City of ROSEVILLE Minnesota, USA

Regular City Council Meeting Minutes
City Hall Council Chambers, 2660 Civic Center Drive
Monday, April 8, 2024

1. **Roll Call**
Mayor Roe called the meeting to order at approximately 6:00 p.m. Voting and Seating Order: Etten, Schroeder, Groff, and Roe. Councilmember Strahan was absent. City Manager Patrick Trudgeon and City Attorney Rachel Tierney were also present.

2. **Pledge of Allegiance**

3. **Approve Agenda**

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

Roll Call
Ayes: Etten, 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 came forward to speak.

5. **Recognitions, Donations, and Communications**
   a. **Introduction of Antonio Montez, Equity & Inclusion Manager**
   Assistant City Manager Rebecca Olson introduced the new Equity and Inclusion Manager, Antonio Montez.

   Mr. Montez provided a recap of his background and the work he had previously done regarding equity and inclusion.

   Mayor Roe welcomed Mr. Montez to the position and to the City.

6. **Items Removed from Consent Agenda**

7. **Convene as Board of Adjustment and Appeals**
   a. **Consider an Appeal to the Variance Board's Denial of an Electrified, 10-Foot-Tall Fence at Caliber Collision, 1914 County Road C**
   Community Development Director Janice Gundlach briefly highlighted this item as detailed in the Request for Council Action and related attachments dated April 8, 2024.

   Member Schroeder thanked Ms. Gundlach for the detailed information. She asked if the applicant came back and wanted to ask for something other than this particular item, such as a shorter fence, how much time would the applicant have to wait before coming back with a different variance request.

Ms. Gundlach indicated she did not believe the applicant would have to wait any particular time. The applicant would just have to make the application and it would be considered a different request.

Chair Roe welcomed the representative from the appealing party to speak to the Board of Appeals and Adjustments.

Mr. Michael Pate, representing Amarok Ultimate Perimeter Security, reviewed the type of device that is being requested for the variance.

Member Etten indicated he was struggling with why Mr. Pate is saying that this is not a fence. If it is something that is ten feet tall and has wires running across it, he wondered why it is not considered a fence.

Mr. Pate explained it does not meet the definition of a fence. The property line is not delineated, it is non-scalable and is not a fence. It is basically suspended wires that run the alarm with a deterrent, which is a pulse, and a shock.

Member Etten explained without looking up the City's definition of a fence in the Code, he did know that it asks that a fence not be on a property line. Instead, it is on a setback or a parking lot or something like that. He did not think that the City would look at the definition in the same way and in this sense, it appears to be an intentional barrier that is built in some form. He wondered what would happen if this was six feet tall and angled back into the property so it would be harder to jump over.

Mr. Pate explained this needs extra height in order to work. Most industrial or commercial areas where these are operated actually allow somewhere around eight feet throughout the country and that is the reason this is being requested for ten feet. Ten feet is also the standard and what every business builds for.

Member Etten indicated the application refers to this as a fence in many areas and he was not sure how Mr. Pate is saying this is not a fence.

Mr. Pate explained his company was asked to do this and told it is not going to be considered an alarm. It would be considered a fence so when the application was filled out, his company was told it had to use the term "fence".

Member Schroeder asked for clarification on how many wires there are.

Mr. Pate explained there are twenty wires, separated about three inches apart up to about three and a half feet and then it goes to eight inches apart all the way to the top.

Member Groff explained he grew up on a farm, knows what electric fences are, and there is a shock involved. He thought the fence issue was important because that is how the City's Zoning Code reads and this is a fence, in his opinion.

Chair Roe indicated one thing Mr. Pate explained is that the device initializes a call as an alarm. He wondered if there were other technologies available that do not involve this approach but would initiate similar alarms such as motion sensors or those types of technologies.

Mr. Pate indicated his business does not have motion sensors and the company does not provide other types of security devices. His account list is basically every major trucking company in America such as UPS, Fed Ex, Fed Ex truck, all of the major automobile repair centers, and Caliber. He noted that all of the major equipment companies in the US use this device because it works and saves the police a lot of money by not having to answer calls and write reports or do drive-bys. He noted these businesses should have the ability to prevent crime on their property.

Chair Roe asked if there was any, from the point of view of installation, relative to the existing perimeter fence and will this be a certain distance from that fence, or can it be farther away than what is being proposed.

Mr. Pate stated that is a good question. He explained the standard is to be 100 to 200 millimeters away, which is somewhere between four to eight inches. This should not be too far away from the perimeter fence because it then creates what is called a zone of entrapment where someone could basically sit in there, manipulate the device, and break in anyway. If the two are close together, it works as a team so to speak and makes it very difficult to get inside the space. The gates are even tighter than that because most gates run on electricity and are chain driven gates so they need to be even tighter, around three inches in between.

Public Comment

Chair Roe offered an opportunity for public comment with no one coming forward.

Etten moved, Groff seconded, adoption of Resolution No. 12064 entitled, "Resolution of Decision of the Board of Adjustments and Appeals Concerning the Appeal by Amarok Ultimate Perimeter Security and Caliber Collision of 1914 County Road C of the Variance Board's Denial of a Fence Variance."

Board Member Discussion

Member Etten explained this clearly does meet the City's definition and he would like to see the applicant, and the business, work with the Police Department to make significant changes to improve the security zone. He would like to see that as a step to pursue as a resolution. He was concerned about precedent setting but also that there seemed to be other methods to be tried first.

Member Groff agreed and sympathized with the comment about theft of catalytic converters which are being worked on at the State level and also within the City for some time. He did think there were other ways that can be used to address this, and those ways have not been exhausted or attempted.

Member Schroeder agreed with Member Etten that other options have not been looked at so going all the way to an electric ten-foot fence is extreme, in her opinion. She thought there were ways that can be discussed and worked on with the City staff and the police to come up with a solution for this.

Chair Roe read the City's definition of a fence for clarification. He explained for him, it is the enclosing or separating of areas and there is also not a requirement in the City for a fence to be installed at the property line. It can be installed within a yard and described in the general requirements of the City Code. He thought also, there are other technologies that can trigger alarms and for that matter, he believed, if the property owner wished to do a ten-foot screening fence, it is actually allowed by Code and would not require a variance, potentially. He noted it is difficult to justify the criteria for a variance because there are other options available. He was supportive of the motion and resolution, which reaffirms the findings of the Variance Board and their denial of the variance.

Roll Call
Ayes: Etten, Schroeder, Groff, and Roe.
Nays: None

8. Adjourn Board of Adjustment and Appeals and Reconvene as the City Council

9. Business Items

a. Consider Ordinance Amending Chapter 801 of Roseville City Code, Private Water Supplies

Public Works Director Jesse Freihammer briefly highlighted this item as detailed in the Request For Council Action and related attachments dated April 8, 2024.

Public Comment

Mayor Roe offered an opportunity for public comment.

Mr. Dennis Deitzel, 2954 Hamline Avenue N.

Mr. Deitzel indicated his home has a well. He understands the main objective to do this is because of possible cross contamination but he did not understand what that affects if there is only a well on the property and not City water hookup. He asked if he would be able to repair, in the next ten years or so, the elements shown on the screen, other than digging a new well hole. He also asked if there would be any assistance, information-wise, about contractors, how this is done, other questions and concerns, and also financial assistance opportunities.

Mayor Roe closed public comment with no one else wishing to speak.

Mayor Roe asked Mr. Freihammer to answer Mr. Deitzel's questions about cross contamination and if the well could be repaired as well as if there would be any information about contractors and financial assistance.

Mr. Freihammer reviewed the possibility of cross contamination with a well. He also explained the existing Ordinance does allow for the next eleven or so years to replace a pump or do other repairs to the well. It is permitted as long as a new well is not drilled. He indicated the City can provide a list of contractors and there is no funding associated with this unless the Council chooses to provide it.

Councilmember Schroeder asked if the water is not to the curb and the street needs to be dug up, what party is responsible for doing that.

Mr. Freihammer explained that would be the property owner's responsibility and would be an additional cost.

Groff moved, Etten seconded, enactment of Ordinance No. 1674 entitled, "An Ordinance Amending Title 8 Section 801.22 of the Roseville City Code to Update Regulations Related to Private Water Supplies"

Council Discussion

Councilmember Groff thanked the department for doing all of this work, noting that in real estate, they have dealt with water issues for many years and the aquafer, if contaminated, is a huge issue. Sealing the wells up is for the public good and one of the main reasons he supported this as well as the issue of cross contamination. He explained that having the City's data accurate on the water usage for sewer billing is the other reasons he is supporting this.

Councilmember Schroeder indicated she would be interested to hear about some of the programs the City has to help residents and what it would look like to have a discussion on that some other time.

Mayor Roe echoed Councilmember Groff's comments on not continuing forward with residential wells, especially as the wells exceed useful life and need to be replaced anyway. He thought the benefit of accurate sewer billing was important to consider as well.

Roll Call
Ayes: Etten, Schroeder, Groff, and Roe.
Nays: None

b. Approve Issuance of Request for Proposal for the Replacement of the Playground at Lexington Park

Parks and Recreation Director Mattew Johnson briefly highlighted this item as detailed in the Request for Council Action and related attachments dated April 8, 2024.

Mr. Johnson provided a presentation to the Council on the Lexington Park Playground Replacement project.

Councilmember Schroeder explained it is easy to get excited for this type of project. What she loves is that the City does a good job of funding sources where the City has planned for this so CIP funds are put away, the Friends of Roseville Parks, and being able to get closer to that inclusion part. She indicated she supports this.

Public Comment

Mayor Roe offered an opportunity for public comment with no one coming forward.

Etten moved, Groff seconded, Authorizing Staff to Issue and RFP for the Replacement of the Lexington Park Playground, as Outlined in the RCA and Related Attachments date April 8, 2024.

Council Discussion

Councilmember Etten agreed with Councilmember Schroeder, noting this is a great opportunity to use their friends at FOR Parks, the vision of inclusivity, and some variety of funding sources to make this a feature piece.

Councilmember Groff concurred with the comments, noting this is a very used park. He was happy with the inclusivity part and was glad staff is using the funding from FOR Parks.

Roll Call
Ayes: Etten, Schroeder, Groff, and Roe.
Nays: None

c. **Discuss Feedback Regarding the Human Rights, Inclusion and Engagement Commission Scope and Duties**

Assistant City Manager Rebecca Olson briefly highlighted this item as detailed in the Request for Council Action and related attachments dated April 8, 2024.

Mayor Roe thanked Ms. Olson for the presentation on the HRIEC feedback to the Council. He expressed his thanks to the Commission for their discussion and feedback and was impressed with the frankness of the conversation, the willingness to discuss, and answer questions the Council was seeking answers to. He wanted the Commission to know how much he appreciated and hoped the Councilmembers appreciate the fact that the Commission had that conversation, it was not an easy conversation, and the outcome does help the process.

Councilmember Groff indicated he also watched the meeting and thought it was a very frank, open, and helpful discussion. He also thought it was helpful to understand where the Commission is coming from. He wanted to express appreciation for Ms. Olson's guidance because it is not an easy task to work with that number of opinions and try to pull it together. He liked where this landed, where this is headed, and the recommendation of Ms. Olson and administration. He also liked the ideas proposed and looks forward to the meeting in May.

Councilmember Schroeder thanked staff and the Commission for all of the work done. She wanted to give thanks to the people who were frank, the people who were leading, and those who said good, positive things about ways to make things better. She thought the high level list Ms. Olson went over was exactly what the Council was looking for. Her view is that the Council would take this, because it aligns well with what the Council was thinking in many ways. To her, she wants to get many of these meetings to continue to narrow down to where the City is going to end up. She thought if the Council was going to do this workshop, this might be a good spot to start. There does need to be more work on this list. She wondered if it is not a bad idea to take some of this and take a stab at a purpose statement based on some of this. She thought the purpose was what the Council needed to agree on. With regard to the purpose of this group, she thought the Council had confusion on that as well so if they can come up with an actual purpose of the group, she thought that would go far.

Councilmember Etten agreed with the comments. In watching the meeting, he noted the commitment of the Commission, even in their last meeting, to have a rigorous and thoughtful discussion and a commitment to make improvements for the City in how it moves forward. He thanked the Commission for all of that and Ms. Olson for helping facilitate that discussion. He stated a lot of what the Commission came back with are things that fit his general concept and are a great starting point. Things like the SREAP is there but getting back to some of the data and things that have been lost in the last year as the Commission has gone through transitions. The idea of expanding beyond SREAP and talking about equity and inclusion in general, the

Council saw an example of that in their last item. He suggested a group that would not be limited to the SREAP but thinking equity and inclusion more broadly in the functions in the City. He also thought with the hiring of Mr. Montez, the City has the opportunity for some members of the HRIEC to be a part of the hiring process and to think about other ways, as the MAC does with police officers. He asked if there are ways for this group to have a role in that process. The one thing he would push back on, in the review of what came out of the Commission, is the sense that a Commission is what worked best. He thought there were a lot of ideas, up to three different groups. He noted one Commissioner had talked strongly about that as a thing to have a Commission. But, he also thought there was a lot of discussion about two or three groups. For him, it was the purpose that the City needs to come back around, nail that first, and then discussion can be around the process for how the City would get to that purpose.

Councilmember Groff indicated he did want to hear what Mr. Montez has to say as well because Mr. Montez has a breadth of experience that the City needs to capitalize on in making this decision. As far the discussions about the committee to be more like MAC or a Commission, one of the reasons he was hearing is because the Commissioners were thinking that an organization like MAC would not follow the same structure as a City Commission. He thought it was important that this Commission does follow the same structure as a City Commission because it needs to be transparent. He indicated he does not like the idea, even though the Commission said it might make people more comfortable having conversations, of this being off the transparent structure for the public.

Mayor Roe indicated the Commission definitely had a lot of back and forth in their discussion about the structure of the Commission and a lot of ideas were out there. But, he thought most of the Commissioners agreed with the idea of a structured Commission. He noted this was an evolutionary discussion and he appreciated that is the way it worked. He thought it made sense to have a draft purpose statement if the sub-committee is willing to look at that as something to respond to in the discussion on May 13. He noted it helps to have that guided discussion about drilling down on some of the other points about the roles, how the group would interact with SREAP, and the equity statements in the RCAs. He can envision ways in which that could work well and ways it can't so he thought that is an appropriate conversation to have at that meeting.

Mayor Roe thought it was interesting that the discussion talked about whether the Commission wanted to make sure that it matched what the Council was looking for. He noted there was some pushback on that which was appropriate because he did not think the Council intended for the Commission to read their minds. He appreciated that the Commission thought more from the point of view of what made the most sense. The other piece he thought was interesting was that former Equity and Inclusion Manger, Thomas Brooks had the Commission look and do a sounding board sort of activity related to the original SREAP. This was done when SREAP was first introduced and the Commission was confused as to why they were tasked with doing that because it did not seem to match with their understanding of what the Commission was supposed to be doing. That, to him, was a very insightful thing. There was other related feedback about the tension between what Commissioners thought the Commission was supposed to be doing and what was before them at each meeting for them to discuss. Certainly, that coincides with the sense of tension through the last few years on the Commission.

Councilmember Schroeder explained she liked the fact that the Commission wants to narrow it down because if it is too broad and general, people have very different ideas. She suggested the City Council define things well and narrow it down.

d. Discuss Missing Middle Housing Legislation Known as House File 4009/Senate File 3964

City Manager Patrick Trudgeon briefly highlighted this item as detailed in the Request for Council Action and related attachments dated April 8, 2024.

Mayor Roe stated it appeared this is written as zoning standards and not something the State is providing as broad guidelines or general requiremetns. He stated, as an example for accessory dwelling units, cities need to permit accessory dwelling units in their zoning code and the cities still get to determine what the parameters are. To him, it seems like this legislation was written much like the Sacred Settlement legislation where it states the requirements and cities have to follow it. He wondered if he was interpreting this correctly.

Mr. Trudgeon noted the bill also tasks the Minnesota Housing Finance Agency to do a model zoning ordinance. There is some specificity in this draft but also a lot that needs to be determined. He was not sure how much leeway the City is going to have to deviate too far from the general tenor of what the State is trying to get at.

Ms. Gundlach explained staff included one of the letters that the League and the group representing the League sent to the House. To her, one of the things that stuck out in that letter is that a lot of the content of the bill is actually creating requirements and then there is added language where it states it has to be compatible. She noted there is a lot of language in the bill that conflicts with one another, which creates a lot of uncertainty with implementation, and what the City will and won't be able to do, if it passes.

Mayor Roe stated from his perspective, one of the things he would generally object to is the State writing zoning codes for cities in the State Statutes. He noted it is one thing to set standards that cities may have to meet and general parameters, but it is a whole other thing to be specific about everything down to the details.

Councilmember Schroeder stated she was there when this was presented and there was reaction from a lot of cities but before that, she wanted to say that she thought

Roseville does a very good job with this. She thought the City had intentionally had their zoning set up and if looking at all of the different types of housing the City has, Roseville has done a very good job. She thought each city had to decide that and to have that zoning authority taken away is very short sighted. She did think that the League of Minnesota Cities letter was excellent and she liked what was pointed out in the letter. She noted those are exactly what some of her concerns were. She would probably support the thought of the City writing a similar letter to show where Roseville stands on this because it was a bad idea for the State to take away a lot of this from each city because one size does not fit all with cities.

Councilmember Groff stated he pushed back a little bit on that because Roseville does a good job on it, but other surrounding communities do not. Part of the reason for this is that everyone bears some of the weight and that is the logic behind the bill. He was not supportive of everything in the bill, but he probably would not support a letter that the City is against this. He indicated he would stay neutral on the bill.

Councilmember Etten appreciated the Mayor's point on State-determined zoning versus providing parameters that can open up more doors for housing. He thought there was a lot that the State or the Met Council, in their guidance on zoning, could do to ensure there is more housing or more spaces in which housing can happen without this dramatic rewriting of all things. Thinking about allowing housing in business districts but not requiring the largest housing possible but, rather, a scalable piece would seem to be a reasonable adjustment to this. He was concerned about that and about the removal of not just aesthetic things but more substantial code language the cities would be able to create. He thought there could be broad standards that still are not zero standards. He was concerned about things like that and their impacts on good quality homes. He indicated the builders are excited about this because they can then cut corners and there is no guarantee that the price is going to be lower because there will not be cheaper homes, but it is to make homes cheaply. He would support a letter along certain lines. It may be different than the League of Minnesota Cities letter but he did think that the City and the citizens have skin in the game and to discuss and provide information is needed.

Mayor Roe commented on potentially having housing in industrial districts, and asked what kind of quality would that be for the people living there. On the one hand, there is talk about affordability but ultimately, the housing needs to be decent. He would support a more general letter along the lines of disagreeing with specific requirements from the State but support providing some parameters for cities and more generalized requirements. He thought the League had done a good job of listing specific objections to specific parts. He did not think the City needed to repeat that. He supported expressing to the Legislature the concern of the City about the level of control for local decision making that is embodied in some of the legislation that has been brought forth.

Councilmember Etten explained they talk about local decision making but it sounds like what the State is after is that "not in my backyard" concept. He thought the City had proven its willingness, as the City had already gone well beyond the affordable housing requirements from the Met Council for 2040. He understands that not every City has and wondered how the State can open some of those doors without getting rid of everything. It is not just about local control, it is about understanding local impact and then a broad stroke from the State government eliminates the ability to consider local impact. He thought that was something that will negatively affect people in their current or future housing that does not have services connected to the area or bus routes, etc. Then, suddenly, there is housing in random spots or housing that is not supported by the infrastructure that does not make sense but is cheap and easy to build. Those local impacts, even beyond local control, is what the State is missing and it would have potential negative consequences.

Councilmember Groff asked if it could be tailored so it is Roseville specific. That is what he would be interested in.

Mayor Roe thought it still made sense to talk about what makes sense for Roseville, may not make sense for a city like Paynesville. It does not mean that city should not have things they should strive for and perhaps broad parameters they need to fit within. To Councilmember Groff's point about not everybody is doing something, he thought it would be important to talk about that. The reason why the City of Roseville has been successful is because the City has considered and been sensitive to those adjacencies and impacts and how it can work in the community which may not meet the letter of what was in some of these requirements in the legislation. He thought that was kind of the nuance, the local angle, but also still tying it back to how something coming from the State legislature does not always fit for all localities.

Councilmember Schroeder agreed. She thought it was important for the City to pick out very specific things for the City to do to say, "this does not work for Roseville because of this, this and this". The Council does not know what will work and not work for other cities, but the staff and Council does know what does and does not work for Roseville and that is the important part here.

Mr. Trudgeon explained the purpose of a letter to the legislature is to let them know that there are concerns the City has generally speaking about the bill. These items can be listed in the letter. He thought the City would be chasing its tail a little bit to get very specific and it would be helpful to state the City has some concerns about the way this bill has been going through the process, the lack of involvement of local officials, and some of the decisions. He noted the letter can talk about what Roseville has been doing at a local level and the City would encourage the legislature to stay in touch with the City as this process moves forward, whether it is a session or future sessions, and to have a conversation with the City about what is workable. He did not think it is on Roseville's shoulders to prevent this bill from happening, noting the reason there is the League of Minnesota Cities and Metro Cities to advocate for the City. He thought, if nothing else, the legislators would appreciate hearing from the City about where it stands on this. He would also be a little cautious about sending this to different committees. He thought this bill was dead now, it went to some committees, but he did not know where this is going to go, but staff can certainly do whatever the Council wants.

Councilmember Etten thought it was important for the City to outline that the City is concerned about the local impact and potential unintended consequences, not just letting the legislature know the City wants to be involved without itemizing the most recent bill.

Mayor Roe thought it made sense for staff to draft something up for the Council to take a look at.

e. Discuss Proposed Special Legislation to Create Ramsey County Economic Development Authority

City Manager Patrick Trudgeon briefly highlighted this item as detailed in the Request for Council Action and related attachments dated April 8, 2024.

Mayor Roe updated the Council on the meeting he and Assistant City Manager Olson attended related to this legislation.

Councilmember Groff asked how Mayor Roe would see this helping Roseville.

Mayor Roe stated the City has an EDA so it does some business support programs but there may be some things outside the scope of what the City's EDA does that the County may be able to do, noting the City partners already with the County on Open to Business and things like that. He thought it would help fill gaps or augment the things the City does. Certainly, the City does have the ability to opt out, if it wanted to do, maybe not opt out of paying the levy because it is the HRA levy but certainly opt out of the programs.

Councilmember Schroeder thought the concept was fine, but it is the method that she has an issue with. There is a reason why there is a process in place but to go around the process, that is where it is a little uncertain. She did not think the City needed to do anything about it and hopefully the County learns something from this.

Councilmember Etten agreed with the statements that have been made and thought there were possibilities, noting the City's housing aspect has dovetailed with the County and the programs augmented each other. Certainly, there are possibilities of supporting businesses in Roseville in a positive way; however, the process does not look right. The only thing he would have about saying something direct is to tell the County that the City supports this legislation because of 'x, y, and z' changes to it, to highlight that for the local legislature and point out the key things in order not to go backwards.

Mayor Roe thought the City could send a letter to the local legislators pointing out certain things.

Councilmember Schroeder was not sure if she was comfortable sending a letter unless it is stated that the City still supports the process that is in place.

Mayor Roe thought staff could work through a letter pointing out those things.

f. Consider Approval of Hotel Licensing Ordinance

City Manager Patrick Trudgeon briefly highlighted this item as detailed in the Request for Council Action and related attachments dated April 8, 2024.

Mayor Roe asked if staff communicated to the hotel operators that this item was on the agenda for consideration.

Mr. Trudgeon indicated the hotel operators knew about this.

Councilmember Groff heard that the hotels appreciated the interaction on this. It was a good process and felt that the final ordinance was done well, as staff conveyed to the Council. He asked how the City would police permanent residency in a hotel.

Mr. Trudgeon explained it would probably be in response to a call and finding the person has stayed longer than the Code allows.

Councilmember Etten noted this mentions fines, and asked if something will be put into the fee schedule or is this something that will be determined as it occurs.

City Attorney Tierney explained staff talked about whether to create a fine penalty schedule, like in some of the other ordinance, and felt that might be premature as a little experience may be needed in determining the enforcement and fines and at some point, to add it as a part of the fee schedule.

Councilmember Etten asked if inspections will be done by the Fire Department.

Mr. Trudgeon explained inspections will mostly be done by the Fire Department but also Community Development staff because there is a Building Code and a Fire Code.

Schroeder moved, Etten seconded, enactment of Ordinance No. 1674 entitled, "An Ordinance Amending Title 3 to Create Chapter 317 of the Roseville City Code Entitled "Hotel Licensing Regulations".

Council Discussion

Councilmember Schroeder stated this came back a number of times with multiple discussions and community involvement and at this time, it seems to make sense to approve.

Councilmember Etten explained he was not at the last discussion and in reading this, he appreciated the questions from Councilmembers Groff and Strahan. He thought they helped improve things and staff did a nice job of responding to that. He also noted the dramatic improvement after the Repeat Nuisance Ordinance came in. Hopefully, that is a core improvement rather than just phone calls not happening. He also appreciated seeing the Racial Equity Toolkit in action. Thinking about people staying in hotel rooms for a long time, ultimately the goal is to find greater stability for individuals rather than living in hotel rooms as it is such a limited way to live. He hoped the City will continue to use its robust services that have been developed with partners to help people find stable and supportive housing for them in the long term.

Roll Call
Ayes: Etten, Schroeder, Groff, and Roe.
Nays: None

Groff moved, Schroeder seconded, adoption of Resolution No. 12059 entitled, "A Resolution Approving Publication of an Ordinance Summary of Ordinance No. 1674 Creating Title 3, Chapter 317 of the Roseville City Code."

Roll Call (Super Majority Required)
Ayes: Etten, Schroeder, Groff, and Roe.
Nays: None

10. Council Direction on Councilmember Initiated Agenda Items

11. 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 March 18, 2024 and March 11, 2024 City Council Meeting Minutes
Groff moved, Schroeder seconded, approval of the March 18, 2024 and March 11, 2024 City Council Meeting Minutes as presented.

Roll Call
Ayes: Etten, Schroeder, Groff, and Roe.
Nays: None.

12. 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 April 8, 2024 and related attachments.

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

Roll Call
Ayes: Etten, Schroeder, Groff, and Roe.
Nays: None.

a. **Approve Payments**

ACH Payments	$402,144.64
109037-109179	1,416,652.74
TOTAL	**$1,818,797.38**

b. **Approve General Purchases or Sale of Surplus Items Exceeding $10,000**
c. **Approval of 2 Temporary Gambling Permits, and 1 Temporary Liquor Permit**
d. **Adopt Resolution No. 12060 Awarding Contract for Construction of New Park at 2381 County Road B**
e. **Approve Professional Services Agreements for McCarrons Retaining Wall Project 22-22, Construction Services**
f. **Approve a Short-Term Rental License for 419 Judith Avenue**
g. **Adopt Resolution No. 12061 Approving Motor Vehicle Repair, Auto Body Shop, and Motor Fuel Sales as a Conditional Use for Troy's Auto Care, 2171 Hamline Avenue**
h. **Appoint Youth Commissioner Members to the Public Works, Environment and Transportation Commission**
i. **Approve Service Agreement for City Facilities Garbage Services**
j. **Adopt Resolution No. 12062 Awarding Contract for 2024 Sanitary Sewer Lining Project**
k. **Approve Resolution No. 12063 Awarding Contract for County Road B Reconstruction and 2024 Pavement Management Project**
l. **Award 2024-2026 BMP Maintenance Program Contract**

13. Future Agenda Review, Communications, Reports, and Announcements – Council and City Manager

City Manager Patrick Trudgeon reviewed the April 15, 2024 City Council Work Session meeting, April 22, 2024 City Council meeting, May 6, 2024 City Council meeting, May 13, 2024 EDA meeting and the May 13, 2024, 2024 City Council Work Session meeting.

14. Adjourn

Etten moved, Groff seconded, adjournment of the meeting at approximately 8:33 p.m.

Roll Call

Ayes: Etten, Schroeder, Groff, and Roe.
Nays: None.

Daniel J. Roe, Mayor

ATTEST:

Patrick J. Trudgeon, City Manager