



Regular City Council Meeting Minutes
City Hall Council Chambers, 2660 Civic Center Drive
Monday, August 7, 2023

1. Roll Call

Mayor Roe called the meeting to order at approximately 6:00 p.m. Voting and Seating Order: Schroeder, Groff, and Roe. City Manager Patrick Trudgeon and City Attorney Christina Cruz-Jennings were also present. Councilmembers Etten and Strahan absent.

2. Pledge of Allegiance

3. Approve Agenda

- a. City Manager Trudgeon requested removal of Item 10B (Approve 1 Temporary Gambling Permit and 2 Temporary Liquor Licenses) from the consent agenda for separate consideration to remove one of the licenses from consideration because it was already approved.

Schroeder moved, Groff seconded, approval of the agenda as amended.

Roll Call

Ayes: Schroeder, Groff, and Roe.

Nays: None.

4. Public Comment

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

5. Recognitions, Donations, and Communications

6. Items Removed from Consent Agenda

- a. **Approve 1 Temporary Gambling Permit and 2 Temporary Liquor Licenses**

City Manager Trudgeon briefly highlighted this item as detailed in the Request for Council Action and related attachments dated August 7, 2023.

Mr. Trudgeon asked the City Council to approve only the 2 temporary liquor licenses due to the 1 temporary gambling permit being approved at the last City Council meeting.

Groff moved, Schroeder seconded, approving 2 Temporary Liquor Licenses.

Roll Call

Ayes: Schroeder, Groff, and Roe.

Nays: None.

7. Business Items

a. Public Hearing to Consider Approving a Liquor License for Smash Park

City Manager Patrick Trudgeon briefly highlighted this item as detailed in the Request For Council Action and related attachments dated August 7, 2023.

Mayor Roe reviewed public hearing protocol and opened and closed the public hearing at approximately 6:06 p.m. for the purpose of receiving public input on the above-referenced liquor license for Smash Park; with no one appearing for or against.

Schroeder moved, Groff seconded, approval of the Liquor License for Smash Park.

Council Discussion

Councilmember Schroeder thought everything was in line and it made sense to approve this.

Councilmember Groff thought people are looking forward to having this in Roseville and he thought it would be interesting to see how it develops.

Roll Call

Ayes: Schroeder, Groff, and Roe.

Nays: None.

b. Consider Adoption of Ordinance to Amend Chapter 5 of City Code to Update References to Marijuana and to Prohibit the Use of Cannabis and Hemp in Public Places

City Manager Patrick Trudgeon briefly highlighted this item as detailed in the Request For Council Action and related attachments dated August 7, 2023.

Councilmember Schroeder indicated she was looking at where some of the wording was changed in the ordinance, specifically around line 105, it seems like all the other lettered paragraphs up to that point talked about controlled substances and this one it states cocaine into the human body. She wondered if that should say controlled substances as well and not just specifically cocaine. She thought if the ordinance is going to be changed, it should be done correctly.

Mr. Trudgeon thought that could be looked at changing, noting it is also referred to elsewhere and a good catch.

City Attorney Cruz-Jennings indicated she looked at this information earlier and thought the same thing, it should be changed because some of the things listed in the ordinance can be used together.

Councilmember Schroeder indicated some of the items have been crossed off the list but can be used with marijuana like water pipes and other things so her question is if these items listed can be used for both controlled substances and marijuana, how can it be distinguished.

City Attorney Cruz-Jennings explained City Attorney Tierney did some research, as much as she could, to see how some of these devices are used and she did mention that some of them can be used to smoke other drugs. She thought it was a good catch and made sense to make this a little bit of a broader category.

Mayor Roe asked if that would be accomplished by substituting “controlled substances” for the word cocaine in the first paragraph, K, which then everything below it refers back to.

City Attorney Cruz-Jennings believed that to be correct.

Councilmember Groff indicated he was concerned as to why the law went into effect in the first place was because there is a history of laws like this being used to discriminate against people in the BIPOC community. His concern is that this would be adding it back into the equation. He has full confidence in the City’s police force and he knew where the City was at regarding not penalizing poor people. This is the only concern he has with this.

Mr. Trudgeon stated that was a very good point and something the City should be cognizant of. He thought absent having anything in the code, it is very hard to stop people or educate people that they cannot smoke in a park. He indicated every case is going to be different depending on the circumstances but he thought the approach would be more of an educational one. Having this in the code does allow interaction to make sure that things are not happening in the parks, whether it be in front of children or other things and the City can have the individual move along and not be in the park.

Councilmember Groff said that he understood that.

Mayor Roe indicated he had a series of questions that he brought forward to Mr. Trudgeon earlier that related to equity in the sense of how the City handles other controlled substances in public spaces in the City of Roseville and more broadly in the State of Minnesota. Through a little bit of research, he found that with public intoxication, the State of Minnesota actually has a law that states that Public Intoxication is not a crime in the State of Minnesota, which pre-empts anybody from being able to put anything on the books to say it is a crime. Minnesota also has the open container law which relates and is fairly specific about, especially in vehicles, driver and passenger and responsibility of owners, even if not present, and things like that. Very prudent, he thought. The only other thing he could find in State Statute seemed to be that the State also prohibits consumption of alcohol in

State Parks and perhaps other spaces like that in the State. Then it is up to individual jurisdictions to talk about more restrictions about public consumption on the alcohol side. He noted in Roseville, specifically, the only prohibition the City seems to have on the consumption of alcohol is in the parks, which is actually in Chapter 7, the bench handout the Council received tonight. As noted in the initial presentation, as this new ordinance is drafted, it is extremely broad. It is defining public space as essentially any space that is not otherwise a private space. The City is prohibiting the use of cannabis products as well as lower potency hemp edibles and hemp derived consumer products, which may or may not be a nuisance in their use to members of the public. He was very concerned about the things that are covered by it, the places covered by it, and the equity with alcohol consumption use in public spaces. With smoking, he did not believe the City prohibited smoking in the parks.

Mr. Trudgeon indicated not by ordinance.

Mayor Roe stated it was probably because it is an outdoor space so if the City is concerned about people smoking these products but are not talking about smoking cigarettes, which can be just as disturbing to people and potentially have health impacts to people, perhaps the Council may want to think about that equity amongst different types of uses and make sure the unintended consequence of this broadened drafting is exactly what Councilmember Groff is saying. But, more broadly, the City is being more restrictive with these products, even what some might consider fairly mild products, such as the hemp derived edibles and the like. That is what gave him pause and he wanted to make sure the Council had a conversation as to how they want to look at that. The Council may want to restrict smoking in the City parks, which would cover any kind of smoking. The Council may only want to limit it to these products and then could that be done in the Title 7, Chapter 7.1 that talks about other things that cannot be done in City parks. Or, does the Council want to do something more broadly across other public space? Then the question is how to address alcohol use and is there a difference between some of these edible products, those types of things, and things like smoking and vaping. He wanted to get the question out there for the Council and get some feedback so the Council may be able to provide some feedback to staff in that regard.

Councilmember Schroeder asked if the Council has the State Statute section 342.01 regarding the terms. She wondered if it would make sense that the City is in align with what the State has written.

Mayor Roe indicated that was correct, but the question is how the City wants to regulate those products. It is one thing to define them the same way and the City definitely wants to be consistent with State Statute.

Councilmember Groff thought consistency was one thing and tied into what Mayor Roe is talking about. He thought the smoking issue is tricky because he does not

smoke, and he has his own views on that, but he does understand that some people smoke, and it is a legal thing. The City does not want to make it so impossible for people either.

Mayor Roe thought it is probably able to be said that smoking marijuana products is both creating smoke that can be an irritant and annoyance to people, which smoking tobacco products also does. But, it is also a controlled substance in a sense that it does some of the same or similar things to its users as what alcohol does. The City does not allow use of alcohol in the City parks, specifically, so it could be said that it would be consistent, at least in the point of view of it being a substance that can create impacts to or impair people's abilities, similar to alcohol. If the purpose of not permitting alcohol in the parks is to prevent issues related to that, it could be sensible to say the same relating to use of these products, at least higher potency products. He did not know if the City wanted to draw the line on some of the lower potency products that may be harder to know whether people are using it in the first place. He could see where the City may be able to put some distinction there and put that into the City Code. There is also the question of whether the Council just talks about the parks specifically or talks about more broadly other spaces. But then he would turn the question back around and ask what the City is doing with respect to consumption of alcohol in these other places.

Councilmember Schroeder indicated she is having trouble with the lower potency Hemp derived consumer products. She noted there are salves, and some things so what would be put in here. She wondered if it could all be lumped together.

Councilmember Groff thought it would be terrible to enforce something like that.

Mayor Roe asked if there was a sense that the Council is okay with the broad prohibition and specific to these products or does the Council want to look at something more specific to parks and/or potentially other public spaces more in the public realm, like City owned. Then talk about the different types of products and how to treat those, or does the Council need to table this for further discussion with the whole Council and potentially more information from staff and the attorney if there are certain questions about, for instance, sorts of these edibles and what their "potency" is relative to other products the Council might think of like alcohol.

Councilmember Groff indicated he was leaning that way, but thought this was a broad enough subject, this is the information, and it will not hurt to delay it a little bit to have a discussion with the whole Council or at least one more member would be better.

Councilmember Schroeder thought more information would be better.

Mayor Roe noted another option would be the Council could act on the first part of the Ordinance and strike out the second part, if the Council wanted to, at least

change the regulations that are outdated by the new law and then noting the change, substituting controlled substances for cocaine on line 107.

Mr. Trudgeon suggested it would be easier to keep together in one package, noting State law speaks to regulation of cannabis items already in some respects. He wondered if it was the desire to have all the Council Members at the meeting to consider a narrower perspective just really focused on parks or public land owned by the City. He also asked if there was any desire to bring forth something banning smoking of tobacco products in the City parks.

Councilmember Groff indicated he would lean towards looking just at public parks. He did not see the City banning everything such as smoking outside of a building and seemed unreasonable for something that is still a legal product.

Mayor Roe thought individual businesses certainly could enforce their own requirements inside and on their premises and he knew a lot of businesses prohibit smoking within a certain distance of doorways so perhaps that is the best system related to the smoking side of it. He did not think the Council wanted to go down the road of prohibiting smoking in the City parks or a broad prohibition of smoking. He thought there was a distinction in terms of the effects of cannabis products and smoking that the Council might have a look at being consistent with alcohol in the parks.

Councilmember Schroeder agreed that made sense because the high potency cannabis is like drinking and driving. That is where it is closer to the alcohol side of things versus the cigarette side of things.

Mayor Roe was not sure on the "potency" of some of the low-potency items as to whether those are also included in terms of if you are under the influence or would a person have to consume so much. He thought the Council would need expert information on that to even understand it.

City Attorney Cruz-Jennings explained there is not a specific standard for what intoxication looks like for marijuana; it can be any amount. She stated that is something the State is going to have to grapple with as this is figured out. She indicated the other thing she wanted to make sure was understood is that lower potency hemp edibles is anything that has less than .3 percent THC and beverages with five or ten milligrams of THC. Those are all classified as lower potency.

Mayor Roe indicated he was not sure if the State law was treating those any differently other than how the sale is regulated and things like that.

City Attorney Cruz-Jennings explained the only other thing the State law has that she can think of is a prohibition on vaporizing or smoking cannabis flower,

cannabis products, or hemp derived consumer products in a location where these may be inhaled by a minor. She noted there is no enforcement mechanism for that.

Councilmember Schroeder thought that was a good point to keep in mind when looking at this.

Mr. Trudgeon thanked the Council for their input, noting Staff will start to narrow it to parks and City-owned property and have the conversation go from there when the rest of the Council is in attendance.

Councilmember Groff asked if there has been any input from the police department.

Mr. Trudgeon indicated beyond general conversation there has not been much discussion.

Councilmember Groff indicated he wants this to be something that is not too complicated and that the police department can enforce.

Mayor Roe indicated this will be coming forward at a future meeting for further discussion.

c. Discuss Changes to City Code Chapter 316, Tetrahydrocannabinol (THC) Products

City Manager Patrick Trudgeon briefly highlighted this item as detailed in the Request for Council Action and related attachments dated August 7, 2023.

Mayor Roe asked if the two liquor stores that have THC licenses got those after the new State law went into effect, allowing sales at 'exclusive liquor stores,' which City ordinance prohibited prior to that.

Mr. Trudgeon indicated that was correct.

Councilmember Schroeder indicated she liked the suggestion to remove prohibiting liquor stores but when it comes to the cap piece, she liked the second option where the cap is kept at eight. But, if a business has a liquor license, which includes the restaurants, those businesses could be exempt from the cap. Part of the reason she likes that, is she thought there would be new restrictions on how many cannabis sales licenses can be in a county and city later on. She would be more comfortable trying to keep it at eight until the State got some of that figured out. She noted the State was talking about limiting it to the population in a county. She wanted to make sure that the City does not get too many.

Mr. Trudgeon thought it was only logical to assume that if there is only THC products, eventually they will look to sell cannabis as well so to Councilmember Schroeder's point if the City has a lot of them the City may have to try to claw some

of that back. He also noted that under the State law the City can have a cap not lower than a level that is based on the City's population. But the City does not need to have a cap, it can allow as many as the City wants but that is up to the Council to decide what they are comfortable with.

Mayor Roe explained the way the State law is written, as he understands it, it says you cannot set a cap lower than the number per population unless there is a County-wide limit and that it is already at the limit.

Councilmember Schroeder would like to wait until the City sees more of that information from the State or other cities.

Councilmember Groff indicated the City did not want to be the municipality in the County that ends up with all of these types of businesses.

Mayor Roe indicated he was leaning towards option two as well and then in terms of the restricted entry to people over 21, he thought that language was pretty good.

The Council agreed.

Mr. Trudgeon indicated staff will put the information in an Ordinance form and bring it back to the Council for further discussion.

d. Consider Adoption of an Ordinance to Amend Chapter 10 to Allow Display of Political Signs Prior to In-Person Voting

City Manager Patrick Trudgeon briefly highlighted this item as detailed in the Request for Council Action and related attachments dated August 7, 2023.

Councilmember Schroeder thought this was pretty straightforward since the State of Minnesota changed this and the City would be in lockstep with that. Also, everything the City Manager talked about made sense and this is a very straightforward fix. She thought this was something the City needed to do.

Mayor Roe indicated the one thing he was a little curious about, just because this topic has come up, is why the City of Roseville treats general elections in the State general election even year differently in time frame than elections in the odd year. He asked why do candidates who happen to be up for election or ballot questions in those even years get an extra twenty-five days to have their signs up? He was not sure if there was something in State law that precludes cities from making it any shorter than forty-six days or from that point of view, does the City want to change it to be consistent for all elections? He stated since the Council is talking about this, he wanted to put the question out there and see if there is a reason the City has to treat the two types of elections differently, which seems unlikely. He asked does the City want to treat them differently, just from their own policy perspective?

Councilmember Schroeder asked when the early voting is starting this year.

Mayor Roe indicated with this year's election, the date would move from September 22nd to September 4th, if there is no primary.

Councilmember Schroeder stated she would want to get this changed sooner than later just because of that.

Mayor Roe explained he understood that but wondered why the two years of elections are treated differently. He also wondered if school board elections and whatever else might be on an odd year election is less important than general elections and once again, is there something in State law that makes it have to be forty-six days?

City Attorney Cruz-Jennings indicated this would need to be looked into.

Mr. Trudgeon explained in doing his research, he did not recall anything but he can see in State Statute in 211b.045 that allows campaign signs forty-six days before the State primary in a State general election.

Mayor Roe thought based on that the City Code was trying to be consistent with the State law with regard to those.

Mr. Trudgeon explained how the City diverged twenty-one days in non-State primary, State general elections. He was not quite sure, noting it could be peculiar to Roseville, it might be the standard, or might be some reference to the code, but he has not come across it.

Mayor Roe explained Roseville used to hold municipal elections in odd years as well and in that case, the only signs that were up in Roseville during even years were State-related offices and issues. He imagined that it was originally drafted to be consistent with State law with regard to State elections in paragraph A, which is where the forty-six days might have come from. Then paragraph B was created for municipal elections. It seems like, with respect to fairness, the City might want to make it the same in every election year.

The Council indicated agreement with that suggestion.

Mayor Roe explained if the Council were to take this up tonight, it sounded like the consensus would be to change the date in paragraph B, or the number of days from twenty-one days in both instances to forty-six days, to be consistent.

The Council concurred.

Mayor Roe asked if there was any legal reason for the Council to not do that.

Mr. Trudgeon explained he would have to look at his notes, but he thought the challenge is when there is a primary.

Mayor Roe explained it would be the same dates as for an even year election.

Mr. Trudgeon indicated at one point, staff was looking at some combination where a person could start putting up signs before the registration period ended for filing in the first place.

Mayor Roe asked if in fact, the forty-six days in State law is related to the election day, and the City is putting in a standard related to early voting.

Mr. Trudgeon explained they were putting it eighteen days before that the start of early voting. He thought that got it into the end of May, early June, if he remembered right.

Mayor Roe thought the filing period should be the same for primaries in odd years because the primary date is set to be in August.

Councilmember Groff noted the person would not need to put up their signs at that time either.

Mayor Roe thought if the State law is forty-six days before the actual election day, conceivably, if there are eighteen days of early voting prior to that, a person could continue to have the sign law be forty-six days before the election day because that is going to be at least a good chunk of time before the early voting starts.

Councilmember Schroeder indicated that is the main thing, if the person is able to get their signs up before early voting starts.

Mr. Trudgeon recapped the date the signs could go up before early voting occurs.

Mayor Roe reviewed the reasoning for the time frame he was proposing for election signs to be posted.

Mr. Trudgeon recapped the proposed changes the City Council requested.

Groff moved, Schroeder seconded, enactment of Ordinance No. entitled, "An Ordinance Amending Title 10 Section 1010.09 to Allow Display of Political Signs Prior to In-Person Voting" including the amendments discussed, and changing the time to follow forty-six days before the primary and forty-six days before the general election.

Roll Call

Ayes: Schroeder, Groff, and Roe.

Nays: None

Mayor Roe asked City Attorney Cruz-Jennings if the Ordinance Summary required two-thirds of the members present or of the entire City Council.

City Attorney Cruz-Jennings explained a super majority would be a two-thirds vote of the Council. She did not think the Ordinance Summary could be voted on at the meeting tonight.

Mayor Roe asked if the Ordinance Summary would need to be brought back at another meeting.

Mr. Trudgeon indicated that could be done or the City could just print the entire Ordinance.

Mayor Roe and the City Council thought since the Ordinance is one page, the entire Ordinance could be published.

e. Discuss Hotel Licensing Ordinance

City Manager Patrick Trudgeon briefly highlighted this item as detailed in the Request for Council Action and related attachments dated August 7, 2023.

Councilmember Groff indicated he was pleased this was happening because the City has struggled with this for years. He thought this might help them solve some of the problems the City gets and asked regarding the revocation, if it went through to the City Manager and then to the Council.

Mr. Trudgeon indicated that was correct.

Councilmember Groff indicated there were a number of calls that triggered a response and asked how would the City handle someone who has it out for the property and continues to call on the property.

Mr. Trudgeon explained it would have to be a verified call where something is actually happening. He noted under the repeat nuisance Ordinance, the City uses a threshold of ten calls per month. Staff looks over the calls over years and there was a clear break in hotels that had more than ten calls in a month or more versus fewer so that seemed to be a very valid threshold when looking at the data. Hotels that had more than ten calls were extraordinarily busy compared to the other hotels. That was the metric staff used but staff does take out any medical calls, domestic abuse calls, things like that. What staff does not want is to have people not call, although, he thought it was a good point to keep their eyes on the ball to make sure that staff is really narrowing in on what it is counting so there is not the back and

forth every time. He was not sure if he had a direct answer but it was something that staff can continue to refine.

Councilmember Schroeder thought the Council needed to define what a serious nuisance would be and what warrants immediate action. She explained it talked about when the City is inspecting the premises, the Ordinance indicates the City will give seventy-two hours prior to the inspection and she wondered if that was given.

Mr. Trudgeon thought that is optional. Staff does provide notice on their regular inspections of when the City is coming and does that on all the City's businesses. This is to make sure that the right person is there when the City needs to be there to walk through. He did not know how often the City does it but occasionally staff does pop out to the site, especially if there is a complaint, but with a regular inspection, it is scheduled with the appropriate person at the site.

Mayor Roe stated while looking at Waite Park's ordinance about the three-strike rule, he thought it might make sense for the City to simplify this by taking it back to the existing repeat nuisance call Ordinance, such as the first notice is for any month that triggers a fine under that repeat nuisance call ordinance, and the second notice is for the second such month within a certain look-back period, and the third notice is for the third such month within a certain look-back period. He liked the ability to have that immediate action as something that could be done, and it is still appealable. He did not think it would be unreasonable to have that and define it as clearly as they can but also give the City the discretion to apply it to things the City does not know yet that are going to come up. He also thought the Council wanted to think about how the City considers nuisance and building Code violations and put that into the equation as well as health code violations that the County cites for.

Mayor Roe referenced the section of Waite Park's ordinance regarding lodging establishments, noting there is a long section about buildings that are used within a distance from a hospital or medical center used for patient's families for sleeping accommodations. He indicated he would like to remove that part because he did not think it pertained to Roseville unless that has to be in there as a part of State law. He did not think that applied to Roseville.

Mayor Roe indicated on the transferability part, he agreed the City would want to make sure that the business cannot just continue to pass the license along. He noted there is some language in the City's liquor license statutes about a transfer requiring Council approval that could be used here.

Mayor Roe thought this is a good starting point. He did want to get into the topic of minimum standards for operations, referencing Waite Park's Section 105.3, page 105-6, the A&B talking about requiring their tenants and occupants to sign a register and verify their identity. He knew the Council discussed that in relation to

their regulation of single-family, short-term rentals, not necessarily being able to require that, and angst associated with that. He was curious to see that in this language for hotels, motels, and lodging establishments so he wanted to point it out. This is something he would like to hear more about from the City Attorney in how that relates to the discussion they had as to why it was not being required for single-family, short-term rentals.

Mr. Trudgeon indicated he did not have an answer but thought it was a more standard practice for hotels to do this traditionally anyway, but he was not sure what the difference was.

The Council would like to have a conversation with the hotel owners before this is enacted to give them a chance to give their input or arguments regarding this.

8. Council Direction on Councilmember Initiated Agenda Items

9. 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 17, 2023 EDA and City Council Meeting Minutes

Schroeder moved, Groff seconded, approval of the July 17, 2023 EDA and City Council Meeting Minutes as presented.

Roll Call

Ayes: Schroeder, Groff, and Roe.

Nays: None.

10. Approve Consent Agenda

At the request of Mayor Roe, City Manager Trudgeon briefly reviewed those items being considered under the Consent Agenda; and as detailed in specific Requests for Council Action dated August 7, 2023 and related attachments.

Groff moved, Schroeder seconded, approval of the Consent Agenda including claims and payments as presented and detailed.

Roll Call

Ayes: Schroeder, Groff, and Roe.

Nays: None.

a. Approve Payments

ACH Payments	\$385,130.25
107197-107311	512,910.31
TOTAL	\$898,040.56

- b. Removed from Consent Agenda
 - c. Receive Second Quarter Financial Report
 - d. Adopt Resolution 12010 Approving the Danny Boy Estates Final Plat, and Authorize Execution of the Danny Boy Estates Development Agreement
 - e. Approve the Issuance of a Premise Permit for Minnesota Fastpitch Academy Foundation to Conduct Lawful Gambling Activities at 1744 Terrace Dr (Bent Brewstillery). Resolution No. 12011
 - f. Approve Be Active! Be Green! Bench Grant Agreement with Ramsey County
11. **Future Agenda Review, Communications, Reports, and Announcements – Council and City Manager**

City Manager Patrick Trudgeon reviewed the August 21, 2023 City Council meeting, August 24, 2023 City Council meeting, September 11, 2023 City Council meeting and the September 18, 2023 EDA and City Council meetings.

Councilmember Groff reminded everyone of the Envision Roseville, August 16, 2023 at the OVAL open house from 4:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. He also thought the Night to Unite event went well.

Councilmember Schroeder agreed and indicated there were so many parties going on throughout the City that she could not get to all of them.

Mr. Trudgeon noted there were over eighty parties that night.

Mayor Roe noted this Saturday is the Rice Larpenteur Alliance summer block party.

12. **Adjourn**

Schroeder moved, Groff seconded, adjournment of the meeting at approximately 7:33 p.m.


Roll Call

Ayes: Schroeder, Groff, and Roe.

Nays: None.

ATTEST:


Patrick J. Trudgeon, City Manager


Daniel J. Roe, Mayor