

  
**ROSEVILLE**  
**REQUEST FOR COUNCIL ACTION**

Date: August 10, 2015  
Item No.: 15.b

---

Department Approval

City Manager Approval



---

Item Description: Discussion of 2015-2017 Policy Priority Planning Document

---

1 **BACKGROUND**

2 At the June 22 City Council meeting, the City Council adopted the Policy Priority Planning document  
3 that identified two strategic priorities to be focused on over the next 18 months. The two priorities were  
4 Housing and Redevelopment and Infrastructure Sustainability. The City Council instructed staff to  
5 bring back the document for further discussion and decisions on identifying targets and initiatives for  
6 the identified priorities. Attachment A includes the approved document. The City Manager has  
7 included the previously identified targets and initiatives in the table for information purposes.

8 **POLICY OBJECTIVE**

9 Adopting strategic priorities will provide the City Council and staff direction in providing City services  
10 and programs in a planned and targeted way.

11 **FINANCIAL IMPACTS**

12 There are not any costs for further discussion of the Policy Priority Planning document. As the  
13 priorities are executed, any new costs will need be included in future budgets.

14 **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

15 The City Council should discuss and decide on possible targets and initiatives that will implement the  
16 identified strategic priorities.

17 **REQUESTED COUNCIL ACTION**

18 The City Council should discuss and decide on possible targets and initiatives that will implement the  
19 identified strategic priorities.

20 Prepared by: Patrick Trudgeon, City Manager (651) 792-7021

Attachments: A: Policy Priority Planning Summary Document  
B: June 22, 2015 City Council minutes

## City Council Priority Plan – 2015-2016

<b>Strategic Priority</b>	<b>Key Outcome Indicator (KOI)</b>	<b>Target*</b>	<b>Strategic Initiatives*</b>	<b>Responsible Staff/Commission</b>
<b>Housing and Redevelopment</b>	<b>SE Roseville</b>	<i>Increase in comm. MV Increase in resid. MV</i>	<i>Create Southeast Roseville Redevelopment Plan  Formalize Southeast Roseville Working Group</i>	
	<b>Twin Lakes</b>	<i>50 Increase in living wage jobs</i>	<i>Establish Twin Lakes Economic Development Program</i>	
	<b>Move-up housing</b>	<i>20 Increase units \$350k/&gt;</i>	<i>Establish Move-Up Housing Program</i>	
	<b>Residential hsg value</b>	<i>10% chng. Owner-occupied value-2015-20 10% chng. Rental value-2015-20</i>	<i>Establish Housing Value Support Program</i>	
<b>Infrastructure Sustainability</b>	<b>Capital improvement funding</b>	<i>Adopted comprehensive infrastructure plan &amp; funding strategy</i>	<i>Establish enterprise-wide consistency for asset management plan implementation</i>	
	<b>Infrastructure Condition</b>	<i>Adopted standards for each asset category</i>	<i>Establish measure of effectiveness for each infrastructure asset</i>	

*\*These columns need further discussion and revision by the City Council. Previous thoughts on the contents of these columns are shown in italics for reference purposes.*

### **Guiding Principles of City Council Priority Plan Educational Outreach, Process, Policy, and Transparency**

**Regular City Council Meeting**  
**Monday, June 22, 2015**  
**Page 14**

**12. Public Hearings**

**13. Budget Items**

**14. Business Items (Action Items)**

**a. Consider Policy Priority Planning Document**

As Councilmember Laliberte had been unable to attend the initial discussion of Councilmembers in May when this document was discussed, Mayor Roe invited her to share her feedback at this time.

At the request of Councilmember Laliberte, the “City of Roseville-Strategic Plan Summary for 2015-17 (part of Attachment C, page 3) was displayed for reference during her comments. In general, and as she previously shared with her colleagues and City Manager Trudgeon, Councilmember Laliberte stated she was not in favor of adopting the strategic initiatives as presented. Councilmember Laliberte reviewed each of the five strategic priorities listed and provided her comments specific to each.

Civic Engagement

Councilmember Laliberte questioned how or whether to include this as part of the strategic plan, especially her differing view of proposed strategic initiatives laid out by staff. Recognizing that increased engagement was an overarching priority of this City Council, and recent creation of the new Community Engagement Commission (CEC), and regular requests of and a desire by staff and the community to improve those engagement efforts, Councilmember Laliberte questioned the need to included it as part of the strategic plan when it was already a given.

Councilmember Laliberte opined that the use of “civic” and “community” engagement meant different things, and while the City Council values that area of focus, she found a gap in understanding how best to achieve it. Until that became a common understanding among all stakeholders, Councilmember Laliberte suggested it not be included as a new goal; and not be a checklist, but an ongoing process and culture shift that the City Council and staff had already made a commitment to.

Councilmember Laliberte expressed her confidence in allowing the newly-formed CEC, and her expectations of staff to engage the community, would suffice without defining additional strategic initiatives. In consideration of those initiatives proposed by staff, Councilmember Laliberte noted the Key Outcome Indicator (KOI) for community satisfaction was already being addressed in surveys with commitment by the City Council to perform them every other year.

**Regular City Council Meeting**  
**Monday, June 22, 2015**  
**Page 15**

Regarding the KOI to increase volunteer opportunities, Councilmember Laliberte opined that the target goal to simply increase volunteer opportunities by 5% didn't necessarily translate into engagement.

Councilmember Laliberte opined that the KOI of improving participation by under-represented populations in Roseville and target of engaging three new segments of the community, while appreciated, also did not mean engagement. Councilmember Laliberte questioned if any of the targets or strategic initiatives as proposed actually got at what was needed or what the City Council hoped to accomplish.

Housing and Redevelopment

Councilmember Laliberte opined that this section needed more work by the City Council as a group, since it involved bigger issues and involved multiple departments, commissions, community stakeholders and others.

Councilmember Laliberte opined that the KOI of SE Roseville should be a priority for everyone, but suggested more progress could be made if that priority remained open, and the who, what and when was better defined.

Regarding Twin Lakes, Councilmember Laliberte opined that there remained more work to do, and a clear priority should be for the City to define that work, the steps and processes to achieve it, and goals at the end of the process.

Regarding move-up-housing, Councilmember Laliberte agreed that it could be an initiative, but since the City didn't own the land, further discussion was needed about what was possible, what the City Council needed from staff and advisory commissions, and then set targets that could be realistically achieved.

Regarding the value of residential housing, Councilmember Laliberte suggested more discussion about the specifics of that section and proposed targets as currently outlined.

Effective Governance

Councilmember Laliberte suggested striking this strategic priority completely, opining that it involved individual leadership and actions speaking louder than words from each person. Councilmember Laliberte opined that the proposed targets and strategic initiatives didn't serve to resolve any particular item; and recognized that involving the community may mean issues take longer to bring to fruition. As far as the process transparency KOI, Councilmember Laliberte agreed with the concept, but since staff and the CEC had already been tasked to pursue that continuum, no new document was needed.

Specific to the KOI of respectful interaction of the leadership team, Councilmember Laliberte further opined that this was up to each individual and that there was

**Regular City Council Meeting**  
**Monday, June 22, 2015**  
**Page 16**

no meaningful way to measure it or change it, and therefore there was no need for it to be addressed on staff's radar. Councilmember Laliberte opined that, if residents didn't believe Councilmembers were being respectful of each other or them, they would address that during the next election cycle.

Organizational Effectiveness

Councilmember Laliberte also suggested striking this section entirely. While the community and staff cared, Councilmember Laliberte noted the City Manager was hired and had expressed confidence that he could lead the organization in the most effective way possible. Therefore, Councilmember Laliberte clarified that the community, City Council and staff either believed that or didn't, and it would become self-evident in other ways.

Regarding the KOI of employee satisfaction, Councilmember Laliberte opined there was no need to hire another consultant, but under the City Manger's leadership and during employee reviews or exit interviews, part of the discussion should be why people stayed or didn't stay. Councilmember Laliberte further noted that employee turnover could serve as another tracking measure.

Specific to the KOI for resource allocation, Councilmember Laliberte noted this was already under review by the City Manager and his management staff, and would be further reviewed annually by the City Council during the budget process.

Councilmember Laliberte suggested that the proposed strategic initiative suggesting an annual review of organizational interdependencies and collaboration opportunities was another aspect of why the City Manager was hired and part of what he was already doing. If he had concerns or opportunities that should be brought to the attention of the City Council, Councilmember Laliberte opined that he could do so, but there was no need for any additional tracking.

Infrastructure Sustainability

Without focused work form this group or a lack of funds for improvements, Councilmember Laliberte opined there was a need for the City Council to focus on the CIP as part of the KOI for capital improvement funding should be incorporated in the budget process sooner rather than later. Councilmember Laliberte noted the pending nature of the asset management software program across the organization and the City Council's desire to see that completed, opining that urgency should be monitored moving forward.

Regarding the infrastructure condition KOI, Councilmember Laliberte suggested this should already be part of the City Manager's work and area of focus for each department as they worked around industry standards.

General Comments

**Regular City Council Meeting**  
**Monday, June 22, 2015**  
**Page 17**

Regarding the actual document itself, Councilmember Laliberte expressed her concerns about cost, proposed timeframes, and staffing limitations.

Councilmember Laliberte opined that the City had done a disservice to the community with this proposed plan as currently drafted, suggesting it proceed cautiously about which portions it ultimately adopted. Councilmember Laliberte noted the need to knowingly agree among Councilmembers the staff time and resources being expended.

Councilmember Laliberte noted her initial hope that the Retreat exercises would allow the City Council and staff to come away with broad goals for the Mayor and City Council to address for one year, in addition to the ongoing work of the body. Since it's now the middle of the one year, with the original proposal for a three year plan, Councilmember Laliberte noted that only two of those years remained, part of which could realistically be under the direction of a new City Council. Councilmember Laliberte stated her unwillingness to obligate a future City Council to this sitting City Council's priorities.

Councilmember Laliberte noted that considerable staff time had already been spent on this project, and given their time constraints, the City Council needed to decide if this was how they wanted their staff to spend their time. Councilmember Laliberte recognized the City Council's commitment to measurable results and delivery of quality services in Roseville, and questioned if this plan allowed the City to make progress on specific issues in a timely manner.

Instead, Councilmember Laliberte suggested moving forward in the remainder of 2015 with only two to three short-term, big picture items that the City Council and staff could realistically work toward. In defining those 2-3 strategic priorities, Councilmember Laliberte suggested making those a standing agenda item for each subsequent City Council meeting or at least on a monthly basis for an update or discussion publically to review continuing progress, allowing all stakeholders access to the same information at the same time. Councilmember Laliberte opined that this would provide the public with the benefit of and assurance that behind-the-scenes work was being performed (e.g. SE Roseville working group or Twin Lakes community meetings).

Additional Strategic Priority or Goal

Councilmember Laliberte suggested the addition of one additional new item for discussion by the body, and as part of the short-term priority list specifically addressing the consistency of direction given by the City Council to its advisory commissions. As those groups work on their own, Councilmember Laliberte questioned if the City Council touched base with them as often as it should whether through the joint meetings or in other ways.

SWOT Analysis

**Regular City Council Meeting**  
**Monday, June 22, 2015**  
**Page 18**

Councilmember Laliberte opined that the SWOT analysis provided good information, much of which didn't rise to the final document, but worth reviewing, and recommended that should be done on an annual basis moving forward. Councilmember Laliberte suggested a swift review of the SWOT document be performed each January as part of the organizational meeting.

**Councilmember Comments/Feedback**

**Councilmember McGehee**

In response to Councilmember Laliberte, Councilmember McGehee agreed with her comments regarding civic engagement and effective governance, and emphasized her concurrence that both are cultural and under individual control. In terms of transparency, Councilmember McGehee suggested the development of policies addressing a known and clear process inviting specific elements of a neighborhood or other or civic participation opportunity. If those policies are not built into programming, Councilmember McGehee opined it would continue to be inconsistent on only complaint-driven.

Regarding move-up housing, Councilmember McGehee opined a good discussion had been held at the Retreat about that, and when she considers the twenty new units and their price point as part of the revised Dale Street Project, she thought that could be removed from the list once they're constructed.

Councilmember McGehee agreed that she didn't like the checklist approach either, and while agreeing this had been a good exercise, some things had come out of the Retreat that did not become part of the final report, nor had they been discussed in any meaningful way even though she found the overall discussion to be good.

Councilmember McGehee agreed with the need to shine a light on the asset management program for continue monitoring and subsequent completion.

In terms of civic engagement, Councilmember McGehee opined that the City Council and City still had a long way to go, but the checklist would not get anyone there, and required a cultural shift. Agreeing that outreach was a fine initiative, Councilmember McGehee opined that it needed to be to everyone, not only targeting a specific group, but across the board.

Whether or not an employee survey is done, Councilmember McGehee opined that it was important for the City Council to understand staff jobs. Councilmember Member McGehee suggested that may be accomplished through the City Manager proposing a policy for consistent exit interviews; and how to provide enough steps within each department to satisfy employees as they grow in their career. Councilmember McGehee stated she would defer to the City Manager on this topic, and if he felt a survey was needed he could provide information going forward to establish a policy.

**Regular City Council Meeting**  
**Monday, June 22, 2015**  
**Page 19**

Councilmember McGehee suggested a project template going forward, with minimal tweaking and similar to the Dale Street process, that would go a long way toward civic engagement and organizational effectiveness. While understanding the need to do so as part of the budget process and allowing Department Heads to know City Council expectations for major focus items, Councilmember McGehee noted there were other policy issues for departments.

**Councilmember Etten**

Councilmember Etten expressed appreciation of many of the ideas expressed in Councilmember Laliberte's "white paper," and suggested taking items and making revisions that would essentially prioritize those priorities. Councilmember Etten stated that he really liked Councilmember Laliberte's idea of having fewer priorities and monthly updates, even perhaps some quarterly as applicable, but keeping them in front of the City. Councilmember Etten clarified that the purpose is not meant to direct all city operations and services, but those few areas the City Council wanted to specifically focus on.

Councilmember Etten opined that housing and redevelopment was important for Roseville as the market continued to improve and the City to transition. Councilmember Etten also spoke in support of the need to look at how to task advisory commissions and boards with meaningful activities. Specific to housing and redevelopment efforts, Councilmember Etten opined that this was largely up to the HRA and City Council working together to flesh out the targets and strategic initiatives currently listed on the right side of the document; with continual adjustment over time as citizens and advisory commissions bring new information forward for the City Council's and HRA's attention.

Specific to civic engagement, Councilmember Etten suggested changing the strategic priority to "Community Outreach." Councilmember Etten noted that the CEC had already been tasked with many of these items, and had asked to be given the opportunity to address them in this important role. While supporting volunteer opportunities, Councilmember Etten noted the need for more public input about how to get more new people involved.

Noting his total support of participation by underrepresented groups in the community, Councilmember Etten noted the need to continually and further address immigrant populations and apartment dwellers as part of that process and as a vital part of the community. Councilmember Etten opined that those initiatives could be addressed as part of the role of advisory boards and commissions.

Regarding infrastructure sustainability, Councilmember Etten opined that it fell into so many departments, and under the adopted CIP. Councilmember Etten opined that from his perspective, updating the CIP and adopting those updates in 2016 from the original 2012 document was a necessary step and would provide a more accurate document with those updates four years after inception.



**Regular City Council Meeting**  
**Monday, June 22, 2015**  
**Page 20**

Councilmember Etten agreed that individuals could work on respectful interaction on their own, but opined that things were in a better spot than in the past.

Councilmember Etten suggested moving the community survey into the Organizational Effectiveness priority.

Regarding resolving items as introduced, Councilmember Etten agreed that sometimes items may need deferral to receive additional information or for a recommendation or clarification from a citizen advisory commission, but suggested that simply could involve providing additional information in packet materials for follow-through.

Councilmember Etten supported retaining the process transparency KOI as being vitally important.

Councilmember Etten recognized his appreciation of Councilmember Laliberte's idea to work with boards and staff assigned to those boards by providing clear direction allowing them to be more productive and positively engaged. Councilmember Etten opined that this was a good goal to retain, as he had heard comments from a number of advisory commissions that the City Council had not helped as much as they could have.

Under a new document title of "City Council Priority Plan – 2015/2016," Councilmember Etten suggested revising the goals to focus on just a few things that would end before a new City Council is seated and as follows:

- 1) Housing and Redevelopment;
- 2) Community Outreach/Communication (formerly civic engagement);
- 3) Infrastructure Sustainability; and
- 4) Effective Governance/Organizational Effectiveness

**Councilmember Willmus**

Councilmember Willmus thanked Councilmember Laliberte for providing her perspective; and offered his agreement with much that she had stated and the input from Councilmember McGehee. While appreciating the ranking or prioritization suggested by Councilmember Etten, Councilmember Willmus was unable to fully support that, and agreed that "Effective Governance" and "Organizational Effectiveness" could fall off.

In reviewing strategic priorities and tasking citizen advisory commissions, Councilmember Willmus opined that civic engagement specifically could fall within the role of the CEC. When starting this process, Councilmember Willmus noted his understanding that this would identify several areas of focus for the City Council over the next two years.

**Regular City Council Meeting**  
**Monday, June 22, 2015**  
**Page 21**

Regarding infrastructure and housing, Councilmember Willmus noted the need for them to remain, but suggested more focus of the City Council and their citizen advisory commissions in order to attain the direction being sought.

One area of disagreement Councilmember Willmus noted as addressed by Councilmember McGehee included targets being static, but from his perspective they should be continually moving. As an example, when the new housing units come online as part of the Dale Street project, Councilmember Willmus opined the need remained to continue evaluating housing needs.

Councilmember McGehee clarified that was not the intent of her comments, and agreed with Councilmember Willmus' perspective that they continued to move; and would constantly be in flux.

**Mayor Roe**

While in agreement with a lot of things already discussed and the common viewpoints expressed, Mayor Roe questioned the need to rank the priorities by number, but to simply recognize them as THE priorities with no one more important than another. Mayor Roe spoke in support of streamlining and reducing the document.

Specific to organizational effectiveness, Mayor Roe agreed this was more internal, even though the goal was to have the City Manager more involved, it may be of lower priority for the City Council and therefore removed as part of this document.

Mayor Roe suggested combining organizational effectiveness with civic engagement re-titled as "Community Outreach/Engagement," and then have two other categories and priorities identified as "Housing and Redevelopment," and "Infrastructure Sustainability."

Related to community outreach, Mayor Roe agreed with Councilmember Laliberte that since a survey was already being done periodically, there was no need to stress it as part of this document.

Regarding volunteer opportunities, Mayor Roe noted the target to increase volunteer engagement or teams, for him the strategic initiative was to figure out those strategies, as well as engaging underrepresented populations, which the CEC was already looking at and how best to measure that.

Specific to move-up housing, Mayor Roe reminded his colleagues that the number of 20 additional units was a starting point for discussions at the Retreat, and initiatives may be to pursue applicable initiatives versus an actual program.

**Regular City Council Meeting**  
**Monday, June 22, 2015**  
**Page 22**

Regarding residential housing values, Mayor Roe again questioned whether a program was needed rather than looking at initiatives to incentivize property values (e.g. code enforcement, building standards, etc.) and involved staff, the HRA and the Planning Commission among others.

Regarding effective governance, if combined with civic engagement, Mayor Roe opined that only the area of process transparency be retained and development of ways to improve it and hold the City Council and staff accountable to ongoing improvement.

Mayor Roe agreed with Councilmember Etten's comments regarding updating the CIP.

Mayor Roe expressed his agreement in only going through 2016 from the point of view that 2015 is already half over, and if pursuing a similar exercise as this in 2016 it only be done with the purpose to further tweak this document.

When talking about strategic planning, and in response to the public and citizen advisory commissions, Mayor Roe opined that the City Council reworded it to reflect the intent as a priority planning exercise, and not an exercise to develop a new *Imagine Roseville 2025* community document. Mayor Roe clarified that such a community visioning process would be the focus in a few years, and the perception of this process became much larger than originally intended. However, Mayor Roe expressed his appreciation to his colleagues that the original intent was being refocused, which should make the public more comfortable with the outcome. Mayor Roe reiterated that the purpose of this exercise and subsequent document was not replacing the CEC discussion and larger community vision; and also emphasized that the *Imagine Roseville 2025* community visioning process would need to be revisited in the near future, and would be an entirely separate process than this.

**Councilmember Laliberte Responses**

Councilmember Laliberte stated that, if organizational effectiveness was eliminated from the document, she was fine with that.

As for effective governance, if to remain or be disseminated, Councilmember Laliberte suggested it be discussed further at a future City Council Worksession.

Regarding renaming community outreach, Councilmember Laliberte opined that some still didn't serve to measure engagement. If better direction is needed for citizen advisory commission, Councilmember Laliberte suggested the CEC provide recommendation to the City Council but not include it in this document for eventual adoption.

**Regular City Council Meeting**  
**Monday, June 22, 2015**  
**Page 23**

Specific to housing and redevelopment priorities, Councilmember Laliberte noted the many entities working on those items, including the Planning Commission, HRA, Community Development Department and CEC.

Councilmember Laliberte spoke in support of retaining the priority for infrastructure sustainability.

Councilmember McGehee asked that her four overarching focus areas be incorporated into each and every goal as finalized, and including: educational outreach, transparency, formulation of policy, and process.

**Public Comment**

**Lisa McCormick**

Ms. McCormick expressed appreciation for the thoughtful contributions provided by Councilmember Laliberte as well as the points brought out by individual council members tonight.

Under effective governance, Ms. McCormick expressed her total agreement, noting culture references by several Councilmembers. As a member of the community, Ms. McCormick expressed her frustration at times to fully understand community and civic engagement, opining that sometimes they appeared to be at odds.

Without going into too much detail, Ms. McCormick referenced a personal incident this week causing her to pause and consider the current Ethics Code, and lack of mention in the Mission Statement about a code of professional conduct. Ms. McCormick opined that this involved not only interpersonal interaction between Councilmembers, boards and citizen advisory commissions, but also should include those parties and their interaction with the public. Ms. McCormick opined that it was important to her to be assured as a citizen if she interacts with a board member or commissioner, she would receive courteous treatment.

While appreciating the transparency efforts, and in her personal review of staff reports and staff presentations, Ms. McCormick noted the need to provide a review of financial implications as part of that information, especially impacts to infrastructure and CIP, both important aspects.

Ms. McCormick expressed appreciation for tonight's discussion, opining things were moving in the right direction. However, regarding accountability being addressed at the next election as suggested by Councilmember Laliberte, Ms. McCormick stated she would prefer not to wait until then and as with conduct, people be held accountable as part of being challenged to be better.

**Kathleen Erickson, 1790 Centennial Drive**

Ms. Erickson expressed concern, specific to community engagement efforts, that often it seems like the only time the City was interested in that involvement was

**Regular City Council Meeting**  
**Monday, June 22, 2015**  
**Page 24**

when seeking help clearing Buckthorn or building a playground, or serving on a task force or commission. Ms. Erickson opined that it needed to start in the community and not just be a City Hall culture, but a recognition that each neighborhood had its own culture as well; and encouraged the City Council and staff to make themselves aware of the flavor of each neighborhood. While not necessarily perfect, Ms. Erickson opined that people lived where they did for a reason, but often when speaking to the City Council at a public meeting such as this, it felt like the City Council and staff were light years away from understanding what the neighborhood valued and what they didn't want to lose. Ms. Erickson asked that community engagement not be thought of as "drive-through government" cruising through their neighborhood, but by expending effort to find out who they were. As a result of recent neighborhood issues, Ms. Erickson noted she had found out she lives in a great neighborhood, and asked that the City Council and staff also look beyond the obvious perception of community engagement.

Mayor Roe thanked the public for their verbal and written comments throughout this discussion process.

Laliberte moved, Willmus seconded, renaming the document to "City Council Priority Plan – 2015-2016," finishing out this year and tweaking it as needed in 2016; and adopt only two strategic priorities or goals entitled "Housing and Redevelopment," and "Infrastructure Sustainability."

At the request of Mayor Roe, Councilmembers Laliberte and Willmus confirmed that this would retain key outcome indicators as currently written.

Councilmember McGehee offered an amendment to incorporate her four goals as previously mentioned.

Councilmember Laliberte opined that those would come into the targets and initiatives yet to be rewritten or refined.

Councilmember McGehee noted the public comment reference and upcoming training sponsored by the Human Rights Commission for community training addressing ethics and professional conduct.

Mayor Roe suggested that as an additional item, at the discretion of the body, following this discussion.

Councilmember McGehee reiterated the importance of ethics as an important part of civic engagement when citizens bring things forward and the City Council's current response is only "thank you."

As part of this overall process, Councilmember Etten stated his enjoyment of the robust discussion resulting in the community and among Councilmembers, as

**Regular City Council Meeting**  
**Monday, June 22, 2015**  
**Page 25**

well as tonight's discussion. However, Councilmember Etten opined that he was still not ready to let go of the third piece of the document; and therefore offered a friendly amendment to include a strategic priority for "cultural change" and how best to communicate and provide information as a City.

Etten moved, Roe seconded, an amendment to include a third category entitled "Community Outreach/Communication," and including process discussion from the current "Effective Governance" priority for process transparency and other indicators (KOI's) involving participation of other areas from the current "Civic Engagement" category; and those areas that fall into the CEC realm for further refinement.

To clarify the amendment, Mayor Roe reworded it as intended to add a third priority entitled, "Community Outreach/Communication," incorporating the process transparency KOI category from "Effective Governance," and participation by underrepresented populations KOI category as part of "Civic Engagement" at a minimum.

Councilmember Laliberte expressed her interest in working more closely with citizen advisory commissions on guiding principles to use in working on priorities, not as a checklist but guiding those things not being tasked to advisory commissions.

Councilmember McGehee spoke in opposition to the amendment, agreeing with Councilmember Laliberte that the original motion presented a more manageable and cleaner approach, while still allowing inclusion of those other items as addressed by Councilmember Laliberte. Councilmember McGehee expressed her preference for a clean, comprehensive document.

Councilmember Etten stated his rationale for including the amendment was based on the reasons outlined by Councilmember McGehee; opining that it included in the document it allowed for regular updates and tracking versus a checklist.

Councilmember Willmus stated his concern was even in providing charges to citizen advisory commissions, as a body the CEC incorporated a good group of people that he would like to allow an opportunity to take this document and see what they returned with versus the City Council now establishing its own KOI and targets. Councilmember Willmus suggested allowing the CEC to bring it back; and therefore would not support the friendly amendment at this time; concurring with the two items in the original motion as moved by Councilmembers Laliberte and McGehee, and including the four goals stated by Councilmember McGehee and embedded in each goal.

Mayor Roe spoke in support of the amendment, stating that the priority of this City Council is to improve communications through the process of transparency,

**Regular City Council Meeting**  
**Monday, June 22, 2015**  
**Page 26**

and nothing talked about the targets in the original, thus the added third category included. As noted by Councilmember Etten, if additional KOI are received from the CEC or others, they can be added in, but this amendment to the motion reflected the February Retreat and subsequent discussions, and needed to be amended to the original motion to adequately address the priorities of this City Council and the City organization.

Councilmember Laliberte stated she would not support the amendment for the main reason that this direction had already been given and requests that these things happen outside of this document.

**Roll Call (Amendment)**

**Ayes:** Etten and Roe.

**Nays:** Willmus, McGehee, Laliberte.

**Motion fails.**

**Roll Call (Original Motion)**

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

**Nays:** None.

As a follow-up to staff, without objection Mayor Roe directed that the “Rapp” document be identified as reference material only, and not the official document until this new revision was created as a separate document.

For clarification, City Manager Trudgeon reviewed that staff would create a similar one-page document listing the two priorities as adopted and KOI as part of that revised and separate document; with the “Rapp” report serving as reference material, and including the SWOT analysis.

At the request of City Manager Trudgeon as to whether to include Councilmember McGehee’s four goals, Mayor Roe clarified that they were not yet an official action of the City Council at this time.

Regarding targets and strategic initiatives to support what has now been adopted by the City Council, Councilmember Laliberte asked that at a future work session, they discuss those further, at which time citizen advisory commission, staff and other feedback could be engaged providing a much broader group than just the City Council.

Personally, Mayor Roe opined the City Council needed to decide how to move on from here as a body.

Councilmember Laliberte opined those groups be involved a City Council work session.

**Regular City Council Meeting**  
**Monday, June 22, 2015**  
**Page 27**

Mayor Roe asked if this only got us back to the same current issue if citizen advisory commissions were part of that discussion, questioning if the City Council needed to figure it out now or have it as part of the next step in the conversation.

Next Steps

Councilmember McGehee yielded to Councilmember Laliberte on the work session, taking those two main items and KOI, with each individual coming up with a list of what they would like to see for the direction from input received from citizen advisory commissions and sending that input to the City Manager for dissemination, with the subsequent meeting to determine consensus. After that, Councilmember McGehee suggested that document be forwarded to commissions for their feedback and responses to the City Council as to how they envision implementing it.

Councilmember Willmus agreed with that concept, recognizing the timing of the next HRA meeting and upcoming City Council work session, allowing the benefit of their background discussions at that time.

Councilmember Laliberte suggested the work session allow for a review of targets to determine which should be kept or tweaked; and then publicize who should be involved and how involved, with the public and commissioners – as private citizens – all having time to speak.

Mayor Roe noted this would serve in identifying targets as well as stakeholders.

Councilmember Laliberte clarified this was not to say it would remain static but would start with an initial group and add to it moving forward.

Councilmember McGehee opined that she didn't see it as limiting if specific targets were identified, with the potential for short-term task forces and specific direction to interested community members.

Mayor Roe noted the City Council anticipated staff input as well during their review of the document, and as part of the public and City Council discussions at that July 13, 2015 Worksession.

McGehee moved to keep her four goals in mind as guiding principles: educational outreach, process, policy and transparency as part of this activity.

Mayor Roe directed staff to include that list on the bottom of the document; and was approved without objection.

**b. Authorize Interfund Transfer – Dale Street Development**

As detailed in the RCA, Community Development Director Paul Bilotta summarized this request.