

REQUEST FOR COUNCIL ACTION

Date: April 10, 2017
Item No.: 7.h

Department Approval

City Manager Approval



Item Description: Discussion of 2017 Policy Priority Planning Document

BACKGROUND

At the February 13, 2017 meeting, the City Council reviewed the 2016 Policy Priority Planning (PPP) document and discussed new priorities for 2017. Minutes from that meeting are included as Attachment A. As a result of that conversation, the City Manager organized the identified priorities into three strategic priorities; *Economic Development*; *Inclusive Community and Governance*; and *Capital Improvements*. Under each strategic priority, strategic initiatives are listed. Most of the strategic initiatives are new, but there are several that have been carried over from 2016. The 2017 draft strategic priorities and initiatives are as follows:

Economic Development Strategic Initiatives

- Foster Twin Lakes Redevelopment
- Facilitate City-wide Economic Development

Inclusive Community and Governance

- Focus on Southeast Roseville
- Continue Imagine Roseville Efforts
- Enact Inclusive City Policies and Procedures
- Prepare for Participation in Government Alliance on Race and Equity Program (2018)

Capital Improvements

- Increase Pedestrian Connectivity
- Ensure Capital Improvement Funding
- Provide Timely and Transparent Capital Improvement Budget Information

Attachment B shows the changes made from the 2016 PPP to the 2017 PPP. Attachment C is a clean version of the draft 2017 PPP.

POLICY OBJECTIVE

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

28 **FINANCIAL IMPACTS**

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

31 **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

32 Staff recommends that the City Council review the draft 2017 PPP with special attention to make sure
33 the draft captures the priorities and initiatives desired by the City Council. Once there is agreement on
34 the wording of the strategic priorities and initiatives, the City Manager will draft the individual strategic
35 initiative worksheets identifying desired outcomes, responsible staff/commissions, and timelines.

36 **REQUESTED COUNCIL ACTION**

37 The City Council should review and provide direction about the draft 2017 City Priority Plan.

38

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

Attachments: A: City Council Minutes dated February 13, 2017
B: Draft 2017 PPP Strategic Priorities and Initiatives (redlined version)
C: Draft 2017 PPP Strategic Priorities and Initiatives (clean version)

Mayor Roe opined that this had proven a good process for meeting outside City Council chambers and off line; and allowed for frank discussions for the benefit of all parties and the community. Mayor Roe assured the public that less than a quorum of the City Council and the commissions attended those meetings so no violations of Open Meeting Laws occurred.

d. 2017 Policy Priority Plan Discussion

At the request of Mayor Roe, City Manager Trudgeon referenced Attachments A and B to the staff report, respectively entitled, “Adopted 2016 City Priority Plan” and “2016 4th Quarter Policy Priority Plan Update.” Mr. Trudgeon noted the two main priorities were “Housing and Economic Development” and “Infrastructure Sustainability” with specific initiatives for each detailed in the Attachments.

Discussions were initiated by individual Councilmembers sharing their personal proposals for updating, revising the current document moving forward into 2017.

Councilmember McGehee

Councilmember McGehee stated her interest in a “General Connectivity” strategy as a new proposal, especially in light of the transportation plan being undertaken as part of the comprehensive plan update. Councilmember McGehee opined that the plan should include benches along pathway connections to make them more user-friendly. She opined that it was an important priority to have connections to schools and to businesses. Councilmember McGehee also noted the need to improve pedestrian connectivity around larger malls and smaller satellite malls in the community; opining that the traffic problem was significant now and would not get any better.

Also, Councilmember McGehee referenced the three years that the Rental Registration and Licensing Program had been operating in the city, with some of those properties coming up for their six-month renewal later on tonight’s agenda (Consent Item 9.f). Councilmember McGehee advised that she had spoken with staff earlier urging them to bring forward their ideas and suggestions on the policy, after the first three years of its implementation, and how to make the program better for the city and for those property owners.

Councilmember Etten

Based on tonight’s previous discussion and action for guidance and purpose for a newly-combined CEC and HRC, and review by the City Council Subcommittee for potential additions or adjustments, Councilmember Etten stated his interest in creating a more robust review and check-in process for all advisory commissions beyond once per year if and as needed.

Councilmember Etten suggested a new priority entitled “Inclusive City and Civic Life, Activities and Governance.” Councilmember Etten suggested that category could include taking action steps on the recent Imagine Roseville community dis-

cussion process; wrapping up some of the work in SE Roseville beyond that of the existing working group; equity work with the League of Minnesota Cities as they delve into more human rights and community engagement efforts and best practices along those areas; recruitment and hiring of a diverse staff and community leaders; and a review of policies and actions taken by the city that may be inhibiting full inclusion for those of diverse backgrounds. Councilmember Etten opined that this was an important priority for the city in its leadership role moving forward.

Councilmember Willmus

Councilmember Willmus stated his interest in prioritizing capital needs of the city and a more frequent and ongoing proactive review and analysis of how capital improvement program (CIP) dollars are allocated.

Mayor Roe asked if Councilmember Willmus intended that to cover all CIP spending or only that related to infrastructure.

Councilmember Willmus clarified that while the heading now specified infrastructure, he broaden the heading across the board for any and all CIP needs.

Councilmember Laliberte

Councilmember Laliberte stated that her thoughts were similar to those of Councilmember Willmus, with her interest in getting a good handle on other 2016 priorities and those carrying over. While supportive of a regular check-in on the 20-year CIP outlook, Councilmember Laliberte stated her interest in a more realistic, closer-in look (e.g. five years) of what could be deferred and take that beyond staff's review up to the City Council's review.

Councilmember Laliberte suggested refinement of "tasks" versus "priorities." Councilmember Laliberte reviewed several of those task-related items that had been discussed but had yet to be implemented (e.g. continuum of engagement by having visuals at certain types of meetings) for the purpose of showing those engaged about their involvement, how their expectations were or were not met and the city's response. While the city continues to seek community feedback, Councilmember Laliberte noted that various iterations had been discussed but the initiative continued to fall off the table. Councilmember Laliberte stated her interest in adding it back on to allow citizens to understand where a project or area of interest was at in the process.

Councilmember Laliberte stated her interest in a "cost benefit analysis" for all decisions made by the City Council, as well as Councilmember McGehee's often stated request for that analysis for projects the city is investing in, Councilmember Laliberte noted that was another idea discussed but not yet taken hold.

Mayor Roe

To tie into the CIP priority, Mayor Roe stated that a missing link is receiving a report on what has changed from year to year and rationale from staff's perspective for those annual changes.

Mayor Roe stated his interest in looking at the city's overall infrastructure, including pedestrian connectivity as part of the community's quality of life; an issue he found becoming more and more important for the marketplace and where people consider living.

Councilmember McGehee stated that she would also like to consider sustainability as part of that CIP review, opining that sustainability as a goal was a long way from done. While stated in the PPP document, Councilmember McGehee opined that "a more robust or inclusive view and listing of our assets" was still not together. Councilmember McGehee noted that one area of concern she had was in not having all city building or facilities listed together, but currently listed separately, along with programs, opining that there needed to be a top level listing available to track all city assets under one umbrella.

Specific to a deeper look at CIP assets, Councilmember Etten suggested a better explanation or understanding for the City Council without the City Council attempting to micromanage departments and their respective managers. Councilmember Etten sought clarification as to what level the City Council was looking for with its CIP and how the City Council should review each piece.

Mayor Roe spoke in support of more detail on streets and water/sewer assets. While talking about them briefly at preliminary budget discussions about information desired by the City Council for the 2018 budget, Mayor Roe suggested that instead of a one-line item the actual streets or projects be identified so the City Council would know from year to year how and why the CIP is changing and steps where they may be in agreement or at least made aware.

Councilmember Willmus agreed with Mayor Roe's observation; clarifying that he wasn't interested in the City Council directing dollars, but was seeking a more thorough review by staff to the City Council of where needs were or where funds may be over-allocated in one area for repurposing to another. Councilmember Willmus opined that this came into play if the City Council could then shift those dollars to alleviate needs elsewhere, but noted the need for that view and allocation level. If staff is aware of areas where the city is falling short or exceeding, Councilmember Willmus noted that the City Council needed to be made aware of that as well.

As an example over the last few years when the water tower rehabilitation project was moved up due to a number of factors, Mayor Roe noted that the process for making those determinations isn't always known or completely understood by the

City Council until closer to year-end with CIP review and when funds don't add up. Mayor Roe stated his agreement with his colleagues for the City Council's need to know the how and why as soon as known by staff to help them and the public. However, Mayor Roe also agreed that no further involvement than that was being sought by the City Council.

In response, Councilmember McGehee stated that in order for her to concur with her colleagues, she needed to be assured that everything in the CIP is being adequately addressed and not simply eliminated or left unaddressed; thus her desire for a more overarching picture of facilities versus a view by program.

City Manager Trudgeon responded that this discussion aligned itself well with internal staff discussions related to budget information and how to present it. Mr. Trudgeon agreed that the basic information should include awareness for the City Council and public to know and for staff to comprehensively say how and why changes are coming about. While some unexpected thing occur from year to year, Mr. Trudgeon stated they were usually few; and agreed with the importance for everyone to be on the same page and have a general understanding. If the City Council chose to make this a priority, Mr. Trudgeon voiced his and staff's wholehearted support.

While agreeing it was important to look at the CIP on an annual and five-year basis, Mayor Roe opined that it remained important to continue that long-term view over twenty years (e.g. fire engines) and change the CIP accordingly as needed and as part of annual discussions. By having shorter-term reviews in addition to the twenty-year CIP review, Mayor Roe noted it added one more layer to the available information and planning process.

Mayor Roe stated his support for Councilmember Etten's new "Inclusive" priority, especially coming off the Imagine Roseville process, possibly creating a number of different recommendations in different areas, including but not limited to: leadership in city government and staffing diversity and recommendations about city policies in other areas. While agreeing that this would be a good category to add, Mayor Roe suggested some items currently included under "Economic Development" could be moved into that category.

Mayor Roe also suggested removing "move up housing" from the current list.

General Discussion

If removing "move up housing" from the list, Councilmember Willmus suggested replacing it with a housing style currently lacking in the community, one-level living.

Councilmember McGehee agreed with that comment, adding that housing was needed on small lots.

Councilmember Etten stated his agreement in retaining the Economic Development goal and revising it, but asked if “housing” was an actual priority of the City Council or simply happened in the background.

Councilmember Etten stated his agreement with Councilmember Willmus on the need for single-level housing; but questioned if that was a City Council priority, was the city in turn willing to fund it as a policy priority for funding or to support developers undertaking that housing style. Councilmember Etten stated those were different discussions for him; and noted that “move up housing” had been desired by the city, but the market took over and the city wasn’t called upon to subsidize it. However, Councilmember Etten stated his interest in having more discussion around that idea.

Councilmember McGehee questioned the priority to “increase the value of existing homes,” recognizing that the city didn’t need to do anything when the market increases, and since there were few factors the Council could control, questioned its retention as a goal.

As an afterthought, Councilmember McGehee revised her suggestion to consider the review of the multi-family housing licensing program as a part of priority planning since it was actually a task. Specific to cost benefit analyses, Councilmember McGehee spoke in support of using them anywhere possible.

Mayor Roe opined that “cost benefit analysis” fell into the task versus priority area as well. Mayor Roe also questioned if other areas (e.g. rental licensing and increased housing values) also fell under ongoing activities that could be acknowledged but didn’t necessarily need to be shown as a priority. However, Mayor Roe stated the importance of not losing sight of those areas either; suggesting that they be considered as part of the continuing review of programs.

Councilmember McGehee opined that “cost benefit analysis” should be a policy not a task. It was a policy defining the City Council evaluated some items.

Mayor Roe noted that, since the 2016 PPP, that analysis had already been added to several city policy revisions in the interim.

Councilmember Willmus recognized Councilmember Etten’s comments on housing, while at the same time and depending on the type of development and its location, stated that all of those considerations should remain on the table. Whether or not it should remain a goal as currently identified, Councilmember Willmus agreed probably not; but noted that over the last year or so, some tools had been implemented by the city to help facilitate desired development (e.g. resurrection of the PUD process) that could help spur that type of development in the future.

Specific to cost benefit analysis, Councilmember Willmus opined that something the City Council needed to be cognizant of was that if the group didn't define the purpose or what constitutes benefits and costs, it could become cumbersome and could become complicated rather quickly unless some clearly-defined parameters were agreed upon by the City Council, community and staff.

Councilmember Laliberte agreed with that statement; and specific to housing as a priority, stated that she would go on record that she'd rather help fund housing stock not currently available in Roseville versus funding housing stock already available in the community. Councilmember Laliberte opined that if there was some other hierarchy in or for the community, it needed further conversation.

In addition to the continuum of available housing stock, Councilmember McGehee stated her support for any changes that would make any and all housing accessible.

Mayor Roe noted that a lot of these policies fell into the realm of the city's current housing goals; and stated his interest in not putting too many priorities in place to avoid it becoming a "to do" list with too many areas of focus.

In response, Councilmember Etten stated that he was a huge fan of connectivity, something he considered very important to the community's viability and quality of life. However, since the city was paying a consultant to review the transportation and pathway plans as part of the broader comprehensive plan review, Councilmember Etten asked if it was needed as a priority on the PPP, since it would happen due to those steps already in place.

While that could be the case, Councilmember McGehee opined that some areas that she had discussed with Public Works Director Culver didn't fall into the general pathway scheme, opining that some areas had more difficult issues in achieving t connectivity and providing pedestrian safety. She used her side of town as an example.

Specific to connectivity, Councilmember Willmus noted the importance of retaining that in the PPP. While having had pathway task forces and committees and comprehensive plans in place for decades, Councilmember Willmus noted that while some progress had been made, it wasn't enough. Given that, Councilmember Willmus opined that it needed continued focus to receive more attention that it had over the last decade or so; and by bringing it to the forefront it served to repeatedly remind the City Council, staff and the community of its importance.

Mayor Roe concluded that two items appeared to be rising to the level of additions to the PPP: pedestrian connectivity and access, and Councilmember Etten's

suggested “Inclusive City and Civic Life, Activities and Governance.” Mayor Roe also noted the additional engagement piece as a task for the CEC and HRC process currently being undertaken; and refinement of the CIP as discussed. Mayor Roe noted tonight’s discussion identifying a lot of other priorities moving to “tasks.”

With Councilmember McGehee noting that pathway connectivity was also tied to the CIP; Mayor Roe added that with larger retail properties, just getting from the car to a store was sometimes difficult. However, with the focus on that type of issue and as noted by Councilmember Willmus, Mayor Roe suggested the need to consider whether something rose to the level to warrant being a priority for the City Council going forward.

City Manager Trudgeon thanked the City Council for recognizing the need to refine the priority list, affirming that many of the things mentioned tonight were in the works in the background. For his benefit, Mr. Trudgeon reviewed those items addressed by the City Council during tonight’s discussion and for refinement of the PPP by staff, including but not limited to:

- Connectivity
- Inclusive Governance
- CIP refinement

City Manager Trudgeon listed some of the other ideas identified tonight, including:

- Review of the multi-family rental licensing program is a task and would not be included in the PPP
- No comment on Councilmember Etten’s more frequent review of advisory commissions
- Interest in single-level housing stock and the broader housing issues would not be included in the PPP
- SE Roseville remaining as an important priority but as a subheading under the new “inclusive” priority
- Creation of a policy for inclusivity of everything citywide whether involving economic development or focusing on results when combined with other areas
- Remove “increase residential housing values” as that was achieved by the market
- Remove “move-up housing”

City Manager Trudgeon advised that he would combine this information, create different categories, and prepare a draft for review by the City Council.

Specific to establishing a measure of effectiveness for each infrastructure component, Mayor Roe asked if that had been accomplished or could be checked off.

In response, Public Works Director Culver advised that with establishment of the condition rating criteria to measure effectiveness, it would be reviewed annually and infrastructure prioritized accordingly and therefore, could be removed as a priority.

Without objection, City Manager Trudgeon was directed to remove that priority.

Without objection, Mayor Roe directed staff to provide any other areas they thought needed to be combined or removed on the next iteration.

8. 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 City Council Minutes – January 23

McGehee moved, Etten seconded, approval of the January 23, 2017 City Council Meeting Minutes as amended.

Corrections:

▪ **Page 10 (Laliberte)**

Lines 22 – 26

Correct to read “*City News*” rather than “*Roseville Review*” in all instances
Strike the last sentence (lines 25-26) as repetitive

▪ **Lines 28 - 30**

Correct to read: “Depending on the timing of the *City News* editions related to this process, Mayor Roe agreed it was the vehicle that could be used for feature articles as well.”

Roll Call

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

Nays: None.

b. Approve City Council Minutes – January 30

McGehee moved, Etten seconded, approval of the January 30, 2017 City Council Meeting Minutes as presented.

Roll Call

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

Nays: None.

9. Approve Consent Agenda

At the request of Mayor Roe, City Manager Trudgeon briefly highlighted those items being considered under the Consent Agenda as displayed for the benefit of the viewing pub-



City Priority Plan 20176

Approved ~~December 7, 2015~~

Strategic Priorities – The city Council has determined that there will be three ~~two~~ strategic priorities that the City will focus on in 2016:

~~Housing and~~ Economic Development

Inclusive Community and Governance

Capital Improvements

Infrastructure Sustainability.

In order to implement these priorities, the City Council has identified strategic initiatives under each Strategic Priority.

~~Housing and~~ Economic Development Strategic Initiatives

- ~~• Focus on Southeast Roseville~~
- Foster Twin Lakes Redevelopment
- ~~• Create Move-Up Housing Opportunities~~
- ~~• Increase Residential Housings Values~~
- Facilitate City-wide Economic Development

Inclusive Community and Governance

- Focus on Southeast Roseville
- Continue Imagine Roseville Efforts
- Enact Inclusive City Policies and Procedures

- Prepare for Participation in Government Alliance on Race and Equity Program (2018)

Capital Improvements

- Increase Pedestrian Connectivity
- Ensure Capital Improvement Funding
- Provide Timely and Transparent Capital Improvement Budget Information

Infrastructure Sustainability Strategic Initiatives

- ~~Categorize Infrastructure Condition~~
- ~~Ensure Capital Improvement Funding~~



City Priority Plan 2017

Approved _____, 2017

Strategic Priorities – The city Council has determined that there will be three strategic priorities that the City will focus on in 2016:

Economic Development Inclusive Community and Governance Capital Improvements

In order to implement these priorities, the City Council has identified strategic initiatives under each Strategic Priority.

Economic Development Strategic Initiatives

- Foster Twin Lakes Redevelopment
- Facilitate City-wide Economic Development

Inclusive Community and Governance

- Focus on Southeast Roseville
- Continue Imagine Roseville Efforts
- Enact Inclusive City Policies and Procedures
- Prepare for Participation in Government Alliance on Race and Equity Program (2018)

Capital Improvements

- Increase Pedestrian Connectivity
- Ensure Capital Improvement Funding
- Provide Timely and Transparent Capital Improvement Budget Information