



**Regular City Council Meeting Minutes
City Hall Council Chambers, 2660 Civic Center Drive
Monday, August 11, 2014**

1. Roll Call

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

2. Approve Agenda

Councilmember McGehee requested removal of Consent Item 7.d entitled, "Reject Irrigation Proposals and Authorize Re-Solicitation of Proposals," for discussion purposes.

Mayor Roe requested removal of Consent Item 7.g entitled, "Set Public Hearing to Consider Approving a Small Brewer Off-Sale Intoxicating Liquor License, an On-Sale and Sunday Brewer's Taproom License, and an Outside Sales and Consumption Endorsement for Blume Brauhaus, LLC (Bent Brewstillery) located at 1744 Terrace Drive;" for a brief discussion.

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

Roll Call

Ayes: Willmus, Laliberte, Etten, McGehee, and Roe.

Nays: None.

3. Public Comment

Mayor Roe called for public comment by members of the audience on any non-agenda items.

a. Roger Toogood, 601 Terrace Court

At the request of the Board of Directors of the Owasso Hollow Townhome Association, Mr. Toogood advised that he'd been asked to speak on their behalf regarding the ongoing and ever-increasing significant issues encountered with deer and their negative impacts on the community, and particularly in their neighborhood. Mr. Toogood, noting the contingent of approximately twenty neighbors in the audience tonight regarding this issue, reviewed his research on the issue, contact with City staff, and asked the City Council to take remediation efforts to address the significant deer population in the community.

Bill Frank, Spokesperson for his neighborhood, 3141 Sandy Hook Drive

Mr. Frank reviewed his observations of the overpopulation of deer in Roseville, and recognized the difficulty in controlling that population. However, Mr. Frank asked that the City Council and staff take action to address the negative impacts of these animals and detriments to foliage, and safety concerns. In his comments, Mr. Frank referenced recent studies from other states and/or colleges; and the pros

and cons of various options to correct or control the deer population. Mr. Frank respectfully reminded Councilmembers that the City of Roseville was an urban environment, not the wilderness, and asked them to keep Roseville pleasant for its residents.

Mayor Roe recognized that this topic came forward periodically as deer populations cycle; and noted that this public nuisance issue was a regional problem across municipal borders. Mayor Roe asked staff to provide an update and possible options at a future meeting to effectively and proactively mitigate the problem.

City Manager Trudgeon advised that staff would discuss options at the staff level; and that staff would notify Mr. Toogood of future discussions with the City Council so he could alert those interested in attending that meeting.

4. Council Communications, Reports, and Announcements

Mayor Roe announced that applicants were being sought for the youth members of City's Park & Recreation Commission for a one-year term concurrent with the school year. Mayor Roe noted that the application deadline was August 29, 2014; with additional information available on the City's website or by calling City Hall at 792-7093.

Mayor Roe announced the opportunity for donations at collection boxes at the Mall of America from August through October for the Operation Military Kids Program and their "Make the Change" fund. Additional information available from Amber Greely, representative of the organization, at 612/624-8198 or e-mail runk0014@umn.edu.

Mayor Roe announced the upcoming 2015 Budget Hearing of the Capitol Region Watershed District (1410 Energy Park Drive, St. Paul, MN) on August 20, 2014 at 6:00 p.m. Mayor Roe advised that the Capitol Region Watershed District was one of several addressing water issues in Roseville, this one mostly in the southeast area of Roseville.

5. Recognitions, Donations and Communications

a. New Police Officer Introduction to Roseville City Council

Police Chief Rick Mathwig introduced the City of Roseville's newest Police Officer Daniel Iverson; and provided a brief biography of Officer Iverson.

On behalf of the City Council and community, Mayor Roe welcomed Officer Iverson and thanked him for his military service to the country and also to the City of Roseville.

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 21, 2014 Regular Council Meeting Minutes**

McGehee moved, Etten seconded, approval of the Meeting Minutes of July 21, 2014 as amended.

Corrections:

- **Page 6, Line 24 (McGehee)**
 - While understanding the rationale in needing a stop by the Job Corps office,
- **Page 12, Line 8 (Roe)**
 - Add “13. Business/Action Items”
- **Pages 13, 15 and 21 (Roe)**
 - Correct and clarify numbering/lettering as applicable
- **Page 25 (McGehee)**
 - **Line 1:** Remove “However,” and revise first sentence as follows: “[G]iven the [many] infrastructure improvements already installed by the City at Arthur, Prior and Mount Ridge, there were [few] options available...”
 - **Line 3 and 4:** Remove “However,” and revise sentence to read: “Councilmember McGehee opined that there was already access to that site [through] [and to] Langton Lake Park.”

Roll Call

Ayes: Willmus, Laliberte, Etten, McGehee, and Roe.

Nays: None.

7. **Approve Consent Agenda**

There were no additional changes to the Consent Agenda than those previously noted. 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 August 11, 2014, and attached check register.

ACH Payments	\$523,516.41
74444 – 74696	2,567,878.70
TOTAL	\$3,091,395.11

Roll Call

Ayes: Willmus, Laliberte, Etten, McGehee, and 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 August 11, 2014.

Roll Call

Ayes: Willmus, Laliberte, Etten, McGehee, and Roe.

Nays: None.

c. Approve General Purchases and Sale of Surplus Items in Excess of \$5,000

McGehee moved, Etten seconded, approval of the submitted list of general purchases and contracts for services presented as follows; and as detailed in the RCA dated August 11, 2014; and Attachment A entitled, "2014 Capital Improvement Plan Summary – Updated 07/31/2014."

Department	Vendor	Description	Amount	Budget / CIP
Sewer	Ess Brothers	Manhole Sealing	\$30,000.00	CIP
Parks	Upper Cut Tree Care	Diseased and Hazardous Tree Removal	15,000.00	Budget
Parks	Tuf-werks	Cushman Turf Machine	20,079.00	CIP
Streets	Midstates Equipment	Crack Sealing Material	12,236.40	Budget
Streets	Allied Blacktop	Pathway & Parking Lot Pavement Seal	13,715.59	Budget
Vehicle Maintenance	Zahl Petroleum	Fuel Dispenser System	50,000.00	CIP

Roll Call

Ayes: Willmus, Laliberte, Etten, McGehee, and Roe.

Nays: None.

e. Adopt a Sign Retroreflectivity Policy

McGehee moved, Etten seconded, adoption of the Sign Retroreflectivity Policy (*REVISED* Attachment A), bringing the City into compliance with the Minnesota Manual on Traffic Control Devices (MN MUTCD) per the compliance date of June 14, 2014; *as modified by the City Attorney.*

Roll Call

Ayes: Willmus, Laliberte, Etten, McGehee, and Roe.

Nays: None.

f. Approve Amendment to Purchase Agreement with Independent School District No. 621 to Extend Contingency Date

McGehee moved, Etten seconded, approval of an Amendment to Purchase Agreement between the City of Roseville and I.S. D. No. 621 for school property at 2959 Hamline Avenue (Attachment A) to extend the Due Diligence Date to December 31, 2014; and authorize the Mayor and City Manager to execute the Amendment to Purchase Agreement on behalf of the City.

Roll Call

Ayes: Willmus, Laliberte, Etten, McGehee, and Roe.

Nays: None.

h. Consider Approving IT Shared Service Agreement with the City of Spring Lake Park

McGehee moved, Etten seconded, approval of a Shared Service Agreement (Attachment A) between the Cities of Roseville and Spring Lake Park for the purpose of the City of Roseville providing IT support services for the deployment of new police mobile user security procedures required by the FBI for database access.

Roll Call

Ayes: Willmus, Laliberte, Etten, McGehee, and Roe.

Nays: None.

i. Consider Approving IT Shared Service Agreement with the City of Fridley

McGehee moved, Etten seconded, approval of a Shared Service Agreement (Attachment A) between the Cities of Roseville and Fridley for the purpose of the City of Roseville sharing the City's internet connection.

Roll Call

Ayes: Willmus, Laliberte, Etten, McGehee, and Roe.

Nays: None.

8. Consider Items Removed from Consent

a. Reject Irrigation Proposals and Authorize Re-Solicitation of Proposals

At the request of Mayor Roe, City Manager Patrick Trudgeon briefly reviewed this item as detailed in the RCA dated August 11, 2014.

Councilmember McGehee questioned why the City had received so few bids for this item, qualifications of partially successful bidders, which of the sites already had existing irrigation systems and which did not, and requested more information in general about the bid process itself.

Parks & Recreation Director Lonnie Brokke responded that the City received five bids under the Best Value Procurement process used for Park Renewal Program projects, with only two of those within the original budgeted amount, and the remaining ones outside that parameter.

Mr. Brokke clarified that, with the exception of Autumn Grove Park, the other parks had existing irrigation systems at this time, including the fields at Acorn Park. Mr. Brokke advised that the intent was to upgrade existing systems to a two-wire system for more efficiencies, including rain sensors and web-based monitoring.

Councilmember McGehee questioned if the original budget parameters were set too low, since three of the original five bids had failed on further testing; opining that this may prevent qualified vendors from performing the work based on their expertise and knowledge of actual costs for doing so.

Mr. Brokke advised, that if authorized to re-solicit proposals, several items identified previously within initial budgets, would be identified as alternates for better analysis, as their cost was higher than originally anticipated, specifically at Lexington and Autumn Grove Parks.

Councilmember McGehee stated that she supported this initiative to make the systems more efficient and not waste water; however, she further stated that she didn't want to spend \$200,000 or more on a system that forced vendors to cut corners, ultimately costing the City more in the long run.

Councilmember Willmus asked Mr. Brokke to provide background on vendors, specifically the chosen vendor who was unable to meet the three-year bonding requirements for the duration of the project. Councilmember Willmus further asked if it was possible to repackage the project to break up the scope of work so several vendors could qualify.

Mr. Brokke advised that the preferred vendor was a small business, and were only able to bond for one year at a time, while state law indicated bonding was necessary over the duration of the three-year project. Regarding breaking up the scope of the work among vendors, Mr. Brokke advised that the intent was for one vendor to allow for consistency of the system.

McGehee moved, Willmus seconded, rejecting all irrigation replacement and upgrade proposals as described on the Best Value Summary dated March 17, 2014; and as detailed in the RCA dated August 11, 2014.

Roll Call

Ayes: Willmus, Laliberte, Etten, McGehee, and Roe.

Nays: None.

j. Set Public Hearing to Consider Approving a Small Brewer Off-Sale Intoxicating Liquor License, an On-Sale and Sunday Brewer's Taproom License and an Outside Sales and Consumption Endorsement for Blume Brauhaus, LLC (Bent Brewstillery) located at 1744 Terrace Drive

Mayor Roe recognized that this applicant is attempting to get licenses in place prior to this year's Minnesota State Fair, His research had indicated no state or city code requiring a separate action of the City Council to set a public hearing date. Given the staff time in providing Requests for Council Action, Mayor Roe questioned if it was necessary for this extra step.

City Attorney Mark Gaughan opined that this notice most likely grew out of the desire to make sure all potential interested parties were aware of and able to attend the public hearing; but noted that he was not aware of any mandate requiring the City Council to take action as suggested in this item tonight and done historically to-date.

Roe moved, Etten seconded, directing staff to provide notification of and schedule liquor license hearings through administrative action and without seeking formal City Council action to do so.

Councilmember Laliberte opined that she saw no harm in having the action come before the City Council first and provide double emphasis, as it provided another way for the public to become aware of the public hearing.

Mayor Roe noted, in this case if the applicant was attempting to have their license granted prior to the State Fair starting on August 22, 2014, since the notice required ten days before the public hearing date and had already been processed and advertised by staff, it became a moot point. Mayor Roe opined that, with public hearing notices processed administratively by staff for Planning Commission and others public hearings without the City Council's formal authorization this seemed to provide for more consistency across the board.

Roll Call

Ayes: Willmus, Laliberte, Etten, McGehee, and Roe.

Nays: None.

Etten moved, McGehee seconded, setting a public hearing for August 18, 2014 to consider approving the requested liquor licenses for the remainder of calendar year 2014; subject to the completion of a criminal background check.

Roll Call

Ayes: Willmus, Laliberte, Etten, McGehee, and Roe.

Nays: None.

9. General Ordinances for Adoption

10. Presentations

11. Public Hearings

a. Hearing to Solicit Public Comment on the 2015 Budget & Tax Levy

At the request of Mayor Roe, City Manager Trudgeon advised that staff had no formal presentation, but encouraged public comment and questions on the 2015 City Manager-recommended budget at tonight's meeting. As detailed in the RCA

Regular City Council Meeting

Monday, August 11, 2014

Page 8

dated August 11, 2014, Mr. Trudgeon noted that the proposed budget calls for a tax levy increase of \$890,829 or a 4.9% increase over 2014. Of that increase, Mr. Trudgeon noted that approximately one half was to reinstate funding that had been taken from the reserves in 2014 and no use of those reserves proposed for 2015. Mr. Trudgeon advised that the remainder of the increase was basically inflationary costs.

Mayor Roe noted in the RCA that the average tax impact for a typical single-family home in Roseville would be \$7.56. Mayor Roe noted, and City Manager Trudgeon confirmed, that about half of that increase was due to the fact that residential property values had increased more than commercial properties in the most recent Ramsey County valuations, and, as a result of that shift of tax burden from commercial properties to residential, residential properties' taxes would go up even with no change to the city's tax levy. Mayor Roe noted that historically from year to year the shift in burden between commercial and residential can go either direction, but that for 2015 it will add to residential tax bills.

Councilmember McGehee noted that the commercial tax base was currently at 45% of total tax receipts compared to 55% in past years.

At the request of Councilmember Willmus, Councilmember Etten advised that the Housing & Redevelopment Authority (HRA) budget was initially addressed at their July meeting, with more specific discussions of the HRA Finance Subcommittee held earlier today and outlined specifically by Executive Director Kelsey; with more refined numbers available at the upcoming August HRA meeting, scheduled for Tuesday, August 19, 2014.

Mayor Roe reviewed the budget process going forward, with the Preliminary Levy scheduled for adoption by the City Council at their September 8, 2014 regular meeting; allowing for additional discussions between now and then. Mayor Roe noted further refinement would also occur between setting the Preliminary Budget in September and Final Budget in December; and encouraged the public to pay close attention to those discussions.

After reviewing the protocol for public hearings, Mayor Roe opened the public hearing at approximately 6:48 p.m. for the purpose of hearing public testimony on the 2015 City Levy.

Public Comments

John Kysylyczyn, 3083 Victoria Street

Mr. Kysylyczyn took issue in staff's comparison in the RCA of City services and other utilities and services paid for by homeowners (e.g. gas, electric, cable television, broadband internet, or mobile phone service); and took offense with Finance Department staff injecting their personal opinions into and editorializing a finance document, when most of them didn't even live in Roseville.

Based on his personal review of the first seven months of the 2014 budget, Mr. Kysylyczyn noted that he had not used police or fire services, used no city streets, since he didn't live on a city street, didn't use city parks, and had no street lighting on his street, and in using the County Road D sidewalk recently installed by the City of Roseville, he instead used the Shoreview pathway across the street. Mr. Kysylyczyn stated that the only thing he used was water and sewer, which he paid by fees, not through property taxes. When staff alluded that this property tax increase was not significant, Mr. Kysylyczyn disputed that statement, opining that it represented a significant amount for many Roseville taxpayers. When using the other services listed above, Mr. Kysylyczyn clarified that they were available to him on a consistent, 24/7 basis and he therefore expected to pay more for them; however, it was difficult for him to compare paying for the City's park system when he rarely, if ever, used it.

Mr. Kysylyczyn referenced his term in municipal office for the City of Roseville, comparing General Fund levies and debt service and compared it since 2004 and the huge increases in non-voter approved debt service over that ten year period. Mr. Kysylyczyn referenced an e-mail he'd received several weeks ago regarding the City Council's discussion regarding the former bond issue for City Hall and Public Works Maintenance facilities, which had been approved by the voters, with the promise at that time by him, other elected municipal officials, and City staff that if they supported the bond issue, when paid after fifteen years, it no longer be on the tax levy and property taxes should go down. Since that was the commitment made to taxpayers, who responded and voted in favor of the bond issue based on those promises, Mr. Kysylyczyn cautioned the current City Council and staff to not attempt backfilling that allotted money by jacking up the General Fund and then raising taxes on top of that. Mr. Kysylyczyn opined that this was dishonest and disrespectful of the public, and current discussions were simply a marketing campaign to spin this, and was not fair, consistent or honest.

Dick Houck, 1131 Roselawn Avenue

Mr. Houck referenced the comments of Mr. Kysylyczyn specific to the proposal to repurpose funds originally used for building the City Hall facility, and agreed that if true, it was not an honest or transparent step to take with taxpayers. Mr. Houck opined that the City Council could lose their credibility with taxpayers, and needed to be upfront and transparent, and tell taxpayers how their money was or was not being used. Mr. Houck spoke in support of bond funds, when paid off, being used to reduce taxes by an appropriate amount. If more money was needed, Mr. Houck suggested the City Council go directly to the taxpayers and ask them rather than sneaking in a bond issue without a referendum, which he noted had resulted in litigation against the City.

Gary Grefenberg, 91 Mid Oaks Lane

Mr. Grefenberg clarified that he was speaking for himself, as a private citizen, and not in his role as a commissioner or spokesperson for any neighborhood groups. Mr. Grefenberg offered his agreement with the comments of Mr. Kysylyczyn, and asked that the City Council recognize that over the last eight years, the City's tax levy had increased by over 44%, not including the 2015 proposed levy increase. Also, based on his research of Ramsey County records, Mr. Grefenberg stated that the City of Roseville's per capita taxation was the highest in the county at \$510 per person, compared with the second highest by the City of Maplewood at \$451 per person, and the City of Arden Hills at \$341 per person.

While not supporting rehashing past issues, such as the Parks Renewal Program and Fire Station Construction bond issue, Mr. Grefenberg suggested that the City Council focus on regressive taxes for those without the ability to pay: renters, senior citizens, and immigrant populations within Roseville. Mr. Grefenberg questioned the continued annual levy increase when such a large surplus or reserve was available, based on his understanding of the City Manager's recommended budget in his July 11, 2014 RCA, especially if and when those surpluses are not required, indicating that Roseville residents had been overtaxed over the last eight years.

Mr. Grefenberg strongly encouraged the City Council to consider a budget based on a person's ability to pay.

Mr. Grefenberg noted his budget questions, which he offered to provide to City Manager Trudgeon in writing, as follows:

- 1) How much of the 2013 budget and levy remained unspent at the end of the year, as well as unspent funds over the last eight years; and whether all of those amounts continued forward in future levies?
- 2) Are his calculations of a \$21 million to \$29 million surplus and range correct;
- 3) Why is there a difference in the proposed 5.5% increase in the July 14, 2014 City Manager recommended budget and tonight's proposed increase of .9% and what impact does that have on the property tax levy?

Mr. Grefenberg opined that it seemed to him that the money was proposed to be used for staff raises and adding new positions; and further opined it was time to freeze any additional hiring and get the money back to the public, as stakeholders.

- 4) Mr. Grefenberg suggested reducing or eliminating the proposed COLA and supply increases from 2% rather than as proposed in the July 14, 2014 memo.
- 5) Mr. Grefenberg suggested that staff COLA be eliminated for any administrators/staff receiving \$75,000 or more in annual wages versus the proposed 2% COLA increase, making it income based similar to the senior utility discount.

While Mr. Grefenberg noted that some taxpayers could afford the proposed tax levy increase, many could not, especially renters, senior citizens, or those on lower incomes; and reiterated his suggestion for a property tax based on a person's

Regular City Council Meeting

Monday, August 11, 2014

Page 11

ability to pay, which could be reduced through the current fund reserve levels. Mr. Grefenberg opined that this annual levy increase needed to stop, as it was not sustainable, and suggested that more pencils needed to be sharpened and the proposed tax levy increase reduced.

With no one else appearing to speak, Mayor Roe closed the public hearing at approximately 7:10 p.m.

Mayor Roe thanked those coming forward to speak; and advised that their questions and comments would be addressed at future meetings, and reiterated the upcoming budget schedule, and additional opportunities for public comment and feedback.

At the request of Councilmember Willmus, City Manager Trudgeon anticipated the goal of the newly-formed Finance Commission, next meeting on August 21, 2014, was to provide their feedback on reserves, revenues and future budgets.

At the request of Mayor Roe, Finance Director Chris Miller advised that the Finance Commission had been discussing those topics, and would continue to do so, and in response to their direction from the City Council and interest of the body in receiving their recommendations when they were comfortable in doing so.

Mayor Roe noted that those meetings, including the August 21, 2014 session, were also open to the public as well, and were held at 6:30 p.m. in the City Hall Council Chambers.

In response to public comment, Councilmember McGehee sought to clarify some of the comments related to trust and transparency. While personally agreeing with the accuracy of the recent Parks Renewal Program and Fire Station bond issue, without a voter referendum, Councilmember McGehee noted that she had been in the minority on not supporting that issue for those very concerns, and noted that that represented in excess of 24% increase alone; and that had been openly and frequently discussed. Since 2004, Councilmember McGehee recognized that the average increase of 2% annually over that time excluding bonded indebtedness, has been reasonably transparent and straightforward. When promising to return money to taxpayers, Councilmember McGehee opined that the City Council should be straightforward about its intent and what they were attempting to rectify by repurposing those bond allotments. While the money could be returned to taxpayers, Councilmember McGehee noted that it would only mean increasing the levy by a comparable amount, and she personally found this proposal and reallocation straightforward based on standard bookkeeping practices.

In addressing comments about increased levies over the last ten years, Councilmember McGehee clarified that the reason in doing so was to rectify a long period of time where the City's infrastructure had not been funded, deferring

maintenance and making the entire structure unsustainable. As an example of that deferred maintenance or scheduled replacement, Councilmember McGehee noted the many failures experienced over the winter months when residents were unable to receive essential services (e.g. water and sewer services), which she found even more problematic and inappropriate.

Councilmember McGehee stated that many of the funds identified as surplus were not actually surplus, but simply reserves to allow the City to maintain its infrastructure and services and address emergency situations such as occurred over the winter months, and with past summer storms. Councilmember McGehee opined that, while she thought the City Council had been responsible in setting reserve policies, additional discussions could always take place about the sustainability of reducing those reserves and revise the policies. Councilmember McGehee noted that those policies and specific reserve percentages are public documents and available for public review; and invited taxpayers to look at them. Councilmember McGehee compared those reserves to individual savings accounts; and further noted that when periodic community surveys are conducted, requesting information from the public on what services they did or did not want, the majority indicated they wanted current service and program levels maintained.

Regarding trust issues, Councilmember McGehee agreed that the City Council, as a body, needed to ask for public support by voter referendum on larger expenditures; and opined that the City Council had violated that public trust in the most recent bond issue; and therefore, urged the community to hold the City Council responsible to see that the money was spent judiciously and encouraged public comment throughout the year, not just during the budget process.

In addressing reserves, Councilmember Willmus noted that the 2014 budget year, \$346,000 was used to refund reserves, yet the General Fund reserve still grew by \$198,000. Councilmember Willmus noted that, while the City Council had established target ranges for those reserves, they still needed to do a better job to hold themselves to those targets, opining that there were a number of funds where that target had been exceeded (e.g. License Center, Communication, and General Funds) and further opined that there was more work to be done.

Councilmember Willmus noted that he, for one, looked forward to recommendations from the Finance Commission. Councilmember Willmus advised that these are some of the things he'll be looking at moving forward and the upcoming decision-making process on the 2015 budget. Councilmember Willmus noted that he did not support the 2014 budget and levy, opining that a certain segment of the City's employee group was being provided with significant increases beyond the rate of inflation, which the City Council had made a decision in 2010 to forego due to economic issues. When the City Council majority determined in 2014 to backfill some of those increases Councilmember Willmus opined that he did not

think it appropriate; and thought those decisions should be given more thought before moving forward.

Councilmember Laliberte thanked the public for their comments and noted that she also did not support the 2014 budget and levy; and anticipated more work sessions and public comment prior to decision-making for the 2015 budget.

In relation to reserve levels, Mayor Roe clarified that virtually all were tied to some policy, whether a specific amount set aside for the annual and long-term capital improvement program (CIP) as brought forward by Councilmember McGehee or to provide a level of funding for operational cash flow purpose. However, Mayor Roe stated that he also supported periodically reviewing those policies, noting that the License Center Reserve Fund had already been discussed and additional information previously requested of staff.

Mayor Roe noted that the City Council had requested staff to provide the annual unexpended funds for a comparable time frame as requested by Mr. Grefenberg, showing the actual budget for each of those given years and the ratio of General Fund reserves and budgets for that year, with the intent of informing discussions moving forward. Mayor Roe noted that the City Council was looking at issues and the best interests of citizens, and through a representative democracy, the majority set policy, with the public having the opportunity to pass judgment on those actions and policies through the election process. Mayor Roe noted that the beauty or disappointment of this system depended on one's point of view, but thanked and encouraged citizens to continue providing feedback throughout the budget process.

b. Hearing to Consider a Minor Subdivision of the Residential Property into Two (2) Parcels; and a Variance to City Code Chapter 1103.06 (Lot Standards) to Allow the Creation of a Parcel with Substandard Width and Area

Senior Planner Bryan Lloyd briefly summarized this rather complex request for approval of a minor subdivision of residential property into two parcels and allowing creation of a parcel with substandard width and area, as detailed in the RCA dated August 11, 2014. Mr. Lloyd noted that staff continued to work with the applicant to mitigate impervious surface issues between the two parcels; and staff supported the proposed parcel division, which was roughly in line with neighboring properties.

Applicant John Ellering

In addition to ongoing discussions with staff on impervious surfaces on both parcels, Mr. Ellering advised that tile would be installed running off the gutter system at the house, recently remodeled, and would divert more water and expressed his willingness to construct a small pond as well if determined to be needed.

When originally surveying the property, Mr. Ellering advised that the parcel line for the proposed Parcel B was set up a bit shorter, with the rationale being to be in compliance for impervious surface. However, based on some apparent misunderstandings in the past, Mr. Ellering advised that the Burke side of the lot had been reduced down to 80' lots on the east side and without sufficient right-of-way. In discussions with the City Engineer, Mr. Ellering stated that with Burke being a dead-end street with curb and gutter, it was not anticipated that the roadway would become any wider than current conditions. Also, in an attempt to meet impervious surface coverage requirements, Mr. Ellering advised that one of the existing sheds would be removed and not become part of Parcel A, and at staff's suggestion, another smaller shed would need to be removed from its current location as it was on the line of the proposed two parcels, and would be replaced with a comparable shed with water management systems installed to take up the difference.

At the request of Councilmember Willmus, Mr. Ellering stated that he was in agreement with staff's conditions as detailed; and opined that they had come up with a good proposal and done well in working through the complexities, providing a good compromise for him and the community as a whole.

As the applicant had already spoken to Condition C in the RCA, Councilmember Willmus advised that he would take that into consideration during his deliberations.

At the request of Councilmember McGehee, Mr. Ellering advised that his preference in making both proposed parcels compliant with impervious surface requirements, he would add more to the existing lot, but admitted that wouldn't work due to the right-of-way issues on Burke, and unless the City's Engineering Department was willing to reduce that right-of-way. At the request of Councilmember McGehee, Mr. Ellering clarified that the 35% impervious coverage was a combination of both proposed parcels A and B, and the combined sheds were already included in that figure.

At the request of Councilmember Etten, Mr. Lloyd advised that no determination had been made yet as to the location of any best management practices (BMP) pond or water infiltration systems, recognizing that the lot was heavily wooded; but would be based on where it would best function on the site. Without more definite information on grades of the slope or soil conditions, Mr. Lloyd noted that a routine assessment would be part of the administrative process moving forward as well as installation and a maintenance agreement for any BMP, but noted a great amount of flexibility available in locating it.

Mayor Roe addressed the idea brought up by Mr. Ellering to shift the property line further toward Burke if it was deemed appropriate to reduce the right-of-way in light of any future potential changes; and questioned if this was something staff

would be open to. Mayor Roe noted that, if the property division was moved far enough south, mitigation on the north parcel would become a much smaller issue. Mayor Roe clarified that he was specifically referencing the Burke right-of-way and not any on County Road B.

Mr. Lloyd responded that this could be accomplished and additional footage allowing conformity; however, based on necessary reliance then on easements for County Road B and Burke Avenue, he opined that, while not impossible, it was not being recommended by staff.

Mayor Roe opened the Public Hearing at approximately 7:36 p.m. for the purpose of hearing public comment on this proposal.

Public Comments

Mike Ryan, 957 County Road B

While not directly affected, but having received notice of the meeting, Mr. Ryan questioned why more background information about the split had not been provided, and questioned if this was the normal procedure for neighbors not immediately adjacent.

Mayor Roe reviewed the process, and advised that the post card was simply an invitation to the meeting, with background information available online, or from staff. Mayor Roe advised that the agenda packet materials were also available in the back of the Council Chambers for his review, online, or hard copy from staff; and were always made available to the public by request.

With no one else appearing to speak, Mayor Roe closed the Public Hearing at approximately 7:39 p.m.

Councilmember McGehee commended staff on their report and review of variance requirements, opining that it was thorough and addressed those issues brought forward during public comment; and suggested that format be considered as a guideline in the future.

Mayor Roe clarified that staff's review included code requirements during their analysis in each case, but there were not always the same areas of code being dealt with.

Councilmember McGehee clarified that previous packet information from staff had often been skimpy, and she was commending staff on changes she was observing in their more thorough and careful material developed for Council information, which she appreciated.

Councilmember Etten spoke in support of the request, inclusive of Condition C's first option for installation of a stormwater BMP on Parcel A and based on the re-

luctance of Ramsey County and the City Engineering Department to remove access to streets.

Councilmember McGehee spoke in support of the request in principle; however, she expressed her preference to allow the homeowner an opportunity during the remodeling process to meet the 30% condition with the removal of existing impervious surface, and not supporting forcing him to install a BMP that would run with the land.

At the request of Mayor Roe, Mr. Lloyd questioned if the applicant could sufficiently reduce the 30% coverage limit through removal of the shed alone, but recognized that reduction of impervious surfaces could to some extent reduce the impervious surface coverage, thereby reducing the amount of BMP needed, and allowing more flexibility.

Councilmember Willmus agreed with Councilmember McGehee's recommendation.

McGehee moved, Etten seconded, adoption of Resolution No. 11168 (Attachment D) entitled, "A Resolution Approving a Minor Subdivision and a Variance to Roseville City Code, Chapter 1004.08C (Improvement Area) at 990 County Road B (PF14-017); for subdivision into two conforming parcels with nonconforming impervious coverage on Parcel A; subject to conditions as detailed in the Resolution; *with the draft resolution amended as follows:*

- *Findings (Page 2, Lines 41-46)*
Revise Finding C to read: "The proposal is consistent with the intent of the zoning ordinances because the impervious coverage limits are intended to prevent adverse impacts from excessive amounts of storm water runoff, and runoff from the excess impervious surface on Parcel A can be addressed by mitigating the storm water within Parcel A's boundaries.
- *Conditions (page 3, Lines 75-80)*
Strike lines 75 – 80 in their entirety.

Roll Call

Ayes: Willmus, Laliberte, Etten, McGehee, and Roe.

Nays: None.

12. Budget Items

13. Business Items (Action Items)

a. Consider Design Modification to the County Road B Pathway Project

City Engineer Marc Culver briefly summarized the proposed modifications as detailed in the RCA dated August 11, 2014; and as a result of surveying the five property owners impacted; with four responding and three of those supporting

prohibiting parking, and one supporting parking but reducing the total amount of pavement at a negotiated width. Mr. Culver noted the need for refinement after snow had melted this spring allowing for further consideration on the actual alignment.

Mr. Culver displayed and reviewed options along the section from Fulham Street to Fairways Lane, including existing conditions, the original proposal with parking, and an option without parking for that segment making it consistent with the remainder of the proposed pathway that is currently being constructed east of Fulham at this time.

At the request of Mayor Roe, Mr. Culver advised that the fifth affected property owner had not responded, and was not present at tonight's meeting.

Discussion among Councilmembers and staff included consistency with existing segments; mature tree locations adjacent to the construction area; lack of aesthetic value in additional asphalt and impervious surfaces; specifics of the 2330 County Road B and impacts to the entire segment and boulevards of other properties as they related to parking functionality; or expansion of driveways to accommodate additional vehicle parking versus on street parking.

Public Comment

Nancy Nelson, 2151 Fulham Street

Ms. Nelson thanked individual Councilmembers for their prompt e-mail correspondence with her related to this issue. Ms. Nelson stated that they did not want a 6' parking lane on their side that would in her opinion, with the addition of a 7' pathway and 6' parking lane make the area look like a parking lot. Ms. Nelson opined that with the closure of Highway 280 and Cleveland, there were very few pedestrians and/or cyclists beyond existing residents compared to twenty years ago when the Cleveland Avenue access was open. Ms. Nelson opined that the area was very quiet with little foot traffic, and only a few people walking on the shoulder on the north side of the street. Ms. Nelson noted that there was an existing 6' shoulder on both sides of the street which was sufficient with only one small segment needing a pathway due to the lack of any shoulder.

As to whether this was needed as part of the overall pathway system, Ms. Nelson further opined that people were not going to walk or drive there as a destination as there was nothing beyond the apartment building on that end. In order to save the City money, Ms. Nelson suggested leaving Fulham and Fairways as is, with parking or walking on the existing shoulder, and the few pedestrians or bikers able to go around those vehicles, the same as they'd been doing for the last nineteen years.

Ms. Nelson stated that this was a quiet residential street; and opined that once the turnback occurred from Ramsey County, traffic speeds could be reduced, making

pedestrians feel safer. At this time, Ms. Nelson noted that there was nothing to stop traffic from Cleveland to Eustice, and since it looked like a country road with the homes set so far back, some people increased their speed. Ms. Nelson suggested that installation of a four-way stop would solve the problem, but otherwise the block should be left as-is, since there was no problem with pedestrians walking on the shoulders now, with little vehicle traffic beyond the immediate neighborhood.

Gary Grefenberg, speaking as the coordinator for SWARN

Mr. Grefenberg thanked the City Council and staff for addressing this pathway issue that many residents had worked on for years; and recognized the efforts of City Engineer Culver in being available to residents and for his candor in addressing issues without advocating for any particular position.

Frieda Casey, 2300 West County Road B

Ms. Casey, noting her minority position as per the survey, stated that she did not want to lose any parking, with St. Stephen's directly across from her property, leaving no parking for her property at all. Therefore, Ms. Casey provided a compromise on her survey as noted, allowing for parking, the pathway and less impervious surface. Ms. Casey stated that she did not like the proposed extension into their private yards as proposed, nor did she want to lose parking as there were no other options available for her, in addition to it coming so close to existing trees.

As a walker in the vicinity, Councilmember McGehee questioned Ms. Casey's interest in Ms. Nelson's suggestion to leave the segment as-is and save taxpayer monies.

Ms. Casey state that she had no problem walking the area now, as there were few cars parked; and opined that those not responding to the survey were the ones parking there more than others. Ms. Casey opined that vehicles could be walked around; but she could not support the idea of doing nothing and keeping the ragged edge; and since she didn't want it in her yard, thus her proposed compromise.

Doug Heck, 2331 County Road B (north side)

Councilmember Heck commended the City Council for blocking off County Road B at Highway 280; opining that it changed the entire face of the neighborhood by eliminating that through traffic.

Mr. Heck stated that he agreed with Ms. Nelson regarding on street parking and no need to change it at all, opining that it was wide enough now for walkers. Personally speaking, Mr. Heck stated that he had no problem with "No Parking" signs on both sides of the street, which would also address vehicles parking on the shoulder and the need to walk or bike around them. Since it was only residents using the area or parking and not a destination route for pedestrians or bikers, Mr.

Heck opined that it seemed silly to shift the center of the road to address a problem that didn't even exist.

If there were no parking on the street, Mr. Heck stated that his driveway would more than accommodate any need for surplus parking, or he could even access Fulham or Fairways, providing sufficient parking for any overflow situations. As far as shifting 2' into his property, Mr. Heck admitted that he was being selfish in not preferring that option; and liked the pathway stopping where it was currently, since this area had fewer pedestrians than other areas.

Mr. Heck admitted that residents had been attempting to reduce speed on the road for years, with some outside traffic using the road as a drag strip; but opined that a stop sign at Fulham would address that issue; and suggested that some of the speeding may be originating at the apartment building.

Council Discussion

Leaving functionality as is, Mayor Roe questioned the validity of a multi-purpose shoulder or a dedicated pathway on either side.

Mr. Culver responded that there was an option to not extend pavement at all; but from staff's perspective, they would still recommend that it be a dedicated pathway with restricted parking. Mr. Culver recognized public comment indicating not as many pedestrian or bikers on that part of the roadway today, and while not doubting that traffic counts were low, he suggested part of that may be due to their perception of a lack of safety, and with installation of the pathway it may address a latent demand. Mr. Culver further noted ongoing consideration of and negotiations for purchase by the City of land on the north side of County Road B for future development as a park, which may draw some traffic as well. Again from staff's perspective, Mr. Culver stated that the current pavement could function as a pathway and parking, but questioned whether it could do both; and in response to Mayor Roe, opposed mixing the two.

Regarding the option as recommended by Ms. Casey's compromise suggestion, shifting lanes to allow both parking and pathway construction without going further into properties, Mayor Roe sought staff's perspective.

Mr. Culver displayed a cross section and reviewed how that option would work, opining that the difficulty came in trying to remove the existing center line through that section to shift traffic over by grinding out the center line, which over time created confusion as to where the center line actually was as the restriping wore and without sealcoating didn't stand up. Mr. Culver advised that it became difficult to do in a limited area without additional pavement treatment to remove existing striping. With the pathway being narrower than a car, with typical parallel on-street parking spots 80' wide, Mr. Culver noted that the proposed 7' width by staff was already reducing that width, which could be a traffic calm-

ing method, but to reduce that further would be difficult to do and could create safety issues.

Mayor Roe asked that Mr. Culver address and confirm the City Council adopted process available for residents to pursue stop signs, traffic calming or other mitigation issues, as proposed by the residents for a stop sign at Fulham Street. Mayor Roe noted that the process was initiated through neighbors submitting a petition to the City, seeking resolution, with staff then performing or identifying studies on the specific issue, at a potential cost to the neighbors, and ultimate decision made. Mayor Roe noted that staff would be happy to talk to residents about such a consideration.

Personally, Mr. Culver stated that he would have a difficult time in either method to recommend a stop sign at this location. Mr. Culver stated that this was due to the limited effectiveness found over time of all-way stop conditions. Since it took 300' for a vehicle to reach 30 or more MPH, Mr. Culver advised that any unwarranted stop signs, which he found this to be since there was not enough traffic at Fulham and County Road B, caused a more hazardous situation as vehicles often stopped without any need, and therefore began to stop recognizing the stop signs. Mr. Culver opined that there were other options to manage speeds, and suggested neighbors could pursue that process with staff to determine what other methods could be used for traffic calming.

Councilmember Willmus noted that some of these discussions had originated in October of 2013 with the City's Public Works, Environment and Transportation Commission (PWETC) with neighbors supporting the walkway; and those same residents back in January and February of 2014 to initiate this process. Councilmember Willmus opined that that background information and public comments were important to recognize as part of this consideration.

Councilmember Willmus stated that he was inclined to support the majority of owners as indicated in the survey results, and their support for Option #2.

Councilmember Etten concurred, supporting aligning that segment of the street with the remainder, opining that it was consistent for pedestrians and vehicles. However, Councilmember Etten spoke in support of a third option for an 8' trail on the south, an 11' travel lane, and variables on the north side between 12' and 18'.

Councilmembers McGehee and Laliberte concurred with Councilmember Etten.

Etten moved, McGehee seconded, modifying the design of the County Road B Pathway Project allowing for an 8' trail on the south; an 11' travel lane' and no separate parking on County Road B between Fairways Lane and Fulham Street.

Roll Call

Ayes: Willmus, Laliberte, Etten, McGehee, and Roe.

Nays: None.

Recess

Mayor Roe recessed the meeting at approximately 8:20 p.m. and reconvened at approximately 8:28 p.m.

b. Award Engineering Services Contract for the I-35W at Cleveland Avenue Interchange Improvements

City Engineer Marc Culver briefly reviewed staff's recommendation as detailed in the RCA dated August 11, 2014; and proposed as a result of 2012 federal funding and identification of the project as part of the previously-completed AUAR. Mr. Culver noted the receipt of three proposals as a result of the Request for Proposals (RFP) process, all from well-qualified firms, and each competitive in nature, with scoring listed in the RCA.

Mr. Culver noted that each responded with the potential for a roundabout design at this intersection versus the proposed traffic signal design as required by any state or federal interstate system with that suggested as an option for intersection controls. Mr. Culver alerted Councilmembers that it may be a possibility that, during analysis by the consultant as required by MnDOT and Ramsey County for their approval process, it may be found that a roundabout design provided significant operational benefits; at which time the scope of the project would increase for design of a roundabout and additional construction costs. Mr. Culver noted that this was the largest risk item within this project.

If the City Council awarded the work to SRF Consulting as proposed by staff, Mr. Culver noted that staff was recommending an optional task to the scope, as suggested by SRF, to include an analysis of whether the existing storm water trunk system's capacity from the expanded intersection had sufficient capacity. Mr. Culver advised that the cost of this additional task would add an additional \$3,540 to the contract, but the SRF proposal remained lowest overall of the three proposals.

Mr. Culver advised that staff had just received the consulting firm's comments on the draft agreement (Attachment B), with the City Attorney currently reviewing them, specifically addressing insurance and liability changes to the Standard Agreement for Professional Services, based on recent changes to State law.

At the request of Councilmember Laliberte, Mr. Culver reviewed the proposed funding sources, pending the construction contract going out to bid in 2015 and total actual construction costs and including any consulting fees, as detailed in the RCA.

Mayor Roe clarified that there was an approximate \$200,000 to \$300,000 gap in the identified funding sources and final projected costs.

At the request of Councilmember McGehee, Mr. Culver addressed future discussions and decision by the City Council if the consulting firm's analysis supported construction of a roundabout, and additional estimated costs for that additional design and construction option. At the request of Councilmember McGehee, Mr. Culver reviewed estimated annual costs for a traffic signal at approximately \$1,000 to \$2,000, with general maintenance and signal pole maintenance mostly borne by Ramsey County and power costs borne by the City; with regular maintenance reviewed on a typical five year basis as traffic volumes changed.

Councilmember McGehee expressed concern regarding past discussions and suggestions that roundabouts were not senior-friendly.

Mr. Culver responded that there were already two roundabouts in that area that drivers would experience.

With Mayor Roe and Councilmember Willmus clarifying that construction of a roundabout was only in the preliminary stages at this point, making this discussion premature, Councilmember McGehee asked that staff provide updated data on roundabouts for future discussions.

At the request of Councilmember Etten, Mr. Culver advised that staff would continue to work with MnDOT and/or Ramsey County on any area studies that may prove advantageous for the City's participation; and offered to look into any on-going projects currently underway along the corridor.

At the request of Councilmember Laliberte, City Manager Trudgeon, with agreement by Finance Director Miller, clarified that tax increment financing (TIF) funds were available at this time, and the project would not rely on any future TIF dollars.

Etten moved, McGehee seconded, award of an engineering services contract (DRAFTED in Attachment B) to SRF Consulting Group in the amount of \$301,040, inclusive of the optional storm water system review; *contingent upon City Attorney review of the agreement.*

For the benefit of the public, and for his personal clarification Councilmember Willmus reiterated that this project would not involve any type of assessment process to accomplish, but would be done with existing dollars, whether TIF or state highway dollars. Based on that situation, Councilmember Willmus advised that he would support the motion.

Roll Call

Ayes: Willmus, Laliberte, Etten, McGehee, and Roe.

Nays: None.

- c. **Request by the Community Development Department for a Text Amendment to the Commercial and Mixed Use Districts Section of the Zoning Ordinance, Specifically Table 1005-1 Regarding Residential, Civic and Institutional Uses**
Before staff's presentation, Mayor Roe stated that there appeared to be a desire by the City Council to take up this action at a later date, since there was no time constraint for this particular proposed text amendment.

Councilmember Willmus stated that it was his suggestion to take this up later, to allow for public comment and more information from staff on some aspects of this in conjunction with the student housing aspect when staff felt it was appropriate to pursue those discussions. Councilmember Willmus suggested some neighbors may want to weigh in on the discussion before the City Council took action.

Community Development Director Paul Bilotta advised that it may be appropriate to bring this up for discussion at the anticipated September City Council Worksession.

Mayor Roe noted previous discussions, still pending, on the student housing aspect, basing delay of this item on further consideration of that issue.

Councilmember McGehee thanked staff for their clarity in the RCA addressing previous discussions and accurately reflecting the City Council consensus; again expressing her pleasure with the staff materials being presented.

Willmus moved, Etten seconded, TABLING this item to a date not specific.

Roll Call

Ayes: Willmus, Laliberte, Etten, and Roe.

Nays: McGehee.

Motion carried.

- d. **Consider a Zoning Text Amendment to Section 1004.05A (One- and Two-Family Design Standards of the Roseville Zoning Ordinance)**

Community Development Director Paul Bilotta briefly reviewed this request as detailed in the RCA dated August 11, 2014. Mr. Bilotta advised that this was a result of previous Planning Commission and City Council discussions; and subsequent Planning Commission public hearing and discussions held most recently at their August 6, 2014 meeting. Mr. Bilotta advised that staff was seeking to expedite this request based on a pending development proposal from Hanson Builders.

Mr. Bilotta advised that, at the request of the City Council, the Planning Commission was recommending standards for unique deeper lots that they considered be-

tween four to five car lengths, of 80' to 100'. Mr. Bilotta advised that they had settled on 100' as their recommendation for the standard for garages essentially disappearing from the street front. Mr. Bilotta noted that this would be intended as a standard for exceptional situations, with the Planning Commission using the recent Art Mueller development site and property as an example of one such unique situation.

Even recognizing the considerable amount of discussion held to-date by the Planning Commission and City Council, Councilmember McGehee expressed her preference at 80'.

Councilmember Willmus agreed with 80', and expressed his willingness to go down as far as 70'.

Councilmember Laliberte referenced the Planning Commission discussion, which she had viewed, and expressed her satisfaction with their recommendation of 100'.

Mayor Roe stated that he would prefer 100' versus 80', but was not overly supportive of such a standard at all.

McGehee moved, Willmus seconded, enactment of Ordinance No. 1470 (Attachment B) entitled, "An Ordinance Amending Selected Text of title 10 Zoning Ordinance of the Roseville City Code;" allowing garage doors to be extended forward a maximum of five feet from the predominant portion of the principal use, while still required to meet the thirty foot principal structure front yard setback; and exempting homes with an attached garage [*set back 80*] feet or more from the front property line, but still required to meet all other requirements of Section 1004.05.A.

Councilmember Laliberte reiterated her preference for a 100' setback.

Mayor Roe stated that he could not support 80', and wasn't even sure if he supported the 100'.

Roll Call

Ayes: Willmus, Etten and McGehee.

Nays: Laliberte and Roe.

Motion carried.

- e. **Network Connectivity Options: Park Facilities and Water/Sewer Stations**
Information Technology (IT) Network Manager Terre Heiser noted previous discussions and presentations to the City Council as part of managing network connectivity for park facilities for card access, security cameras, and provision for those sites to provide public internet. As detailed in the RCA dated August 11, 2014, Mr. Heiser noted three viable options as outlined; and reviewed the benefits

and/or limitations and costs for each option. Mr. Heiser noted the staff recommendation to include lift stations where applicable, even though adding to initial construction costs, spreading out operating costs across more buildings, making the overall cost more feasible where possible.

Mr. Heiser reviewed ranges for completing the fiber network for all segments, including total costs and projected operating charges, as detailed in the RCA. Mr. Heiser advised that the City, since 2006 fiber installation, and currently continued outsourcing locates, call outs and emergency repairs to a private vendor for the fiber system to facilitate any splicing needs that would be beyond the City's expertise or time period to reinstate service, especially to schools and other buildings relying exclusively on that service. Mr. Heiser advised that this cost averaged out at \$21,000 per year based on 2014, or \$4,500 per mile, and was calculated by the section of roadway involved, and how many locates were anticipated based on traffic volume and number and extent of utilities located in the rights-of-way. Mr. Heiser advised that he had calculated the annual operating costs on a 30-year fiber lifespan, averaging at approximately \$400 per month per building over that time period. While this was comparable over that 30-year span, Mr. Heiser recognized the significant capital expenditure in initial construction.

At the request of Mayor Roe, Mr. Heiser displayed the detailed costs for each option and proposed location for each service type.

At the request of Councilmember Etten, Mr. Heiser spoke to the benefit to the Public Works Department in connecting lift and booster stations, with all lifts currently connected by wireless connection, and some lift stations dependent on other lift stations, and when failures occur affecting more than one lift station. Mr. Heiser reviewed some recent examples of those failures, and frequent sporadic communication for the wireless system; and expressed the importance in having secure connections, especially between the booster station and water tower as they worked in tandem.

At the request of Councilmember Etten, City Manager Trudgeon addressed potential funding sources, indicating that there was no firm conclusion at this point. Mr. Trudgeon advised that his recommendation would be to initially address the cheaper connections immediately through the Communication Fund, and larger connections addressed and fine-tuned as they were pursued. Mr. Trudgeon noted that there was a balance in the Communications Fund that could cover those capital outlays for the shorter segments, but advised that he would want to look at them more closely before making a final recommendation.

At the request of Mayor Roe, Mr. Heiser reviewed the current fiber plan and any of these buildings or facilities that could be included as part of that expansion now, as well as outstanding and un-built fiber plans as it stands today. Mr. Heiser reviewed common segments and areas of overlap.

Mr. Heiser advised that he was in discussion with the Village of St. Anthony and their School District who had a similar situation. Mr. Heiser advised that they had an alternate connectivity to TIES and currently derived all their applications out of the Roseville City Hall. Mr. Heiser noted that Sandcastle Park was close to the Village, and staffs of both municipalities were currently exploring that segment and how it could benefit them and the School District, and a potential contribution or partnership. However, Mr. Heiser noted this was a significant amount of money and the extent of their contribution would hinge upon where bids came in, with part of the Village's bid including lift stations and other facilities as well. Mr. Heiser advised that it was a wait and see situation at this stage; but other options and potential partnerships may include the C-TV facilitate, and the more partners found on fiber segments the better, including possibly the State and/or Ramsey County. Mr. Heiser reiterated that this discussion was very preliminary at this point and there were too many moving parts to provide more refined information.

Further discussion included other potential partners, with Mr. Heiser clarifying that to-date, the City had only sought public or municipal agencies, and no private entities (e.g. University of Northwestern – St. Paul); and long-term failure of the Dale Street camera.

Councilmember McGehee stated that she didn't find the costs too shocking, and if the money could be put together, the plan to extend fiber as part of the City's overall CIP infrastructure, that seemed to be the right way to go. Councilmember McGehee opined that consistent and continual operation of the lift stations were vital to the community, and needed to have the highest quality service and connectivity available. Councilmember McGehee opined that this needed to be done eventually, and with the excellent IT Department, capacity and expertise, suggested the fiber optic extension be pursued. Councilmember McGehee suggested investigating any grants that may be available for completion of this communication work.

At the request of Councilmember Laliberte, Mr. Heiser addressed the lifespan of thirty-years for the fiber optic system, but numbers identified over a ten-year span consistent with direction from the Finance Department consistent with other typical cost projections over that period of time.

Councilmember Laliberte agreed that there may be grant funds available, and referenced comments of Ramsey County Commissioner McGuire during her recent visit expressing interest by the County in fiber discussions to meet their needs as well. Councilmember Laliberte suggested staff follow-up on that potential interest and partnership.

Councilmember Willmus agreed with Councilmember Laliberte on the need to identify funding sources and partners.

Mayor Roe suggested that a three year agreement with Comcast would provide the City time to figure things out and develop a planning process; at which point the agreement could be renewed, and allow the opportunity for the City to use Comcast service for city guests to determine its functionality. Mayor Roe further suggested that, in the meantime, some shorter, less complicated fiber extensions could be done to buildings as applicable.

If that was agreed to, Councilmember Laliberte suggested earmarking some Park Renewal Program dollars for the purpose of expanding the fiber system, and not spend all of the funds on other items.

Councilmember Etten suggested St. Paul Regional Water Board as another potential partner, especially along Dale Street and McCarron.

Mr. Heiser responded that, when looking at specific segments, staff considers any potential partners, but noted that it needed to be of some benefit or value to them. As an example, Mr. Heiser noted that, at Rosebrook Park, there was no potential partner there, but it was a relatively inexpensive cost for capital and construction costs, since he anticipated no possible partners within 3 – 10 years from now. As another example, Mr. Heiser noted that there were not potential partners (e.g. County signals or facilities) at Lexington Park either. When looking at some segments, the treatment plant, or booster station, or where St. Paul Regional Water may need to consider fiber for their reservoir, Mr. Heiser agreed that long-term funding sources and committed partners were important considerations. However, Mr. Heiser noted that nothing in the foreseeable future changed for Rosebrook or Villa Parks, and as suggested by City Manager Trudgeon, it seemed prudent to look at bids on small projects. With Lexington Park to come on line first, Mr. Heiser opined that it would be informative to see the public usage for that park once in use before moving forward with other facilities.

While in agreement with those comments, Councilmember Willmus questioned if fiber was needed in all buildings; and opined that he was not convinced that answer was affirmative; further opining that some specific park buildings could just as easily be served over the VPN Internet system, and would still work quite well.

In reviewing Mr. Heiser's comments, Councilmember Etten opined that Lexington Park was heavily programmed, and Rosebrook Park represented a short segment; and suggested using available Communication Fund dollars and authorizing those two immediately. Councilmember Etten agreed with using the Comcast Plan as a much less expensive short-term option until definite partners could be found and funding determined for extending the fiber system.

Councilmember McGehee agreed with Councilmember Etten, offering her support of park buildings being constructed and extremely functional; and offered her

support of Lexington Park coming on line first to determine how and when buildings are used, fees generated for rentals, and which if any services are used, along with providing on-site security. Councilmember McGehee advised that she could support Lexington and Rosebrook Parks at this point, opining that it was important to get at least one building up and functioning; as well as directing staff to run at full force to get the information needed to move forward.

Recognizing the comments of Councilmember Willmus in terms of Lexington Park or any of the parks, Mayor Roe questioned if staff knew the limitations of those facilities and what was adequate for them; and sought staff's perspective.

Mr. Heiser cautioned that in using the Comcast program, City Hall staff would be losing any management visibility of what city guest users were doing on the internet with that wireless connection, with that traffic not within the tunnel's filtering system and able to block anything. Mr. Heiser referenced current use of that VPN over Internet system used at Harriet Alexander Nature Center (HANC) and the Golf Course, and while it works, he reiterated his concerns in a lack of management control, based on the City's obligation to provide those connections free, but also recognizing they are subject to the terms of use found acceptable, and not used for purposes that the City could or would not support.

At the request of Mayor Roe, Mr. Heiser clarified that if the connections were by fiber, the City would and could manage that system completely and avoid those potential issues.

At the request of Councilmember Laliberte, Mr. Heiser noted that the Comcast proposal was based on the group rate quoted, and his next step would be to determine if removing any of those locations would significantly impact their proposed rate. Since construction was already happening on some of those sites, Mr. Heiser opined that getting from the right-of-way to the building itself should not impact the quoted rates significantly.

Etten moved, McGehee seconded, authorizing staff to go out for proposals to connect Rosebrook and Lexington Park buildings with fiber using money from the Communications Fund; and seeking proposals to connect the other buildings through a contract with Comcast, and then to explore more partners and funding sources for the Villa Park and Sandcastle connections.

At the request of Councilmember Willmus, Mr. Heiser reviewed previous presentation information related to controls for the uploading component for security cameras and card access areas and their various programming needs. However, Mr. Heiser noted the problems if city guest users were viewing a live-stream viewing a movie or using Netflix on the City's wireless at a park location, and impacts to the program, as well as monitoring capabilities for the Police Depart-

ment for those locations based on their wireless access point consumption and as programs are opened.

At the request of Mayor Roe, Mr. Heiser clarified that the City currently controlled the quality of service, and provided a private dedicated bandwidth for voice; but offered to explore the Hugo connection as a test to provide a more definitive answer regarding connection priorities and continually moving internet data network across VPN.

Roll Call

Ayes: Willmus, Laliberte, Etten, McGehee, and Roe.

Nays: None.

f. Authorize a Joint Fiber Optic Installation Project

Information Technology (IT) Network Manager Terre Heiser summarized information as detailed in the RCA dated August 11, 2014. Mr. Heiser clarified that staff was simply seeking to solicit proposals at this time for this specific project with partners identified; and that service agreements would be drafted for approval by respective parties once proposals were received providing more concrete numbers.

At the request of Councilmember Etten, Mr. Heiser reviewed connection options for the mentioned facilities, anticipating a route from County Road C-2 to Hamline Avenue, as it provided a wider right-of-way than Josephine Road, and could provide more value to other locations and potential partners versus the residential neighborhood on Josephine Road.

At the suggestion of Councilmember McGehee, Mr. Heiser stated that Autumn Grove Park could be added as an alternate to the proposals to provide a cost; however, he noted that there would be some time crunch if installation was to be achieved before the winter of 2014. Mr. Heiser agreed that the project for Autumn Grove may be less expensive based on mobilization by potential contractors in conjunction with this project.

Etten moved, Willmus seconded, authorizing staff to solicit proposals for the 2014 Joint Fiber Outlay project with the Roseville School District, City of Little Canada, and Ramsey-Washington Metro Watershed District as detailed in the RCA dated August 11, 2014 and related attachments; *while seeking an alternate bid to connect the Autumn Grove Park building, and determining what impact that would have to the Comcast bid previously authorized for park building internet access.*

Roll Call

Ayes: Willmus, Laliberte, Etten, McGehee, and Roe.

Nays: None.

g. Establish a New Support Supervisor Position within the Information Technology Division

Finance Director Chris Miller briefly summarized this request as detailed in the RCA dated August 11, 2014. Specific to financial impacts, Mr. Miller referenced lines 64 – 67 of the RCA, which were already included in the 2015 City Manager recommended budget proposal; with funding provided by wireless tower rentals.

McGehee moved, Etten seconded, approval of the establishment of a new IT Support Supervisor position in the Information Technology Division as detailed in the RCA dated August 11, 2014.

Councilmember McGehee spoke in support of the motion, opining that it was needed and well-planned, and needed to expedite services to municipal IT partners.

Councilmember Laliberte advised that, while she would support this position, she would need to give serious consideration to positions going forward, including for the 2015 budget, and would be more cautious in what was supported for full Roseville positions not supported in part by other partners. Councilmember Laliberte noted that the 2015 budget needed resolution before adding other new positions.

Councilmember Willmus concurred with the comments of Councilmember Laliberte.

Roll Call

Ayes: Willmus, Laliberte, Etten, McGehee, and Roe.

Nays: None.

h. Establish an Additional Systems Engineer Position within the Information Technology Division

Finance Director Chris Miller reviewed this request to establish an additional systems engineer position within the IT Division to alleviate the workload of the current two engineers, as detailed in the RDA dated August 11, 2014.

Mr. Miller reviewed proposed financing as detailed in lines 47 – 49 of the RCA; and noted that this one position would be entirely funded by Roseville dollars and to specifically address the growing needs of the city. Mr. Miller noted that this position was included as part of the Finance Department's two-year plan recently presented to the City Council, but staff was seeking to expedite the hire in 2014, with the coming on line of new park facilities and existing park buildings in addressing their support needs that were not currently included in the IT work plan.

Mr. Heiser respectfully requested an opportunity to update the City Council on the ongoing growth of the IT Division within the Finance Department; advantages

Regular City Council Meeting

Monday, August 11, 2014

Page 31

for Roseville and other municipal employees in being able to work within any city within the twenty-seven full-service agreement partnership network system and continued operation from those locations in case of power failures or other emergencies within one of those jurisdictions.

Mr. Heiser addressed the number of residents and employees served in those twenty-one municipalities, as well as other jurisdictions and agencies, on that network; and comparable staffing metrics of the Roseville IT Division and similar systems. By adding this additional engineer, Mr. Heiser advised that this would allow him to better manage the network and off-load day-to-day administrative tasks to expand and address strategic plans; all dedicated to Roseville tasks.

Mr. Heiser provided comparisons numbers and increases specific to the City of Roseville since 2001, in the number of computer users within the City and extended e-mail accounts for employees, City Councilmembers, advisory commissions, and interns; along with discreet user accounts required by law to protect private data and individual passwords; computer equipment in police squads and public works vehicles; and separate accounts for every user and clerk in the License Center handled locally versus formerly handled by the State of MN, but now at the Deputy Registrar offices. Mr. Heiser noted that, in the near future, Ramsey County would be mandating CAD in all fire vehicles as well.

Councilmember Etten questioned how this person could remain dedicated only to the City of Roseville with Roseville footing the bill, when they would be theoretically relieving those other agencies as well through vacation time and other benefits.

Mr. Heiser clarified that the City of Roseville currently paid 25%-28% of each IT employee costs; and the hope was that Roseville would keep this JPA group together and get everyone caught up and remain consistent with ever-changing technology. Mr. Heiser advised that there was more than sufficient Roseville-specific projects over the next 1.5 years to ensure that position was always available and staffing and anchoring the needs of Roseville, as well as other partners. Mr. Heiser noted the management challenge would be to utilize that person for the intended purpose and not for the immediate benefit of other partners.

At 9:59 p.m., Etten moved, McGehee seconded, to extend the meeting to completion of this item.

Roll Call

Ayes: Willmus, Laliberte, Etten, McGehee, and Roe.

Nays: None.

Councilmember Etten stated that, while he supported the purpose of serving Roseville and creating sanity for other IT employees, he favored looking at combining some of the costs for this position with the JPA partners, since they'll benefit from services and the greater system would benefit.

In referencing discussions in October of 2013, Mr. Miller clarified that current the funding with JPA partners was supported by the partners, and support hours for the Roseville network were calculated with the equivalent of four FTE's available, but the City of Roseville only paying for two FTE's. Therefore, Mr. Miller noted that the rest of the group was already paying for two City of Roseville FTE's, which was a benefit of these partnerships. If the question is whether the partners are paying enough, Mr. Miller clarified that the Roseville IT staff was asking the City Council to recognize the service burden just for Roseville that was not currently supported by Roseville, as the explosive growth and needs of Roseville over the last decade were maintained. Mr. Miller advised that the same two engineers could not be continually asked to permanently work 24/7, and 60 hours per week. Mr. Miller opined the only reason for the success of the IT Division to-date was due to the dedicated employees the City had been fortunate enough to retain; and asked that the City Council expedite this position request to alleviate that pressure.

Councilmember Willmus noted the continuing interest from other communities and agencies in this joint venture, and suggested the need to review the formula, understanding that some may drop off. Councilmember Willmus concurred with Councilmember Etten's sentiments that at some point the fee structure in billing other communities under JPA's needed to be reviewed to maximize that for the City of Roseville.

Councilmember McGehee recognized the comments of fellow Councilmembers; however, she expressed her personal concern that only two employees were currently performing these essential functions, without backup. Councilmember McGehee questioned if the majority was willing to go ahead and authorize this now and request that staff talk with the remainder of the group, even if this person is only designated to serve Roseville. Councilmember McGehee recognized the concerns and comments raised by Mr. Miller; as well as having listened to staff's repeated requests to fill this position and alleviate the pressure on the IT Division; opining that under any circumstance, the consortium needed a third person in that key role.

Mr. Heiser advised that he fully intended to bring this back to the consortium during negotiations in 2016, with those partners having been fully involved and supportive in the past. However, Mr. Heiser reiterated the specific needs of the City of Roseville as their operations have become more complex; noting that what the services provided by the IT Division for the City of Roseville was completely different, and the City needed to fend for itself along that line. Mr. Heiser noted that the City of Roseville didn't have an IT Department, and didn't create an IT Division until three JPA's were already in place; and the City had never to-date taken the burden on itself with its own IT needs and growth. Mr. Heiser reiterated that he had no problem bringing the consortium into the discussion and future negotia-

tions starting in 1.5 years; and if everyone says no, the City of Roseville would still benefit.

At the request of Councilmember McGehee, Mr. Heiser addressed some of the software applications handled in-house specific to the City of Roseville, in addition to the complexity of managing the law enforcement's mobile units beyond their day-to-day functions through agreements with other municipalities who were having difficulties on their own. Mr. Heiser noted that the City's IT Division was able to trouble-shoot some of those software applications and now other municipalities and agencies depended on the City's expertise, especially with security and encryption requirements.

Councilmember Laliberte, while recognizing this request in the 2015 budget, but being asked to expedite it now, stated that she was not comfortable making that decision tonight, or with funding being identified from License Center reserves, whether for short- or long-term funding. Without having more specifics available and additional funding confirmed, Councilmember Laliberte opined that further conversation was needed before she could make that decision.

Toward the funding source, Councilmember Etten suggested City Council support of the position for the remainder of 2014 and under the 2015 budget by using reserve funds during the interim, until support from partners could be sought in 2016 as new contract negotiations were underway. Councilmember Etten stated that this could serve as a stop gap to pay for this quality position until the partners could provide more help; and still consider the option as part of the 2015 budget process.

At the request of Mayor Roe, Mr. Miller advised that the License Center reserves should have the ability to fund the position without drawing down on cash annual operating surplus at this time.

McGehee moved approval of the establishment of a new IT Systems Engineer position in the Information Technology Division as detailed in the RCA dated August 11, 2014; funded by License Center surplus dollars until a positive plan from consortium is identified going forward

Mayor Roe declared the motion failed for lack of a second.

Willmus moved, Laliberte seconded, taking no action and continuing discussions as part of the 2015 Budget for this position.

Mr. Miller stated that he had attempted to identify a sense of urgency for the City Council in meeting the increased demands of the new park facilities and network facilities; requiring someone to monitor them once in place and manage projects to get them in place, none of which were part of the IT Division's current work

Regular City Council Meeting

Monday, August 11, 2014

Page 34

plan, but creating additional work for the existing network engineers. Mr. Miller asked Councilmembers if they had any viable solutions for those already overburdened engineers who are now being compelled to do even more.

McGehee moved a friendly amendment to fund the position for the remainder of 2014 from the Park Renewal Program or License Center funds to facilitate filling the position until the end of discussion with the consortium.

Mayor Roe declared the motion failed due to lack of a second.

As 2015 budget discussions continue, Councilmember Laliberte opined that if the majority determined that the position should be filled in 2014, there was no reason it couldn't happen, but was not specific to January 1, 2015.

Mayor Roe advised that he was comfortable making the decision at this time, but reserved the right to take action in the future.

Roll Call

Ayes: Willmus, Laliberte and Etten.

Nays: McGehee and Roe.

Motion carried.

14. Business Items – Presentations/Discussions

15. City Manager Future Agenda Review

16. Councilmember-Initiated Items for Future Meetings

17. Adjourn

Etten moved, Willmus seconded adjournment of the meeting at approximately 10:18 p.m.

Roll Call

Ayes: Willmus, Laliberte, Etten, McGehee, and Roe.

Nays: None.

Daniel J. Roe, Mayor

ATTEST:

Patrick J. Trudgeon, City Manager