



Regular City Council Meeting Minutes
City Hall Council Chambers, 2660 Civic Center Drive
Monday, July 21, 2014

1. Roll Call

Mayor Roe called the meeting to order at approximately 6:00 p.m. Voting and Seating Order: McGehee; Willmus; Laliberte; Etten; Roe. City Manager Pat Trudgeon and City Attorney Mark Gaughan were also present.

2. Approve Agenda

City Manager Trudgeon suggested moving Business Action Item 13.b entitled, "Approve a Resolution of Support for the Installation of Bus Rapid Transit Station at Snelling Avenue and Roselawn Avenue" immediately following the presentation by Metropolitan Council District 10 Representative Marie McCarthy.

Willmus moved, Etten seconded approval of the agenda as amended.

Roll Call

Ayes: McGehee; Willmus; Laliberte; Etten; Roe.

Nays: None.

3. Public Comment

Mayor Roe called for public comment by members of the audience on any non-agenda items. No one appeared to speak.

4. Council Communications, Reports, and Announcements

Mayor Roe announced several upcoming events, including "Coffee with a Cop" scheduled periodically, with the next one scheduled on August 7, 2014 from 9:00 – 10:30 a.m. at Dunn Brothers Coffee, 2471 Fairview Avenue (additional information available at 792-7008); and public meetings scheduled over the next few weeks, including the Roseville Housing & Redevelopment Authority (RHRA) meeting rescheduled from July 22 to July 28, 2014 at 6:00 p.m. at City Hall.

Mayor Roe announced a vacancy on the RHRA for a term ending September 23, 2018; with application deadline of August 7, and interviews scheduled on August 18, 2014 (additional information available on the City's website under "commissions").

5. Recognitions, Donations and Communications

6. Approve Minutes

Comments and corrections to draft minutes had been submitted by the City Council prior to tonight's meeting and those revisions were incorporated into the draft presented in the Council packet.

a. Approve July 14, 2014 Regular Council Meeting Minutes

Regular City Council Meeting

Monday, July 21, 2014

Page 2

Etten moved, McGehee seconded, approval of the Meeting Minutes of July 14, 2014 as amended.

Corrections:

- **Page 10, Lines 14 and 26 (Etten)**
Correct spelling of name to Nancy O'Brien
- **Page 23, Line 15 (McGehee)**
Correct to read: "... Roseville [~~to provide~~] [*already provided*] affordable..."
- **Page 29, Lines 24 – 25 (McGehee)**
Correct to read: "...problem allowing [~~them in~~] office-based campuses as previously discussed, but not straight-forward student housing in these areas as [~~it~~] is currently [*shown*]."

Roll Call

Ayes: McGehee; Willmus; Laliberte; Etten; Roe.

Nays: None.

7. Approve Consent Agenda

At the request of Mayor Roe, City Manager Patrick Trudgeon briefly reviewed those items being considered under the Consent Agenda.

a. Approve Payments

McGehee moved, Etten seconded, approval of the following claims and payments as presented and detailed in the Request for Council Action (RCA) dated July 21, 2014, and attached check register.

ACH Payments	\$615,524.36
74366 - 74443	566,334.66
TOTAL	\$1,181,859.02

Roll Call

Ayes: McGehee; Willmus; Laliberte; Etten; Roe.

Nays: None.

b. Approve Business Licenses & Other Licenses & Permits

McGehee moved, Etten seconded, approval of business license applications for the period of one (1) year, unless otherwise noted, for applicants as listed in the RCA dated July 21, 2014.

Roll Call

Ayes: McGehee; Willmus; Laliberte; Etten; Roe.

Nays: None.

c. Approve 2014 Second Quarter Financial Report

Regular City Council Meeting

Monday, July 21, 2014

Page 3

At the request of Councilmember Laliberte, Finance Director Chris Miller advised that, while not specifically discussed as potential information sought by the Finance Commission, and with all reports a matter of public record and readily available to all, he would still bring this report to the Commission's attention at their next scheduled meeting to determine their interest in receiving it as part of their meeting agenda materials.

McGehee moved, Etten seconded, receipt of the 2014 Second Quarter Financial Report.

Roll Call

Ayes: McGehee; Willmus; Laliberte; Etten; Roe.

Nays: None.

d. Approve a Resolution Delegating Capitol Region Watershed District as the Local Government Unit (LGU)

McGehee moved, Etten seconded, adoption of Resolution No. 11164 (Attachment A) entitled, "A Resolution Regarding the Administration of the Minnesota Wetland Conservation Act;" delegating Capitol Region Watershed District as the Local Government Unit (LGU) administering the Wetland Conservation Act (WCA) with the legal boundaries of the City of Roseville, in accordance with Minnesota Rules, Chapter 8420.

Roll Call

Ayes: McGehee; Willmus; Laliberte; Etten; Roe.

Nays: None.

e. Adopt a Resolution to Accept the Work Completed, Authorize Final Payment and Commence the One-Year Warranty Period on the 2014 Sealcoat Project

As a point of information, Mayor Roe noted that this project had come in over budget as detailed in the RCA, causing the need for staff to reduce the scope of the 2014 sealcoat project accordingly, not accomplishing as many miles as originally intended with this maintenance effort.

McGehee moved, Etten seconded, Adoption of Resolution No. 11165 (Attachment A) entitled, "Final Contract Acceptance – 2014 Sealcoat Project;" initiating the one-year warranty and authorizing final payment of \$11,583.28.

Roll Call

Ayes: McGehee; Willmus; Laliberte; Etten; Roe.

Nays: None.

8. Consider Items Removed from Consent

9. General Ordinances for Adoption

10. Presentations

a. Presentation from Metropolitan Council

Mayor Roe introduced and welcomed Metropolitan Council District 10 Representative Marie McCarthy.

Ms. McCarthy thanked City Manager Trudgeon for his openness in working in partnership with her and the Metropolitan Council.

Ms. McCarthy provided an overview of her representation of twelve communities in Ramsey and Anoka Counties, herself a resident of Blaine, and the status of her term on the Council, which ends this year. As part of that overview, Ms. McCarthy reviewed some of the Metropolitan Council's issues or items affecting the City of Roseville now or in the future.

One of the impacts noted by Ms. McCarthy was the Snelling Avenue BRT as part of the Metropolitan Council's metro-wide transit program, and introduced Metropolitan Transit Senior Planner Katie Roth to provide an update on that project. Ms. McCarthy stated that she hoped to serve as a facilitator in the BRT decision-making process between the Metropolitan Council and Roseville City Council. Ms. McCarthy noted that this was an important issue to the City of Roseville, and reiterated her desire to partner with the community. Ms. McCarthy advised that she had reviewed the City's *Imagine Roseville 2025* community document, and expressed her hope that the Metropolitan Council could help the City execute that vision.

Ms. McCarthy reviewed some of the more recent grant awards from the Metropolitan Council to the City of Roseville over the last eight years, including several for housing projects as well as infrastructure work in the Twin Lakes Redevelopment Area. Ms. McCarthy stated that it was her pleasure to recognize those awards; and assured Councilmembers and staff that the Metropolitan Council considered all grants submitted and their applicable awards.

Regarding Infiltration and Inflow (I&I), Ms. McCarthy advised that, with the recent storms experienced in the metropolitan area and specifically in Roseville, the City would be receiving a letter shortly from the Metropolitan Council addressing and notifying them, along with other communities, of their exceeding maximum allowable rates at that time.

In concluding her comments, Ms. McCarthy offered her availability to the City Council and staff; and her welcoming opportunities to work together.

Katie Roth, AICP, Senior Planner, BRT/Small Starts
(Katie/Roth@metrotransit.org)

Ms. Roth provided an overview of the BRT A-Line along Snelling Avenue, one of twelve planned arterial BRT lines in the metropolitan area, running these buses in mixed traffic with other vehicles with an overall total budget for the project at \$25 million; and intended for initial launch in 2015. Ms. Roth advised that the goal was to provide faster service and more attractive facilities on highest ridership transit routes; and in this case, building upon the strong ridership for the Route 84 service on Snelling Avenue, with current ridership documented at over 4,000 rides/day.

Ms. Roth noted that the intent was to provide service in the most cost-effective and timely manner possible, similar to that of the rail-like experience stations on clearly-delineated platforms set off the curb lines. Ms. Roth noted that Route 84 would continue to run along Snelling every thirty minutes, with the BRT service supplementing that, with stations placed every half-mile based on ridership demand, and available every ten minutes. In order to facilitate this speedier service and make it more functional, Ms. Roth advised that passengers would utilize a “pre-boarding fare payment,” rather than paying upon boarding.

Ms. Roth briefly reviewed the current design process underway; and the most recent rationale and recommendations deferring the previously planned Roselawn at Snelling station. Following extensive preliminary planning and public information and open houses held over the last few years, Ms. Roth reported that those comments had indicated a consistently higher ridership at Hoyt-Nebraska and serving the Job Corp office and other destinations in that area; and supported by average daily boarding activity comparisons from 2010 – 2014. Therefore, Ms. Roth advised that revised feasibility studies addressed citing of a station at that location versus a station at Roselawn and Snelling, even though at the ½ mile mark, but having very low demand documented for ridership, making it hard to continue justifying the Roselawn location. Ms. Roth noted that the revised plan, and station located at Hoyt-Nebraska would serve ten times as many people than both current north and southbound riders using the Roselawn stop.

Ms. Roth advised that, during the planning process, she had shared preliminary plans to-date at that time with the Roseville Public Works, Transportation and Environment Commission in April of 2014; in addition to the four open houses held by the Metropolitan Council in May that included the revised plans; with that revised plan approved by the full Metropolitan Council earlier in July of this year.

Ms. Roth noted that, also based on public comment received during this planning process, not only did participants express a strong confirmation for this new direction; but also, for consideration in the near future of expanding the northern Snelling Avenue BRT north of Rosedale and up to the TCAAP redevelopment area in Arden Hills. Given the public interest and support for that expansion, Ms. Roth advised that Metropolitan Transit anticipated preliminary studies this summer with kick-off meetings for the public, and to consult with primary employers and

educational institutions along that extended area to determine their needs and the role of transit. As part of that working group, Ms. Roth advised that ridership evaluations and technical concept evaluations would be performed, with participation by staff in affected communities along Snelling Avenue North. However, Ms. Roth clarified that there was no timeline for implementation of that future extension available at this time.

Ms. Roth reviewed the next steps in the process as it moves forward, including seeking approval by MnDOT for the Snelling Avenue layout and modification plans. Ms. Roth advised that, while the Roselawn station is not included in these most recent plans, it did not mean that it was precluded from future construction, as construction costs were reviewed and could be incorporated into the available budget and funding. However, Ms. Roth noted that revenues could not grow, and therefore the intent was to look to tighten versus expanding the scope of the overall project. Ms. Roth advised that the final design was intended for completion this fall for submission to MnDOT; and construction anticipated in the spring of 2015 and opening by year-end 2015.

Discussion

Councilmember McGehee noted that, when this BRT route along Snelling Avenue was originally planned, the light rail Green Line was not in play. However, she noted that she was aware of interest from potential riders in her immediate area desiring a Roselawn stop to get them to the U of MN Minneapolis campus. While understanding the rationale in needing a stop by the Job Corps office, Councilmember McGehee opined that by now having the potential for the BRT to the LRT it would make a significant difference in ridership being served; and offered her strong support for a station at Roselawn and Snelling Avenues. Councilmember McGehee stated she was not aware of the financial, shelter costs, and/or time cost to the line for this stop, she noted the number of riders of which she was aware who currently relied on walkers or were otherwise handicapped, opining that this station and ten minute service would be an opportunity for those riders to have appropriate shelter versus the current bench situation.

In addition, since the BRT line will mix with arterial traffic, Councilmember McGehee questioned how those buses could or would control traffic signals along Snelling Avenue.

In addressing Councilmember McGehee's comments related to connection to the Green Line, Ms. Roth advised that ridership forecasts had been included in the planning process, and while current ridership was expected to increase, the current low density of riders in the Roselawn area didn't not indicate the need now or in the future – with projections out to the year 2030 – for providing a station there even with rail service in place.

Specific to traffic signal controls, Ms. Roth confirmed that the design issue was ongoing and how and when to incorporate transit system priorities. However, Ms. Roth noted that where those pre-empts were installed at signals, the communication would only be to request a few extra seconds of green light after boarding, or allowing for an early start on a green light. Reiterating that this was still in the design stage, Ms. Roth advised that Met Council staff continued to work with Ramsey County, MnDOT and City of Roseville staff as to how and if to incorporate pre-emption abilities at some lights and what form it would take.

Councilmember McGehee suggested, if a station was not in the picture for Roselawn, a standard shelter be provided for those still using the Route 84 bus and having to wait for thirty minutes to do so on that corner in order to make a connection to the Green Line LRT, addressing safety and inclement weather issues for those riders.

Ms. Roth referred that request to the City's Public Works Department, noting that they were responsible for shelter placement at stops, not Metropolitan Transit. While there was a minimum boarding threshold to consider when it was appropriate to place a shelter, typically between 25 to 40 people per day depending on the locale and density of that area, Ms. Roth reiterated that it would be up to the City to determine where shelters were appropriate.

Under those circumstances, Councilmember McGehee asked if Ms. McCarthy, as the City of Roseville's Metropolitan Council representative, would be willing to see if there were any grant possibilities for installation of a bus shelter in that location.

Ms. McCarthy responded that she took note as to whether there may be funding available for a shelter, and would report back to City Manager Trudgeon for disseminating that information to the City Council.

Mayor Roe further clarified that the City worked through a franchisee on shelter locations, and staff could perform due diligence on such a possibility.

With the BRT project replacing existing shelters at Snelling and County Road B and Har Mar Mall, Ms. Roth suggested that there may be an opportunity to work with the City's franchisee to relocate those existing shelters to other locations within the City of Roseville.

While recognizing the cost of the station was determined by their different features, amenities and sizes, Mayor Roe asked Ms. Roth for a general range of costs for each station.

Ms. Roth responded that, while the cost estimates were still being refined, based on planning level estimates and not having done any similar projects in this region

before, on the whole, average stations costs for a pair of north/south platforms was estimated between \$300,000 and \$600,000. Ms. Roth noted that a large portion of that cost is for communication and electrical infrastructure costs and preparing concrete platforms versus current bus stops on grassy strips along roadways.

Councilmember Willmus expressed his concerns, as well as those of many Roseville residents and those traversing the community, with current signal timing, especially at County Roads B and C at Snelling Avenue, and existing inefficiencies of traffic flow along those east/west corridors during am and pm peaks, which was significantly encumbered. Councilmember Willmus questioned if there was some way to mitigate that situation as part of this process, but certainly not to further negatively impact it with BRT transit signal priorities.

Ms. Roth advised that, during their evaluation process, it had been determined that some of those east/west arterials functioned as relievers for Highway 36, especially County Road B and Larpenteur Avenue, and therefore were not slated for any consideration for a signal priority system for the BRT service. Ms. Roth noted that part of the rationale for and goal of BRT service was to move traffic as quickly as possible, not to further delay it; therefore, she clarified that there were no plans for any installation of pre-empt capabilities at those intersections.

Councilmember Laliberte thanked Ms. Roth for her presentation, which she opined much better addressed those planning issues she'd been privy to over the last 18 months as liaison for the City with the Metropolitan Council. Councilmember Laliberte noted that she'd heard from several residents who were upset with the deferral of the Roselawn stop, and advised that many of those residents had not attended the Metropolitan Council's open houses, as the Roselawn stop had been included in the original plans, and therefore saw no reason to advocate for it. Having attended the open house held at the library in January of 2014, and heard the considerable interest expressed by residents and those attending in the Job Corps Station and their organized advocacy for that station, Councilmember Laliberte opined that they were able to receive attention.

Given the current ridership, Councilmember Laliberte questioned the need to push for a resolution of support for the Roselawn station versus a station at Hoyt-Nebraska. Also, while not wanting to diminish the importance of extending the line north along Snelling Avenue to serve a ridership density from the colleges along that line, which she was a definite proponent for, Councilmember Laliberte also expressed her desire to not communicate to single-family residence dwellers that transit for them wasn't just as important.

Councilmember Etten agreed that, if the budget was fixed, it was hard to argue with a station at Hoyt-Nebraska. However, even though Route 84 would continue to operate and provide a connection to the Green LRT Line, Councilmember Et-

ten expressed his frustration with the rationale and noted that the minimal amount of money spent per station for the BRT compared to other transit improvements and costs being implemented around the metro area, especially when it provided a direct benefit to Roseville and catalyst for future TCAAP development and enhancing traffic flow in the northern suburbs.

In addition to the previous comments of Councilmember Willmus, Councilmember McGehee opined that Roselawn Avenue also served as a reliever for Highway 36; and agreed with the comments of Councilmember Etten that this BRT line was important to the City of Roseville and those riders connecting with the Green LRT Line. Councilmember McGehee stated that constituents in this area were interested across the board in connectivity within their urban metropolitan environment, whether pathway connections, BRT, LRT or other options. Councilmember McGehee noted that consideration should be given to the most ideal way to address riders, whether handicapped or not, to provide that connectivity around the suburbs as well as to both downtown St. Paul and Minneapolis.

Councilmember McGehee stated that she would personally like to lobby for a bus shelter at a minimum at Roselawn and Snelling Avenues and to pursue that with whatever entity necessary.

While appreciating the forecasting provided by the Metropolitan Council and referenced in bench handouts, Councilmember McGehee questioned if the density, growth and population modeling used was any more accurate than that of area traffic studies. In the thirty years she'd lived in Roseville, Councilmember McGehee opined that the modeling and its methodology continued to be inaccurate based on a thorough review of historical information; and suggested using a more accurate modeling system or equation than the current model, questioning if the modeling was any more accurate in other communities, since it wasn't accurate based on Roseville's history.

Since the City of Roseville was essentially built out, and development only available on certain sites as infill, and also referencing the bench handouts, Councilmember Etten asked if that status was taken into consideration when forecasting future projections, such as an estimated 15% increase in Roseville's population. Councilmember Etten noted that Roseville currently had a variety of housing types, some currently being constructed or proposed in the immediate future; however, he opined that the projections indicated a very considerable increase given that the community was already 97% to 98% built out. Councilmember Etten opined that he continued to struggle with how those projections were arrived at; and questioned where all the people would come from or how Roseville could accommodate that many more people as forecast.

Councilmember Laliberte echoed the comments of Councilmembers McGehee and Etten related to the projected growth with Roseville being built out. Coun-

councilmember Laliberte referenced results of the recently completed community survey and the expressions of seniors in Roseville wanting to age in place in their homes for as long as possible, but then impacting the turnover of those homes to facilitate the projections from the Metropolitan Council anticipating their move into multi-family units. Councilmember Laliberte noted that those senior residents area staying put; as well as survey data supporting that other people are interested in moving into Roseville, and also others wanting to stay in Roseville. Councilmember Laliberte stated that she was unsure if that same impact was being found in other cities, or if it was unique to Roseville.

Councilmember Willmus agreed with comments of his colleagues, and expressed his curiosity in learning more about the modeling methodology used by the Metropolitan Council, given the fact that Roseville has had a relatively stable population for a significant amount of time as noted in the bench handouts. When reviewing the household projections for Roseville over that time, Councilmember Willmus opined that the Metropolitan Council figures had continued to be significantly overstated. As noted by Councilmember Etten, Councilmember Willmus agreed that Roseville was a built out community; and questioned where additional units were supposed to go, by building up, or how the modeling attempted to facilitate that growth. Councilmember Willmus requested additional background information on modeling and methodologies used by the Metropolitan Council.

Councilmember McGehee further noted that there was continual turnover of homes in Roseville, but much of that turnover involved empty nesters moving into Roseville into existing housing stock, as it provided single-level homes on smaller lots with yards that were manageable for the senior population. Given the country's demographics, Councilmember McGehee opined that the City of Roseville had more than sufficient clientele for its existing housing stock; and noted that over 40% of Roseville's population was over the age of 50. Councilmember McGehee opined that it was important for the Metropolitan Council to be aware of that, but also to take into consideration the fact that – as verified in the community survey – people want what they now have, and were not seeking another option. Councilmember McGehee opined that this information was important to the City and the integrity and unity of the Roseville community.

Councilmember Laliberte, in referencing projections for employment and population, noted the current work being done by the RHRA over the last year with business retention efforts; and invited Metropolitan Council representatives/staff to become familiar with that as well and the concerted efforts being taken, even though the community was fully developed and didn't have a lot of room to meet new projects.

Specific to the conversation about projections and modeling, City Manager Trudgeon advised that the Metropolitan Council had adopted new forecasting models in the recent past; which made more sense to him. City Manager Trudgeon

eon further noted that, in addition to the national census updated every ten years, other periodic updates were completed to enhance that census data and provide better accuracy to models and projections. City Manager Trudgeon also reminded that population projections in a built out community may indicate a need to build up or convert existing areas, but clarified that Roseville also had one of the lowest homes to occupant ratios in the metropolitan area. As dynamics change in the future and with the latest generation and 2040 projections, City Manager Trudgeon opined that natural changes could impact those forecasts, but he found the current models being used by the Metropolitan Council more accurate than in the past; and offered to share that methodology information with the City Council as requested.

Mayor Roe agreed with the comments of City Manager Trudgeon, especially about the low number of people per household in Roseville, opining that it was potentially possible for the City to absorb the projected growth by just adding one more person per household to 1/3 of the existing households. While current demographics may not always work out, Mayor Roe emphasized the need as policy-makers to understand that there was no need to fear population growth as long as the density was manageable; and that while a bigger problem and ongoing concern, with higher density always a fearful topic, it was important to work through that process. Mayor Roe suggested an important thing to consider as macro projections of the metro area and its future growth was modeled, was to determine how it filtered down to individual communities and the challenges apparent in those specifics and to understand all the issues involved.

Specific to City Manager Trudgeon's comment, Councilmember Willmus clarified that he was looking at the figures for number of household units versus population.

As mentioned by City Manager Trudgeon, Ms. McCarthy recognized that projections were recently reviewed and different models implemented and adjusted. However, Ms. McCarthy assured Councilmembers that she had heard their comments and concerns; and would take them with her and under consideration. If Mr. Trudgeon could not provide the current Metropolitan Council modeling formula, Ms. McCarthy stated that she would be happy to provide it to City Manager Trudgeon for distribution to the City Council.

In conclusion, Mayor Roe stated that the some neighborhoods in Roseville had continued to experience negative issues with rental properties in the community managed by the Met Council and with particular tenants, requiring continuing communication with managers of that program at the Met Council. Mayor Roe noted that this created ongoing frustration in attempting resolution with several of those properties; and asked Ms. McCarthy to serve as a resource for the community to facilitate those issues and their resolution, and work with neighborhood representatives as their advocate.

Ms. McCarthy duly noted that request and offered to look into the situation and see what avenues were available for her in facilitating this resolution.

Mayor Roe thanked Ms. McCarthy and Ms. Roth for their attendance and their informative presentations.

b. Approve a Resolution of Support for the Installation of Bus Rapid Transit Station at Snelling and Roselawn Avenues

Councilmember Laliberte opined that it was fine for the City to adopt resolutions of support to affect change; however, in this case, she didn't see that such a resolution would accomplish anything in reinstating the Roselawn station on the BRT line. Since Ms. Roth indicated that the Roselawn station was not being eliminated completely, Councilmember Laliberte offered to provide that update to the residents have expressed their concerns to her; and suggested that the resolution not be pursued at this time, but thanked staff for taking time to draft the resolution of support. Councilmember Laliberte suggested focusing on benefits of extending the BRT line further north on Snelling Avenue beyond Rosedale and up to TCAAP.

Councilmember McGehee reiterated her advocacy for a shelter on Roselawn Avenue at Snelling; duly noted by Mayor Roe and directed to City Manager Trudgeon and staff.

While the Roselawn station was not proposed for funding at this time, Mayor Roe expressed his hope that future ridership could prove that it is needed and would be used more heavily.

Specific to Councilmember Etten's comments, Councilmember McGehee noted that this was one of the first transit improvement made for the northern suburbs, and while the City of Roseville should be happy with those efforts and that the Roselawn station was not completely erased from consideration, she was confident that the Green LRT Line would provide significant draw and that station would be reconsidered.

Speaking to the overall transit topic, Mayor Roe noted that the Rice Street corridor was another significant issue and would enhance connectivity issues in the northern suburbs. Mayor Roe noted the concerted efforts of northeast area suburbs in providing focus to decision-makers and making them aware of the problems, including the efforts of the area Chamber of Commerce.

Councilmember McGehee noted the lack of a pathway to access a bus stop on Roselawn and Snelling from Larpenteur and Snelling without circumventing Skillman Avenue and Har Mar Mall traffic and navigating six lanes of traffic to do so. Councilmember McGehee opined that it was not a trivial issue to get to

other stops other than at Snelling and Roselawn; and ridership may be impacted accordingly.

Mayor Roe suggested that the City look at those connections as well.

11. Public Hearings

a. Public Hearing to Consider the Transfer of On-Sale and Sunday Intoxicating Liquor Licenses to Red Lobster Hospitality, LLC (Red Lobster #0154)

Finance Director Chris Miller briefly summarized the purpose of this Public Hearing for transfer of the On-Sale and Sunday Intoxicating Liquor Licenses at Red Lobster on 2330 Prior Avenue, due to a change in ownership effective July 28, 2014. As detailed in the RCA, Mr. Miller advised that all requirements had been met, and staff recommended approval.

Mayor Roe opened and closed the Public Hearing at approximately 7:03 p.m., with no one appearing for or against.

12. Budget Items

13. Business Items (Action Items)

a. Approve the Transfer of On-Sale and Sunday

McGehee moved, Etten seconded, approval of the transfer of the On-Sale and Sunday Liquor Licenses to Red Lobster Hospitality, LLC for the remainder of the 2014 calendar year.

Roll Call

Ayes: McGehee; Willmus; Laliberte; Etten; Roe.

Nays: None.

Recess

Mayor Roe recessed the meeting at approximately 7:05 p.m. and reconvened at approximately 7:06 p.m.

b. Consider the Use of Pooled Tax Increment for the Dale Street Fire Station Redevelopment

Mayor Roe welcomed RHRA Executive Director Jeanne Kelsey, and congratulated her on her promotion.

RHRA Executive Director Kelsey briefly summarized this request for City Council consideration of using pooled tax increment for the Dale Street Fire Station

Redevelopment project, as detailed in the RCA. Ms. Kelsey advised that, while final project costs and development agreement have yet to be finalized, Ms. Kelsey advised that the projected financing gap had already been reduced some (Attachment B); and the attempt was to cover all costs incurred by the RHRA associated with carrying the property, including paying the City for the fire station site, demolition of the building and any additional miscellaneous land costs. Ms. Kelsey reported that the final development agreement would include a “look back” clause to revise cost-share allocations, if homes sell higher than projected. Ms. Kelsey further noted that the property transfer would not occur until after development and approval of the development agreement and any further reductions in financial assistance for the project; with some additional gaps still being determined and their actual impacts.

At the discretion of the City Council, Ms. Kelsey sought their support for reimbursing the RHRA for these expenses from pooled tax increments, through adoption of the resolution as drafted and included as Attachment C to the RCA.

Councilmember McGehee noted that these two tax increment financing (TIF) districts were about to expire anyway, and since older districts allowed funds to be used in other development areas, while newer districts did not, based on her understanding if the City didn’t use these funds within 1-2 years as applicable, taxing jurisdictions would get money back but the City would actually lose funds. Therefore, Councilmember McGehee opined that it was important to understand why these two districts and pooled increments were being considered in particular.

If the “look back” clause came forward in the future, Councilmember McGehee stated that she would like to see the RHRA and City paid first; and further stated that she would encourage the developer to build higher quality homes to increase their market value and sales prices to increase that profit if possible; and expressed her support in any excess funds coming the RHRA and City first.

In an effort to clarify the developer fee at \$618,000, Mayor Roe sought information from Ms. Kelsey on how much of that was attributed to gap financing.

Ms. Kelsey responded that calculations were not done that way, and gap funding of the developer fee was nil, and only addressing the price of the land and price point, with a portion of the gap due to the City’s and RHRA’s preference for less density and therefore facilitating that preference in assisting with the financing; but only using reimbursement of land costs from TIF pools.

As mentioned by Councilmember McGehee, and for the benefit of the public, Mayor Roe noted that if TIF balances remaining in these districts were not used for this purpose, any remaining balances would be roughly allocated with 1/3 of

the money going to the City and the remainder going to the other taxing jurisdictions, with the City not seeing the entire \$1.2 million under those circumstances.

Ms. Kelsey responded affirmatively to Mayor Roe's comments.

No one appeared for public comment related to this item.

Councilmember Willmus expressed his appreciation in having reached this point given the long process involving significant neighborhood planning and focus. Given the considerable comment heard throughout the community by the City Council and RHRA related to density, Councilmember Willmus opined that by the City providing for less density on the site, this TIF tool allowed for it; and expressed his full support of accomplishing that goal and in supporting this recommendation.

Willmus moved, McGehee seconded, adoption of Resolution No. 11166 (Attachment C) entitled, "Resolution Approving Use of Pooled Tax Increment for Land Acquisition and Demolition in Connection with Redevelopment;" ratifying use of Tax Increment Financing (TIF) Districts No. 10 and 12 to help with the acquisition and demolition costs associated with the redevelopment of the Dale Street Fire Station site and adjoining Roseville Housing & Redevelopment (RHRA) properties.

Councilmember McGehee seconded the remarks of Councilmember Willmus; opining that it was very important to the neighborhood and their satisfaction with the outcome and selected modeling as done throughout this process; and spoke in support of using TIF in this instance to address those neighborhood desires.

Mayor Roe spoke in support of the resolution, and the use of this pooled TIF balance outside their districts, since that option was no longer available in other districts with legislative changes implemented several years ago. Mayor Roe noted the positive step in having acquired this accumulated increment for a purpose such as this since it was no longer an available tool.

Roll Call

Ayes: McGehee; Willmus; Laliberte; Etten; Roe.

Nays: None.

c. Approve the PRELIMINARY PLAT of the Property at 301-303 S Owasso Boulevard in to Five Residential Lots

Senior Planner Bryan Lloyd briefly reviewed this requested action, as detailed in the RCA. Mr. Lloyd advised that the recommended conditions referenced in the Planning Commission meeting minutes of July 9, 2014 were no longer relevant, as the applicant had met those requirements and therefore, were no longer part of

the requested approval, with the exception of receipt of the park dedication fee in lieu of land.

Councilmember McGehee expressed concern in the location of the wetland to lots and sought additional information on protections to prevent pollutants and provide a buffer along that wetland as part of this plan; and whether such stipulations could be included as part of the approval, or ensure conservation easements continued to run with the lots. Councilmember McGehee also expressed concern with contamination of the wetland from lawn fertilizers. Councilmember McGehee also expressed concerns, from her personal viewing of the site, that adequate drainage for basements was regulated.

Mr. Lloyd advised that, while he was unable to speak to non-public easements, there were setback requirements in place under various authorizing agencies to address the location of buildings and/or fences as well as for sidewalks, patios, and paved surfaces that were exclusive to properties adjacent to or abutting wetlands. Mr. Lloyd further noted that a natural area buffer requirement also addressed that issue; and whether enforcement was a function of City Code beyond the Zoning Code where it was not addressed, or whether it was a function of the Watershed District, all applicable setbacks and lot coverage requirements would be addressed by one or both of those regulating bodies during the permit process. While not addressing engineering requirements, Mr. Lloyd noted that the City's Zoning Code provided a minimum requirement for floor elevations to ensure basements or the lowest level of a structure was at a minimum of 2' above the water table to address drainage concerns.

At the request of Councilmember McGehee, City Engineer Marc Culver confirmed that the City could access the lots to address any pooling or drainage problems in the future. At the request of Mayor Roe, Mr. Lloyd confirmed that drainage easements would be in place accordingly.

Councilmember Etten expressed his appreciation for including a master agreement for maintenance of common areas (e.g. rain basins) on the front end as developers work with staff to make consideration for that and have those elements included in an agreement. Councilmember Etten questioned the short- and long-term plans for the berm shown in the NE corner and discussions held at the Planning Commission level; and whether it would eventually go away.

Mr. Lloyd advised that it was not intended that it would go away, but probably not be a very significant berm in the end, as described during Planning Commission public comments and deliberations. Mr. Lloyd reviewed the purpose of the berm based on the challenges in developing this site due to traditionally poor soils. However, with new engineering technologies today, Mr. Lloyd advised that the developer was confident they could work with those soils; but other than hauling them away during the construction process, those soils could be bermed and

relocated to other areas during the grading and construction process, and due to the nature of those soils, could eventually be compacted to a much smaller area than suggested in the current grading plan.

Councilmember Etten noted discussion in the RCA regarding tree loss and/or preservation and impacts over this huge area; questioning the need to remove trees in order to plow dirt to develop the site for homes, and at what point it was indicated to leave trees along the wetland. Councilmember Etten opined that, if trees were disturbed along that wetland, they would eventually have to be removed due to damages during construction. Councilmember Etten questioned if the purpose for redoing the elevation was due to water quality concerns for homes to be constructed, or simply to remove soils; and how those two pieces would affect the overall development and tree preservation.

Mr. Lloyd referenced the tree survey as part of Attachment C to the RCA that indicated the trees remaining and those to be removed and species list by size.

Councilmember Etten noted that this brought up recent City Council discussions as to which trees were or were not preferred.

Mayor Roe noted that revisions to the tree ordinance were currently under discussion; but for purposes of this application, the City Council needed to make their decisions based on the current tree preservation ordinance. Mayor Roe opined that the aerial map as displayed showed significant areas of open space that may help in the overall tree preservation effort as well.

Specific to the anticipated height of the NE berm, after further discussion, it was determined from map contour lines that it was approximately 908' with an actual grade increase of 8' to 10'.

Specific to the nature of the soils on the site, Mr. Lloyd deferred to the applicant when recognized for comment by Mayor Roe.

Councilmember McGehee opined that building an 8' tall berm out of clay was not a good thing and there would be no growth possible on it, and it would only serve to shed water toward the homes and/or wetland. If the intent of the berm was to avoid hauling dirt off-site, Councilmember McGehee agreed with Councilmember Etten's comment that cutting down trees to heap dirt for no aesthetic reason and not for preservation purposes was not prudent given the clay soils in Roseville.

Councilmember Laliberte, in looking at the July 9, 2014 Planning Commission meeting minutes, questioned the assignment of homeowner maintenance to Lots 3 and 4 for rain garden maintenance; opining that it should be assigned to lots 2 and 3.

It was determined that this was a typographical error on those meeting minutes and should be corrected accordingly to assign maintenance of the rain gardens to Lots 2 and 3 versus Lots 3 and 4, and was duly noted by staff.

Overall, Councilmember Etten expressed appreciation to the developer for returning with a reduced lot density fitting zoning code, and expressed his hope that the lots work well for the proposed homes.

Developers Dean Hanson, Hanson Builders and Partner of Landmark of Roseville, LLC along with Nathan Fair, Partner of Landmark of Roseville, LLC

At the invitation of Mayor Roe, Mr. Hanson provided a presentation of the proposed development and examples for exterior and interior home designs; and then responded to questions and comments of the City Council.

In light of the City Council's discussion at their July 7, 2014 meeting, Mr. Hanson requested their consideration of a garage exception for their designs for this plat, by allowing the garage to be forward of the home façade by 5'. Mr. Hanson recognized that this was working its way through the system, but would probably not be available in time for their development to proceed.

At the request of Mayor Roe, Mr. Hanson focused his presentation and discussion on the plat itself.

Specific to the required buffer zone, and displaying the proposed plat, Mr. Hanson assured that the wetland would be protected from manicured grass areas; with the developer installing posts all around that buffer zone so homeowners would be aware of the limits for placing their sod or yards.

Specific to basement elevations, Mr. Hanson assured Councilmembers that it was certainly in their best interest to ensure dry basements as one of their most important tasks as a developer/builder; causing them to be very careful in their engineering process to make sure there was proper drainage and movement of water.

Specific to trees on the site, Mr. Hanson referenced the aerial photo, noting that the proposed NE berm area currently consisted of an open garden area with smaller trees, many of which had been tagged for preservation. Mr. Hanson assured Councilmembers of their intent to meet the City Ordinance requirements for tree preservation, as well as the addition of a lot of new trees.

Regarding the berm and why it was proposed, Mr. Hanson reviewed the process and current technologies for relocating existing soils and their specific uses on site versus importing or exporting soils to or from the site. Mr. Hanson advised that they anticipated using 90% plus of soils available on the site by flip/flopping soils to make development of this challenging site more feasible and less expensive. Mr. Hanson reviewed the "borrow area" and soil testing to determine the best

soils for the most suitable use and area with clay soils serving best for foundations on which structures were placed; and compacted well for those building pads. Mr. Hanson assured Councilmembers that black soil would be used on top of any other soils to ensure proper growth and drainage to make these homes as aesthetically pleasing as possible for effective marketing and interest by potential buyers. While comments were made that the site seemed too low related to the wetland, Mr. Hanson advised that part of the dirt excavated would be located in the borrow pit and used to build up building pads to raise them, but in the interim, the soil had to be stored someplace, and thus the NE berm, not due to intentionally bringing in additional soils to the site; with the developer's intent to use up all the dirt possible for their various purposes. Mr. Hanson opined that, depending on how they compacted the soils back in, the NE berm could be smaller than indicated or even become non-existent; but assured Councilmembers that it would not create any drainage issues for the wetland or homes. Mr. Hanson further assured that all drainage issues would be addressed through the rain gardens and contained within the site itself.

Mr. Hanson opined that the Owasso Boulevard berm would provide a great aesthetic approaching the site.

Councilmember Willmus expressed appreciation to Mr. Hanson for the explanation and understood the developer's rationale; but noted that his presentation indicated he would be bringing some materials on site for construction of slabs and radon mitigation; to which Mr. Hanson agreed.

Mr. Hanson responded to Councilmember Willmus that residual soils would be used as applicable around the building pads and to achieve finished heights; and assured that the 908' elevation of the berm as shown on the grading plan would not be built to that height as plans became more final.

At the request of Councilmember McGehee, Mr. Hanson further reviewed their intent to address clay soils and mitigate surface drainage; and defined good and bad soils from the perspective of a builder/developer and their particular uses on a construction site. Mr. Hanson reiterated that a critical aspect of the building process was to ensure for all proper heights and properly sloped water drainage.

In response to concerns expressed by Councilmember Etten as to the 908' height of the berm, which he found extreme, Mr. Hanson advised that their intent was to put as much soil into the site as feasible and as a builder he was not going to accept a high berm; but as a developer he wanted to ensure beautiful yards and beautiful homes; not to create an aesthetic reflecting a "burial mound."

Specific to gradients of the site adjacent to wetlands and water control during and after construction as expressed by Councilmember Etten, Mr. Hanson advised that all water movement calculations now existing were related to current movement;

and the developer engineering plan was intended to make sure there was no change or increase in that water movement, but as hard surfaces were installed (e.g. roofs, driveways, etc.) calculations would reflect those changes to ensure there would be no alteration in the direction of water flow.

Councilmember Etten opined that the water may go in the same direction, but it would certainly have more velocity with the revised grading on the site; and if heavy rains occurred during the construction process, that water would all flow into the wetland. Therefore, Councilmember Etten requested assurances that short-term silt fences were installed; as well as addressing long-term water movement at a higher rate and appropriate drainage.

Mayor Roe noted that the City required a grading permit that would initiate their monitoring of the process and any mitigation required.

Mr. Fair responded that with blanket and mulching, better drainage and vegetation would occur within the first growing year; as well as relocating contaminated soils and making sure that the site was completely cleaned up, without erosion issues; and providing a much more aesthetically pleasing than its current condition.

Mayor Roe assured Mr. Hanson and Mr. Fair that the City would be monitoring that as well; and advised that the City was aware of the garage design issue and would keep their request in mind.

No one appeared to speak for or against this project.

Etten moved, McGehee seconded, approved the proposed Owasso Preserve PRELIMINARY PLAT of the property at 301-303 S Owasso Boulevard; based on the findings and recommendations of the Planning Commission and detail of the RCA dated July 21, 2014; subject to a Park Dedication Fee, pursuant to City Code, Section 1103.07, in the amount of \$7,000 prior to the signed Final Plat being released to Ramsey County for recording purposes; ***amended (Willmus) to accept park dedication cash in lieu of land in the amount of \$7,000 to be made by the applicant before the signed final plat is released to Ramsey County for recording.***

Councilmember McGehee suggested addressing the garage design as part of this approval; with City Attorney Mark Gaughan advising that this would not be legally applicable to this motion.

City Manager Trudgeon concurred; advising that the developer would need to apply for a variance to incorporate that design change; however, he anticipated that the revised ordinance language would come before the City Council for consideration and possible action at their August 11, 2014 meeting.

Roll Call

Ayes: McGehee; Willmus; Laliberte; Etten; Roe.

Nays: None.

d. Approve the FINAL PLAT of the Property at 301-303 S Owasso Boulevard into Five Residential Lots

Mr. Lloyd briefly reviewed this request, as detailed in the RCA.

Etten moved, Laliberte seconded, adoption of Resolution No. 11167 (Attachment B) entitled, "A Resolution Approving the FINAL PLAT of Owasso Preserve (PF14-016);" *including acceptance of a park dedication cash in lieu of land in the amount of \$7,000 to be made by the applicant before the signed final plat is released to Ramsey County for recording.*

Councilmember Willmus thanked the developer for reducing the lot density for this project.

Councilmember McGehee thanked the developer for information provided previously related to garage setbacks.

Roll Call

Ayes: McGehee; Willmus; Laliberte; Etten; Roe.

Nays: None.

14. Business Items – Presentations/Discussions

a. Presentation on the Twin Lakes Area Benefit Analysis and Cost Allocation

City Engineer Marc Culver presented information outlining the methodology being used to define benefit and fund improvements in the Twin Lakes Redevelopment Area.

Through displayed maps, and through presentation materials, Mr. Culver identified transportation improvements in place or still needed to support proposed development, as originally identified in the Alternative Urban Areawide Review (AUAR) in 2001, and updated in 2007, but subsequently allowed to expire.

Mr. Culver identified three key improvement areas identified for near-term construction; and advised that a feasibility study was proposed identifying those costs and benefits for area properties. Those proposed improvement areas are identified as follows.

• I-35W Northbound at Cleveland Avenue Interchange

Mr. Culver addressed federal funds awarded to-date to cover up to \$1.2 million (80%) of the \$1.5 million total costs; and anticipated construction to begin in 2015, contingent upon approval of the feasibility study by the City Council at their August 11, 2014 meeting.

- **Twin Lakes Parkway Extension**

Mr. Culver noted that the Parkway was currently constructed to Prior Avenue; and reviewed further estimated extension costs, federal funding received for right-of-way acquisition. Mr. Culver anticipated the extension to Fairview Avenue as soon as 2015; and noted that the extension would include traffic controls at Fairview Avenue and Twin Lakes Parkway and Terrace Drive.

- **Traffic Signal at County Road C-2 and Cleveland Avenue**

Mr. Culver advised that this improvement was necessary for further redevelopment including the existing Metro transit parking ramp; and anticipated costs of \$500,000, which would provide significant benefit to existing uses on the west side of Cleveland Avenue.

In order to assign benefit and cost allocation, Mr. Culver reviewed optional assessments under Minnesota State Statute Chapter 429 and the current City of Roseville Special Assessment Policy.

Mr. Culver addressed calculations based on trips = benefit and how trip generation was based on assumed highest and best use for a parcel as well as potential land use over an entire area at average trip rate calculations and average floor area (AFR) ratios used to determine the total number of trips for each parcel and their highest and best use. Mr. Culver reviewed calculations with the existing land use plan in defining parcels at 26% of parcel size for commercial/office use and 30% total parcel size for industrial use. Mr. Culver clarified that it remained unknown what the actual land use would end up on any individual parcel, but based on average trip rate calculations, with the average FAR used to calculate the number of trips from each parcel and then distribute that across the area for pm peak hour trips. Mr. Culver provided a general example using a 3/7 acre parcel along Cleveland Avenue.

In accordance with City Policy, Mr. Culver reviewed the appraisal process for proving benefit and showing an increase in value of at least the proposed assessment; with any properties assigned a higher benefit only assessed for the appraised benefit amount. Mr. Culver noted that this could create gaps in actual versus calculated benefits, with that cost borne by the City and funding options (e.g. TIF funds) identified as appropriate.

Mr. Culver identified benefit areas by map and reviewed how traffic was modeled throughout the areas and trip distribution using that model by tracking how many trips from each parcel went through each proposed improvement area, which determined the area of benefit and which parcels paid for each improvement.

Regarding the next steps with direction by the City Council, Mr. Culver advised that staff intended to meet with property owners this fall, followed by a feasibility study; with eventual levying of assessments as individual improvements are com-

pleted. Based on the current anticipated schedule, Mr. Culver suggested the first improvement be the County Road C-2 signal; and then proposed levying all three improvements in 2016.

Discussion

At the request of Councilmember Etten, Mr. Culver provided information on how the benefit area had been determined by looking at an origin destination study from a certain point and then proceeding accordingly. Mr. Culver advised that staff looked closely at the dividing line in using the model to best determine how far the benefit area extended to both tank farms and the clear break defined from that model and based on their current traffic patterns and flow.

Councilmember Willmus opined for the benefit of City Manager Trudgeon, that he didn't see much difference in this proposed process than that of the previous overlay district; and by taking out the Chapter 429 process, it seemed to accomplish the same thing.

City Manager Trudgeon advised that this remained a work in progress; but through the Chapter 429 process and definitive benefit test, it provided solid ground from which to work from; and in those areas that didn't work out, alternative funding may need to be identified or projects scaled back accordingly, using the trip generation model based on land use.

Councilmember Willmus cautioned that the City and property owner appraisals and any discrepancies would result in delayed development as they sat in court rooms for the next fifteen years awaiting a determination.

Mr. Culver suggested that, through spreading out the costs among property owners it provided the City with the ability through State law and City Code to expand those costs beyond just abutting properties to other benefitting properties based on the benefit test. As the improvement moved further out in the benefit area, Mr. Culver noted that those outer parcels would experience a much reduced assessment than those abutting properties based on preliminary projections, with the cost to smaller parcels in those outlying areas not that significant. Mr. Culver noted that the question remains of whether property owners see the benefit and be willing to pay or prefer to fight the cost even though receiving benefit from the improvement. Referencing Mr. Trudgeon's comment, the City would have to prove the benefit on all those properties within the benefit area.

At the request of Mayor Roe, Mr. Culver reiterated that staff intended to have preliminary conversations with all property owners in the benefit area, and planned to do so yet this fall.

Regular City Council Meeting

Monday, July 21, 2014

Page 24

Specific to the Cleveland Avenue Northbound Ramp Influence Area, Councilmember McGehee noted the moneys already received through grants or WalMart, and questioned if all other properties would be assessed.

Mr. Culver responded that they would not; and only actual costs (e.g. project development and construction costs, and consultant fees) would be assessed after all other revenues were included.

Councilmember McGehee opined that the City had been down this road quite a few times already; and further opined that, if she was a property owner, she would not be very pleased with this assessment prospect. Councilmember McGehee questioned why this was being pursued as a City policy; and agreed with Councilmember Willmus' comments that this was not constructive and only served to put the City in an adversarial position with the businesses it was trying to reach out to. Councilmember McGehee stated that she was no more impressed with this model than with those models used by the Metropolitan Council.

City Manager Trudgeon reviewed the challenges being faced by staff: the need to complete the infrastructure improvements to facilitate development; and no TIF balances remaining to pay for those improvements. Mr. Trudgeon noted that several different methods and revenue sources had been used to-date on projects already completed; but it now came down to the need to build the roads to ensure development in Twin Lakes was addressed in accordance with the AUAR or basic common sense. In order to do so, Mr. Trudgeon stated the need for funding mechanisms in place. Under State Statute, Chapter 429, Mr. Trudgeon advised that the potential was available to spread the costs to benefiting properties versus sticking adjacent property owners/developers with the full impact and cost for those infrastructure improvements. Mr. Trudgeon reference comments of at least one property owner expressing willingness to be subjected to assessments through the Chapter 429 process, as long as they were fairly distributed to all benefiting property owners/developers, not only those specifically in the Twin Lakes Redevelopment Area. Mr. Trudgeon reiterated that there was some solution needed to fund these remaining infrastructure improvements; and this provided an allowable course to follow; opining that he recommended it as the best course of action at this point.

Councilmember McGehee noted Sherman Associates ready to develop one site; and identifying other access options available to them off Fairview Avenue. Given the infrastructure improvements many already installed by the City at Arthur, Prior and Mount Ridge, there were options open to the City if it wanted the former PIK Terminal site to develop into housing. Councilmember McGehee opined that there was already access to that site and to Langton Lake Park. Going forward at this point with assessments given the history and impacts already experienced, Councilmember McGehee opined was a dubious prospect.

Councilmember Laliberte requested that staff provide an estimate in the near future for additional city costs such as for appraisals as defined by staff.

Specific to the Twin Lakes Parkway extension influence area and displayed map, Councilmember Laliberte noted hearing interest in developing east of Fairview Avenue with Hershel Avenue cutting through and connecting to businesses opening up more retail/frontage acres. Whether or not that was a serious proposal or only a discussion point, Councilmember Laliberte questioned if that property owner would be upset to hear about this later rather than sooner, and requested that they be included in the discussion now when other property owners were consulted.

City Manager Trudgeon advised that all affected property owners were well aware of this possibility. In assessing regional improvements, Mr. Trudgeon agreed that it opened up property to additional opportunities, and with that regional distinction, advised that property owners were aware of staff's initial thoughts at this time. However, Mr. Trudgeon clarified these were simply that – initial thoughts – and nothing more at this time.

Councilmember Etten clarified that it had been the request of land owners and developers several months ago to the City Council to connect this development area and make it more accessible. Councilmember Etten noted that the City Council agreed in general and agreed to move forward and had thus directed staff to move as they had done and subsequently presenting this potential option.

In that case, Councilmember McGehee expressed her interest in the Planning Department coming forward with a proposal for what they think. Councilmember McGehee opined that this was another example of patchwork without a clear picture for property owners on either side of Fairview Avenue of what the City wants and without zoning in place or proper text amendments processed. Councilmember McGehee further opined that it seemed premature to her until there was a better determination of traffic and streets for both sides of Fairview Avenue going to Snelling Avenue.

Councilmember Laliberte asked that, in the future, staff provide presentation materials in agenda packet materials, which was duly noted by Mr. Culver.

Mayor Roe opined that concerns were being concentrated on the trip calculations, which had been part of previous considerations; but from his interpretation that only provided for a starting point, while the Chapter 429 process actually required proof of the benefit provided. As long as the methodology was not too cumbersome in time and money for the City to do it, Mayor Roe opined that the actual modeling would probably prove to be no worse or better than other methodologies that may be used; which the appraisal process would prove. Mayor Roe stated that he understood the delineation of benefit areas where trip generation dropped

off, opining that it seemed reasonable to him and only required some fine-tuning. Mayor Roe opined that it made sense to him to continue looking at the process, since other costs were already covered through grant awards and WalMart money; leaving remaining costs to be divided up through and as allowed under the assessment process.

Mayor Roe sought comment regarding any objections to continuing the process.

Councilmember Willmus opined that it needed more discussion before staff was directed to proceed in this direction.

Mayor Roe asked what would facilitate that additional discussion or what additional information the City Council would like to see.

Councilmember Willmus responded that he would like additional information as to whether this assessment process had been used in other areas of the country; including similar scopes to define the benefit area geographically. Councilmember Willmus opined that a lot of homeowners would be brought into the mix who may feel their benefit for extension of Twin Lakes Parkway is negligible. Councilmember Willmus stated that there were many aspects needing to be looked at; and he was not yet ready to tell staff this is the direction to go.

Mayor Roe clarified that staff was not looking to move in that direction yet.

Mr. Trudgeon advised that any individual Councilmember input was helpful to staff; and further advised that he hoped to continue the discussion at the August 18, 2014 Worksession. If there was additional information, beyond that already identified and requested, that staff could provide to enhance that discussion, Mr. Trudgeon advised that it would be helpful for staff to know that.

Mayor Roe suggested inviting property owners to that Worksession as well.

Councilmember McGehee agreed with the requested cost information for appraisals from Councilmember Laliberte; including project costs and any development costs or other items not currently being shown.

Mayor Roe clarified that information request for staff to provide a more refined, but not yet finished, product.

At the request of Councilmember Laliberte, agreed with by Mayor Roe, staff was requested to provide tonight's Power Point presentation in that meeting packet, duly noted by Mr. Trudgeon.

As far as informing property owners of these preliminary discussions, Mr. Trudgeon recognized that every meeting was public, but cautioned that this early in the

Regular City Council Meeting

Monday, July 21, 2014

Page 27

process he didn't want to have people asking questions that couldn't yet be answered, since staff was nowhere close to being able to defining costs and/or benefits.

Mayor Roe suggested comments could be heard from the public on August 18, 2014 on the concept; duly noted by Mr. Trudgeon. Mayor Roe asked that any additional feedback or information requests be directed to staff before the August 18, 2014 Worksession to facilitate discussions.

15. City Manager Future Agenda Review

City Manager Trudgeon reviewed upcoming agenda items.

Mr. Trudgeon advised that he would be attending the City Manager National Conference and unable to attend the September 15, 2014 City Council meeting; suggesting that the City Council consider the Preliminary 2015 Levy at their September 8, 2014 meeting.

Mayor Roe noted that he had requested budget discussions from Mr. Trudgeon in Worksession format at the August 18, 2014 Worksession.

16. Councilmember-Initiated Items for Future Meetings

17. Adjourn

Laliberte moved, Etten seconded adjournment of the meeting at approximately 8:36 p.m.

Roll Call

Ayes: McGehee; Willmus; Laliberte; Etten; Roe.

Nays: None.

Daniel J. Roe, Mayor

ATTEST:

Patrick J. Trudgeon, City Manager