community Development Department is the zoning code and a lot of the goals can be controlled with amendments to it. They will be forced to address this as they start to vet the zoning code and align it with the Comprehensive Plan goals. They will need to go through and create a plan to address each goal.

Member Gitzen stated ultimately it is up to the Council to direct which direction they should go.

Ms. Collins noted they get a two-year policy and priority plan. There are usually about four or five concepts the Community Development Department is charged with that sets the tone for the next two years.

- a. Follow up on Items from Previous Meetings:** *What is the definition of equity? The Planning Commission meeting packet contains some information on equity, and discussion at the meeting can begin to develop a definition.*

Mr. Lloyd highlighted the two documents he included in the meeting packet regarding equity: one from the Metropolitan Council and the other from the Government Alliance. He provided a visual metaphor that displayed the differences between equality, equity and justice.

Member Bull referred to the visual metaphor and commented the person on the left has been brought down a level from the box. On page 4 of the Metropolitan Council study, it states “If people of color in 2040 enjoyed the same socioeconomic status as whites, it would result in...” It seems they are saying that all people of color are being elevated to the level of whites in the bar chart provided on that same page. However, the same thing could be done if whites were brought down to the level of the people of color. He inquired what the socioeconomic impacts of this would be.

Mr. Lloyd responded there would be no good socioeconomic impacts and the same would be true for graduation rates. One way to get rid of graduation gap is to compromise the success that white students enjoy, but that is not a productive solution. Another example would be the Americans with Disabilities Act. Street

corners and sidewalks have been rebuilt for wheel chairs, but families with strollers have also benefitted as well.

Member Bull explained equity is not just rebalancing; it is rebalancing with an improvement overall.

Mr. Lloyd agreed and provided a page from the introductory chapter of the Comprehensive Plan that contained the following five suggested lenses provided by the Metropolitan Council: Stewardship, Prosperity, Equity, Livability, and Sustainability. They defined equity as “giving priority attention to the goal of promoting a wider range of choices for those individuals and groups who have few, if any choices.” He read a few other paragraphs that further described this. The City’s goal is not to achieve equity by harming the outcomes of some people to be at a level that is similar to marginalized groups. However, by working to elevate the outcomes of marginalized groups they can have better outcomes across the board.

Member Kimble inquired where this description would be included in the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Lloyd responded it would go either chapter one or two.

Chair Murphy stated he is surprised they are struggling this as a Commission and that the City has not already addressed it.

Mr. Lloyd responded the City does not have an approved description or definition of equity. However, they are committing significant resources and staff time to the issue in 2018. There are 14 staff members participating in the Government Alliance on Race and Equity (GARE) program and among the outcomes will be for them to work with the City to have an equity statement. The program began in January and the equity statement is not yet available.

Member Daire thanked Mr. Lloyd for the visual metaphor he provided earlier. He commented if they want to achieve equality they have to provide something that will help people who do not have what others have. When he worked in Minneapolis, it was particularly important to hire people from the community who were disadvantaged and had something to contribute. He inquired if they were trying to accomplish that same concept to achieve equity.

Mr. Lloyd referred to the topic of housing affordability where they need to provide more choices for people with limited means. It is not about equality because not everyone wants the same residential environment. Under the equity goal of providing more choices, they would be trying to increase the number of options that people have to choose from when considering a house.

Member Daire commented after the community participation that used Roseville Bucks, it was observed that not all the money was spent. The idea behind the exercise was to help understand where people’s priorities were and that was a

question of choice. If people cannot afford housing at a specific quality level, it is up to the City to provide it, so they can afford it. This does not speak to equity in transportation or income, and if they are going to take on that type of housing goal, someone will have to pay for it.

Member Kimble noted the housing and funding programs are helping to make quality housing affordable. She stated she likes the description provided by Mr. Lloyd and knows that the racial and ethnic issues are creating the most disparity. It is a complex topic and they need to make sure there is access or opportunity, not preference. The statistics show there are groups that have not been able to advance, despite their efforts. This requires a more holistic view not just related to housing. When they talk about mixed-use in housing there are places where there might be better access to transportation.

Mr. Lloyd noted another piece has to do with the goals and policies in the economic development portion and improving the employment context or if they can achieve a greater parity of jobs and places to live so that people can minimize their transportation costs.

Ms. Collins stated equity also does not always translate into a monetary value. It may just be the way the City communicates information. Communities can be narrowly focused by having up to date digital information, but that may not get to underrepresented populations. People can snap a picture of a pothole and send it off to the City to alert them it needs to get fixed. People in underrepresented communities may not have this type of technology and they need to make sure they are also being taken care of and communicated with.

Member Sparby questioned the value of defining equity. It means something different to everyone and it is a disservice to take away people's creativity to define it. They do not need staff to tell them what it means and a lot of times it is used to put a different spin on something. He does not support this and is unsure why it is on the agenda. It is good to have the conversation, but it is not the place of the City to define these terms.

Member Kimble commented they asked for a definition because it was talked about throughout the Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Collins stated they do not want to look at it as a definition, but more as a description of what equity could be. She agreed they are not in the position to define it because it is so broad. They are trying to explain how they are interpreting it when it comes to the Comprehensive Plan.

Chair Murphy agreed and noted that is why they asked for a definition.

Member Sparby stated in turn, they are pulling out the creativity that could be there and loosely defining it is not a benefit.



Member Bull stated the Metropolitan Council has requested that the Comprehensive Plan address equity and they must have some common knowledge of what that means. He suggested they reach out to the Human Rights, Inclusion, and Engagement Commission (HRIEC) to see what work they have done on this topic.

Ms. Collins stated they have had conversations with staff liaison Rebecca Olsen about having the HRIEC look at how they have described equity and provide feedback.

Chair Murphy inquired if they have requested guidance from the City Council on describing equity in the Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Collins responded the City Council did not want the task of defining it. It is a broad term they are just trying to provide context on how it is presented in the Comprehensive Plan. She suggested they bring it to the HRIEC for feedback.

Member Kimble inquired if the descriptions provided by Mr. Lloyd were from the Metropolitan Council.

Mr. Lloyd explained the headings are from them, but not the descriptions. The Metropolitan Council has certain requirements but using the five suggested lenses (Stewardship, Prosperity, Equity, Livability, and Sustainability) is not among them. These were inserted into the RFP in 2016 by the Planning Commission and City Council, in addition to public safety. They are elective goals for the Comprehensive Plan process and not a direct requirement. He noted the draft included in the meeting binders does not include the language he presented, and he will email it out to the Commission. He requested they provide their comments to him by the end of next week.

Member Gitzen thanked Mr. Lloyd for the information he provided and noted it is important they understand what they are talking about in the Comprehensive Plan. Everyone has a different idea of what it means and there needs to be common ground and context moving forward.

Member Kimble stated it is well written and understands the need for some context.

Member Bull commented equity is often related to racial, age, or ethnic groups. In the context of the Comprehensive Plan, it should also be thought of as being equitable with a person's surrounding community.

Member Brown commented it is well-written and a concise way of putting it together.

Member Sparby stated they have been very agreeable to the Metropolitan Council throughout the whole process. However, if this is not a requirement, they do not need to include it.

Chair Murphy commented he had asked for the definition and the two paragraphs read by Mr. Lloyd captured what he was looking for.

Member Brown requested a copy of what Mr. Lloyd presented, along with the Metropolitan Council information and equity information on race. This will allow her to look at it in its whole context.

Mr. Lloyd stated he will share a link to the full Choice Place and Opportunity study done the Metropolitan Council.

Member Brown stated it is important because Roseville embodies so many different races within the City. It needs to be addressed in some form and this is a good start.

Mr. Lloyd stated they will look at the Resilience and Transportation chapters at the meeting on February 15 and review the entire draft on February 28. They will send chapters that are not yet included as they are finished.

Ms. Collins noted the document they are providing include all the draft chapters and are still a work in progress. As each chapter gets reviewed, they will provide an updated version for the Commission to include in their copy.

Member Gitzen inquired if there was a way to track the changes that are made.

Mr. Lloyd stated they will begin to leave it in a track changes format and highlight where changes have happened.

Chair Murphy inquired if there will be any other meetings needed besides the first and fourth Wednesday.

Mr. Lloyd noted depending on how the draft review goes on February 28, they may need an additional meeting in March.

Chair Murphy suggested they include that on the agenda for February 28.

Member Bull noted they also need to consider when the ethics training will take place. He also inquired if they will receive the modules done by the other consultants.

Mr. Lloyd stated the Parks and Recreation Director will be in attendance at the next meeting to discuss the Parks chapter and the Transportation chapter will also be available.

## **7. Adjourn**

### **MOTION**

**Member Bull moved, seconded by Member Daire adjournment of the meeting at approximately 9:10 p.m.**

**Ayes: 7**

**Nays: 0**

**Motion carried.**