City of
ROSEVILLE
Minnesota, USA

Regular City Council Meeting Minutes
City Hall Council Chambers, 2660 Civic Center Drive
Monday, December 1, 2025

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

2. **Pledge of Allegiance**

3. **Approve Agenda**

Strahan moved, Bauer seconded, approval of the agenda as presented.

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

4. **Public Comment**
Mayor Roe invited audience members to provide public comment on non-agenda items. No one came forward to speak.

5. **Recognitions, Donations, and Communications**

6. **Items Removed from the Consent Agenda**

7. **Business Items**

a. **Conduct 2026 EDA and City Budget and Levy Public Hearing**
Finance Director Michelle Pietrick briefly highlighted this item as detailed in the Request For Council Action and related attachments dated December 1, 2025.

Ms. Pietrick presented the budget and tax levy, explaining the process and different scenarios. The preliminary 2026 budget was $81.2 million, including new positions and capital projects. Scenarios for the budget explored various funding options and possible tax increases.

Mayor Roe reviewed public hearing protocol and opened the public hearing at approximately 6:28 p.m.

Public Comment

Ms. Dwenda Gjerdingen, 2553 Fisk Street, Roseville
Ms. Gjerdingen said she was surprised by the recent property tax increase on their home, noting a 16% increase she did not expect.

The public hearing was continued to the December 8, 2025, meeting for further public input.

Mr. Trudgeon mentioned a funding request for the circulator bus service.

The mayor and councilmembers discussed the impact of changes in property values on tax bills and the possibility of using utility franchise fees to offset property tax increases was mentioned.

The importance of the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) and its alignment with the city's budget was also highlighted.

b. **Hold a Public Hearing to Certify Delinquent Miscellaneous Charges**
Finance Director Michelle Pietrick briefly highlighted this item as detailed in the Request For Council Action and related attachments dated December 1, 2025.

Mayor Roe reviewed public hearing protocol and opened and closed the public hearing at approximately 6:39 p.m. for the purpose of receiving public input on the above-referenced certification of delinquent miscellaneous charges, with no one appearing for or against.

Strahan moved, Schroeder seconded, adopting Resolution 12192 approving the certification of unpaid charges to the County Auditor for collection on the property taxes.

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

c. **Provide Direction on the Finance Commission Workplan**
Finance Commission Chair Bruce Bester briefly highlighted this item as detailed in the Request For Council Action and related attachments dated December 1, 2025.

Chair Bester addressed the Mayor and City Council with a follow-up to a discussion from the November 14 Finance Commission meeting regarding a letter dated November 12 from a resident. He noted several areas in which he strongly disagreed with the claims in that letter. Key disagreements included:

- **Claim of no financial analysis:** Chair Bester stated this was inaccurate, explaining that the Commission had recently reviewed the CIP and program budgets and therefore had a solid understanding of the financial details.

- **Cost of the Pathway Program:** The letter asserted that the program cost $250 million over 35 years. Chair Bester and another commissioner believed this figure was significantly overstated, estimating the actual number to be closer to $9 million.

Despite these disagreements, Chair Bester emphasized the Commission's willingness to support the City by conducting a deeper review of the Pathways program if the Council desired it. He acknowledged that the program represented only 0.4% of the city's total budget and that the Commission initially questioned whether it warranted such a deep dive. However, he suggested that analyzing a small program could allow the Commission to examine the details and learn from the process thoroughly.

Chair Bester offered two options:
1. **Conduct an in-depth review of the Pathways program**, or
2. **Undertake a review of another program the Council viewed as more critical.**

Chair Bester requested guidance early in the upcoming year so the Commission could incorporate the chosen project into its work plan.

Councilmember Strahan explained that the Council had received comments from Bob Bierscheid, who has a long history in parks, whose concerns centered mainly on how the issue might affect the park system. She noted that although the Finance Commission played an important role, many projects came forward only when fully formed, requiring decisions at that time. In her view, the existing process and prioritization system were not lacking.

Councilmember Strahan expressed greater concern about a community member bypassing the City Council and bringing issues directly to the Commission. She felt that, if this individual, well known to the organization, had questions or concerns, they should have approached the Council first. She compared the action to "asking mom instead of asking dad to get a different answer," and emphasized that she did not want to place the Commission in an uncomfortable position.

After consulting with the city attorney, Councilmember Strahan acknowledged that public comment rules allowed residents to submit items. However, she still believed the Commission's work plan should be directed and approved by the Council. She stressed that any additional assignments, especially for volunteers, many of whom were retired, should be meaningful and clearly valuable.

Given the timing, Councilmember Strahan also noted that it was too late to influence the 2026 budget meaningfully. She reiterated her discomfort with the idea that someone could "jump the system" to push an issue through another body. She emphasized that the Council should decide at the Council table whether to direct the Commission to take on any new work, and only with sound justification.

Councilmember Schroeder expressed appreciation for the Commission's work. She explained that her primary question for any proposed analysis was what value it would provide, specifically, whether it would lead to a decision, a meaningful change, or a worthwhile outcome. She emphasized the need to ensure that any time the Commission invested would deliver clear benefits.

Councilmember Schroeder agreed with Councilmember Strahan that the Council should guide the Commission's work plan and said it was appropriate for the Commission to bring forward ideas for consideration. However, in this case, she was unsure what specific question the Commission would be trying to answer by reviewing the Pathways program.

Councilmember Schroeder stated that, in her view, the Commission's time would be more valuable if focused on the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP). She noted that the CIP involved both long-term and short-term planning, funding issues, inflation impacts, and cost evaluations, all areas where Commission input could significantly help the Council make future budget and capital decisions.

Regarding specific project costs, such as those related to the leaf center, Councilmember Schroeder believed staff already had those details well understood. She felt the Commission did not need to analyze that level of detail, but emphasized that their broader input on major projects would still be valuable as they come forward.

Councilmember Bauer agreed that the Commission should further examine the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP), particularly in light of the city's potential use of franchise fees and how those revenues might affect CIP planning. He reiterated concerns he had raised earlier about relying too heavily on a 20-year planning horizon without accounting for factors such as future tax-base changes, including the expiration of TIF districts.

Councilmember Bauer also addressed a question in the packet regarding the Commission's work plan for the coming year. He noted that his predecessor had worked hard to empower commissions to bring forward their own initiatives. While the Commission was right to seek Council direction, he emphasized that the Council also expected commissions to identify issues they believed were important.

Councilmember Bauer stressed that commissioners were appointed for their passion and expertise, and their independent insights were valuable to the Council. He encouraged the Commission not only to work on tasks assigned by the Council but also to investigate topics they believed warranted attention proactively.

Councilmember Groff added that whenever the Commission considered taking on new work, it was advisable to run it by the Council first. He noted that it was easy for the Commission to come to the Council and get on the schedule, and he appreciated that they already met with the Council at least once a year. He emphasized that the Council was always available to provide guidance whenever issues arose within the Commission.

Mayor Roe noted that the city's commission code required commissions to check in with the Council when initiating new work to ensure the Council validated adding those items to the commission's work plan. He then highlighted several points related to the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP).

Mayor Roe echoed the Council's earlier comments supporting a review of the CIP and explained that one long-standing challenge has been forecasting future costs, particularly inflation. He noted that, as one of the architects of the 2010–2011 updates to the CIP program, he believed the city still lacked a robust process for incorporating inflation adjustments into capital planning funding. He felt the city needed a more consistent policy for adjusting annual set-asides to prevent the CIP from falling behind due to inflation. He suggested referencing federal indices for capital cost inflation and expressed interest in the Commission exploring whether a formal policy could be developed.

Mayor Roe also discussed the complexity of analyzing costs for the Pathways program. He noted that pathways were funded through diverse sources, city and county projects, federal grants, Safe Routes to School funds, and others. Because each project drew from different funding streams, he questioned the usefulness of analyzing total project costs without knowing which entity would ultimately pay for them. However, he believed that long-term maintenance costs, such as snow removal, repairs, and replacements, were more predictable and might be an appropriate area for Commission review, potentially tying those maintenance obligations into CIP planning.

Finally, Mayor Roe broadened the discussion to overall budgeting. He noted that recent years included temporary federal COVID funding and grant-supported positions, which created future financial obligations once the external funding expired. He expressed interest in hearing from the Commission on how the city could better track and document these future commitments so that each new budget cycle began with a clear understanding of built-in cost increases from prior decisions. He acknowledged that the rest of the Council might disagree, but felt it was valuable to raise the topic while the Commission Chair was present.

Councilmember Strahan emphasized that she and the Council appreciated the expertise the Commission brought to its work. She acknowledged that commissioners might have felt offended by claims suggesting they had not done their job, and she wanted to reassure them that such comments did not reflect the views of many people. She recognized that commission service could be thankless at times and expressed gratitude for their time, input, and commitment. She encouraged them to accept the Council's appreciation for the value they provided.

Councilmember Groff agreed with the previous remarks and noted that all Councilmembers understood how much work commission service required because they had served on commissions themselves. He emphasized that while the Council could suggest many ideas, the Commission needed to determine what was realistic within a year's work plan. He reminded them that their role was not a full-time job and that no one expected them to commit excessive hours. He encouraged the Commission to set reasonable priorities and not hesitate to limit its focus to what was manageable for the year.

City Manager Trudgeon sought clarification to ensure that both staff and the Finance Commission correctly understood the Council's direction. He stated that he did not hear the Council instruct the Finance Commission to analyze the Pathways or Bike Plan directly. Instead, he understood the Council to be directing the Commission to focus more broadly on the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) and the various factors that feed into it, including pathways and bike facilities, as part of the larger system. He emphasized that the Commission's work should focus on how the CIP was structured, how planning was conducted, and how factors such as inflation were accounted for. He wanted to confirm this understanding before the meeting concluded.

Councilmembers added that, consistent with the mayor's remarks, it might be worthwhile for the Commission to look at potential maintenance or other ongoing costs associated with the pathways. However, it was emphasized that this should be a lower priority. The Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) should be the Commission's highest priority.

Chair Bester thanked the City Council for their feedback.

d. Consider Adopting an Ordinance Amending Title 5, Section 501.15 to Clarify Dangerous Animal Hearing Officer Requirements

Police Commander Travis Steinberg briefly highlighted this item as detailed in the Request For Council Action and related attachments dated December 1, 2025.

Commander Steinberg presented the amendment to the dangerous animal hearing officer requirements. He indicated the current designation of the Animal Humane Society's Director of Human Investigations has changed to an impartial employee or person retained by the city. The amendment aimed to ensure a fair and transparent process.

Schroeder moved, Groff seconded, enactment of Ordinance No. 1694 (Attachment 1) entitled, "An Ordinance Amending Title 5, Section 501.15 to Clarify Dangerous Animal Hearing Officer Requirements"

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

Strahan moved, Groff seconded, approval of Ordinance Summary No. 12193 (Attachment 2) entitled, "Resolution Approving Publication of an Ordinance Summary of ORD No. 1694 Amending Title 5, Section 501.15 of the Roseville City Code."

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

e. **Appoint City Councilmember to Civic Campus Final Design Stakeholder Group**

City Manager Patrick Trudgeon briefly highlighted this item as detailed in the Request For Council Action and related attachments dated December 1, 2025.

Councilmember Groff nominated Councilmember Strahan for the group.

Groff moved, Strahan seconded, to appoint Councilmember Strahan to the Civic Campus Design Stakeholder Group.

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

8. Council Direction on Councilmember Initiated Agenda Items

9. Approve Minutes

10. Approve Consent Agenda

At Mayor Roe's request, City Manager Trudgeon briefly reviewed the items under the Consent Agenda, as detailed in the specific Requests for Council Action dated December 1, 2025, and related attachments.

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

Roll Call
Ayes: Groff, Bauer, Strahan, Schroeder, and Roe.

Nays: None.

a. **Approve Payments**

ACH Payments	$197,493.65
114216 - 114270	715,267.70
TOTAL	**$912,761.35**

b. **Approve General Purchases or Sale of Surplus Items Exceeding $10,000**
c. **Approve the Issuance of a Premise Permit for St. Paul Firefighters Local 21 to Conduct Lawful Gambling Activities at 1595 Highway 36 West, Suite 1020 (Burger Dive)**
d. **Approve Final Payment for Tamarack Park Pathway Project 24-03**
e. **Approve Final Payment for 2025 Sanitary Sewer Main Lining 25-06**
f. **Authorize a Professional Services Agreement with Keith Streff for Dangerous or Potentially Dangerous Dog Appeals**
g. **Receive Third Quarter Financial Report**

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

City Manager Patrick Trudgeon reviewed the December 8, 2025, City Council meeting.

Councilmember Strahan said a resident had a question about the closed session and asked Attorney Tierney to clarify its purpose. She mentioned that some residents might worry that it involves lawsuits or other legal matters currently in progress, and that the attorney provided information to address those concerns.

City Attorney Tierney explained that state law allows cities to hold closed sessions to discuss how much they are willing to pay for property they are considering purchasing. She stated that this confidentiality protected the city's strategic position, much like a private buyer. She noted that closed sessions on property purchases had several legal requirements: they had to be recorded, attendance had to be taken, and the recordings had to be kept for eight years. Once the property transaction was completed or abandoned, all of that information became public.

City Attorney Tierney addressed questions about lawsuits, clarifying that city-related litigation is also publicly accessible. She noted that anyone can search the Ramsey County judicial website for any active civil or criminal case involving the City of Roseville. She also stated that similar searches can be conducted through the federal court system in the Eighth Judicial District, though she is less familiar with it.

Mayor Roe noted that although most city information is public and available to residents upon request, the city does not proactively publish everything. He clarified that the volume of information makes it impractical to present it all clearly and accessibly, and that different members of the public value different types of information. Therefore, the city relies on public information requests rather than proactively distributing every document.

Mayor Roe reiterated that court websites are often the easiest way for residents to access city-related litigation, as that information is publicly available. He thanked the City Attorney for the clarification.

12. Adjourn

Groff moved, Schroeder seconded, adjournment of the meeting at approximately 7:14 p.m.

Roll Call

Ayes: Groff, Bauer, Strahan, Schroeder, and Roe.
Nays: None.

Daniel J. Roe, Mayor

ATTEST:

Patrick J. Trudgeon, City Manager