



ETHICS COMMISSION AGENDA

**February 10, 2016
6:30 p.m.
Roseville City Hall
2660 Civic Center Drive**

- I. Call to Order
- II. Public Comment
- III. Approve Minutes of November 18, 2015
- IV. Discuss 2016 Ethics Training
- V. Discuss Future of Ethics Commission
- VI. Discuss Ethics Tip
- VII. Other Business
- VIII. Adjourn

Memo

To: Ethics Commission
From: Patrick Trudgeon, City Manager
Date: February 4, 2016
Re: February 10, 2016 Ethics Commission Meeting

The Ethics Commission will cover the following topics at the February 10. They include:

- **Discuss 2016 Ethics Training.** City Attorney Mark Gaughan will be present at the meeting to review the topics for the annual Ethics Training scheduled for Wednesday, April 6. The Commission previously discussed topics ranging for the use of social media, a reinforcement of the Ethics Code and Open Meeting Law, and drawing a distinction between ethical and criminal behavior.
- **Discuss Future of the Ethics Commission.** Over the past few months and since the Ethics Commission's last meeting, the City Council has been discussing its 10 current city commissions. As part of that discussion, they have asked staff to look at the future of the Ethics Commission. They have indicated that they would like to keep in its existence, but have asked staff to research other ways it could be constituted. One way that is being considered is to have the existing Commission Chairs serve on the Ethics Commission and have them meet on an "as needed" basis and have an annual meeting as part of the annual Ethics Training. At the February 8th City Council meeting, the Council will be discussing several commissions, including the Ethics Commission. At our meeting on February 10, I will provide an update to the Ethics Commission about the discussion from the February 8th City Council meeting. For your information, I have included the City Council case for the February 8th meeting.
- **Ethics Tip.** Commissioner Quick-Lindberg will present her Ethics Tip at the February 10 meeting.

City of Roseville
Ethics Commission Meeting Minutes
Wednesday, November 18 2015

I. Call to Order

Chair Lehman called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

Members Present:

Ben Lehman, Norine Quick-Lindberg, Matthew Becker, Sheran Van Driest, and Todd Anderson.

Members Absent: None

Others Present:

Patrick Trudgeon, City Manager; Jim Ericson, City Attorney Office

II. Public Comment

There was no public comment.

III. Approve Minutes of August 12, 2015

Commissioner Anderson moved to approve the August 12, 2015 minutes, seconded by Commissioner Becker.

Ayes All. Motion passed.

IV. 2016 Ethics Training

City Manager Trudgeon noted that the training will be held on Wednesday, April 6, 2016 and provided background of previous discussion about potential topics for the 2016 training which included the use of social media, a general reinforcement of the Ethics Code, a discussion about the open meeting law, and drawing a distinction between ethical and criminal behavior. Mr. Trudgeon indicated that City Attorney Mark Gaughan is willing to do the 2016 training. Mr. Trudgeon reported on his research on other resources that could be used and reported that League of Minnesota Cities didn't have anything specifically regarding local governmental ethics and most of the other materials and resources were tailored for the Federal and State government.

The Commission discussed some possible options on the Ethics Training and decided to utilize City Attorney to make a presentation around Roseville's Ethics Code with discussion around social media and the open meeting law.

V. Discuss Ethics Tip

Chair Lehman reported that he was working on completing the Ethics Tip, but provided an article entitled "Attacking Those who make an Ethical Allegation" for discussion. The Commission reviewed the article and discussed the topic of the responsibility of reporting ethical violations. Chair Lehman indicated that he will complete the Ethics Tip and forward to Mr. Trudgeon for publication on the City web site. The topic will be about the use of social media.

Chair Lehman asked for a volunteer to write an Ethics Tip. Commissioner Quick-Lindberg volunteered to prepare one for the February 10, 2016 meeting.

VI. Other Business

City Manager Trudgeon stated that there has not been any ethics complaints forwarded to the City Manager's Office, but that the City Attorney's office received an inquiry for an informal advisory opinion by a Planning Commission member regarding a potential conflict of interest he may have with an item on the Planning Commission agenda. The person served on the Home Owners Association Board for property operated by a company that had a land use application for a different property in Roseville that the Planning Commission needed to make a recommendation on. Attorney Jim Ericson reviewed the situation and indicated that through the review it was determined that there was no conflict with the Ethics Code since the Planning Commissioner would not personally benefit from making a recommendation. However, the City Attorney's office did recommend that the Planning Commissioner disclose his membership on the Home Owners Association for the sake of transparency.

City Manager reported that the City has a new community engagement portal called "Speak Up Roseville" that is intended to foster the sharing of information and foster two-way communication.

Commissioner Becker indicated that he will not be seeking another term on the Ethics Commission and indicated February will be his last meeting. The Commission thanked him for his service.

VII. Adjourn

Commissioner Anderson move to adjourn the meeting at 6:24 p.m. and Commissioner Van Driest seconded.

Ayes All. Meeting Adjourned

Respectfully submitted,
Patrick J. Trudgeon
City Manager

REQUEST FOR COUNCIL ACTION

Date: February 8, 2016
Item No.: 11.b

Department Approval

City Manager Approval



Item Description: Review Scope, Duties, and Function of the Human Rights Commission,
Community Engagement Commission, and Ethics Commission

BACKGROUND

On November 30 the City Council directed the Human Rights Commission and Community Engagement Commission to review the scope and functions found in the commission chapters of City Code. The minutes from the November meeting can be found as ‘Attachment A.’

Human Rights Commission (HRC)

Per the direction of the City Council, the Human Rights Commission reviewed the Scope, Duties and Functions in City Code and have made suggested changes. Suggested changes to the chapter can be found as ‘Attachment B’ and are intended for clarity and better functionality.

The Human Rights Commission seeks guidance on whether efforts should be concentrated in an ‘advisory’ role or in a role providing a platform for advocacy and education on human rights issues.

Wayne Groff, Chair of the Human Rights Commission, will be present to discuss and answer questions.

Community Engagement Commission (CEC)

The Community Engagement Commission discussed the Scope, Duties and Functions in City Code and agreed that no changes were necessary, that the Code as it relates to the Community Engagement Commission is clear and in alignment with the actions of the Commission to this point. The Commission also submitted a list of 2016 work items and goals for discussion (Attachment C).

Ethics Commission

The City Council directed staff to explore alternative compositions of the Ethics Commission. Suggested changes to the commission chapter (Attachment D) include utilizing existing commission chairs from each advisory commission to form the Ethics Commission on an ‘as needed’ basis. The Ethics Commission currently plans the Ethics Training each year, and an annual meeting may need to be established for this purpose.

Frequency of Human Rights Commission and Community Engagement Commission.

The City Council also asked the HRC and CEC to look at the frequency of meetings. They both meet on a monthly basis. Both commissions discussed the matter and feel there is a need to continue to meet monthly.

From the City Manager’s perspective, the current level of support that the Administration Department

provides to both commissions may be unsustainable in the long term without additional resources. Unlike other Departments, the Administration Department currently serves three commissions (depending on the outcome of the Ethics Commission). Given the level of importance that staff and the City Council attaches to each commission, there is a significant amount of time put in each month working with commission members, preparing agendas, attending commission meetings, and implementing the work initiated by the commissions. As the staff of the Administration Department is tasked with many different duties (as are all City staff), it is often a fine balance of taking care of the commission's priorities and needs while completing the other necessary and important daily tasks.

To be clear, the City Manager is not suggesting Administration staff stop supporting the HRC or the CEC. Nor is the City Manager suggesting that either commission isn't important or less of a priority than any other commission. However, assuming that no additional resources are forthcoming in the near future, one option to consider is lessening the frequency of the meetings of both commissions to better distribute work load. In regards to the CEC, the relatively recent beginning of the Commission, as well as the recent turnover of Commission members, will require a lot of work on behalf of the staff to help advance its work. The reduction in meetings may allow the City Manager to become more directly involved with working with these commissions.

If the City Council is open to considering changing the frequency of these commission meetings, the City Manager suggests the commissions meet every other month (6 times a year). There would also still be the ability to hold special meetings of these Commissions as needed.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

A financial impact would result in changes to meeting frequency. Current costs associated with commission support include minute preparation and staff time.

REQUESTED COUNCIL ACTION

Review scope, duties, and function of the Human Rights Commission, Community Engagement Commission, and Ethics Commission.

Prepared by: Patrick Trudgeon, City Manager

Attachment A: November 30 City Council Meeting Minutes
Attachment B: Human Rights Commission Suggested Code Changes
Attachment C: Community Engagement Commission 2016 Goals and Work Items
Attachment D: Suggested Code Changes to Ethics Chapter
Attachment E: Minutes from January 14 Community Engagement Commission Meeting
Attachment F: Minutes from January 20 Human Rights Commission Meeting

Councilmember Willmus asked staff to provide something about proposed compensation for a paid Intern position.

Councilmember McGehee cautioned that the Reception Desk served as the face of the City of Roseville; and didn't think it should be provided by an Intern or volunteer position.

Recess

Mayor Roe recessed the meeting at approximately 8:53 p.m., and reconvened at approximately 9:00 p.m.

14. Business Items (Action Items)

- a. Approve/Deny Pawn America License Renewal**
- b. Approve/Deny Farrington Estates Easement Vacation**
- c. Approve/Deny Creation of Economic Development Authority (EDA)**
- d. Advisory Commission Review for 2016**

Mayor Roe introduced this discussion subsequent to the City Council's joint meeting in October with its advisory Human Rights Commission (HRC) directing staff to schedule a more comprehensive review of all advisory commissions, currently before the City Council, and as a result of the Uniform Commission Code adopted earlier this year. While initially scheduled to address the three vacancies on the HRC not yet filled, Mayor Roe noted that this discussion could include roles and responsibilities of each standing council advisory commission and potential shifts. Mayor Roe noted this discussion was also in conjunction with the related topic of the newly-created advisory Community Engagement Commission (CEC) and broader commission discussions and thoughts.

HRC

Specific to the HRC, Councilmember Etten expressed his personal interest in returning that advisory commission to its full force. Councilmember Etten recognized the positive activities and robust work currently being undertaken by the HRC even with their limited membership available, and their return to a strong regular versus sporadic meeting schedule. Councilmember Etten stated he thought the HRC should return to full strength to allow them to operate more effectively.

Councilmember McGehee agreed with Councilmember Etten, opining she was impressed with their presentations and their well-attended and well-led efforts when appearing before the City Council at those joint meetings. Councilmember McGehee further opined that this was proving to be a successful advisory com-

mission and a good addition to Roseville, and a necessity for the community the size of Roseville.

Councilmember Willmus noted one thing touched upon during previous discussion was the charge within the function and duties of the HRC, including their programming aspect. Councilmember Willmus advised that he had spoken with the current Chair of the HRC, noting their real focus over the last few years had become presentations or gatherings versus the programming and advisory role, which is currently the role the HRC is charged with by the City Council. Councilmember Willmus questioned if the same understanding was in place with what is actually occurring and what was actually on the ledger; seeking to call attention to that disconnect in their charge and expectations of the City Council on their advisory role.

From a broader perspective, Councilmember Willmus expressed his interest in looking at all advisory commissions and staffing those commissions including questions such as: Do we have too many?; Are existing commissions being properly utilized?; Are tweaks needed to improve efficiencies of existing commissions?; Is it necessary for all commissions to meet monthly or would the city be better served by a quarterly or semi-annual meeting schedule for some commissions (e.g. Ethics and HRC)?.

Specific to the HRC, Mayor Roe opined they had a distinct role, and suggested perhaps the City Council needed to do more to clarify that distinction and define the focus of the HRC and CEC in their respective roles. Mayor Roe stated he continued to support the City Council's expectations as outlined in the CEC's enabling ordinance. Regarding the HRC enabling ordinance, Mayor Roe suggested an immediate review before the next round of appointments, to reconsider its scope, duties and functions. Mayor Roe opined that he found some listed in the ordinance to be unclear or some overlapping with those of the CEC (e.g. assisting the State Human Rights Commission in implementing the Human Rights Act) questioning whether that was even a viable expectation of the City Council. As an initial starting point, Mayor Roe suggested charging the HRC to provide feedback to the City Council on their suggestions to improve language of that ordinance when they return to full membership. As part of that, Mayor Roe stated he would be open to considering meeting frequency or simply establishing a base minimum number of meetings through ordinance language or other City Council action. Mayor Roe stated that he was more concerned in dictating a specific number of meetings as a City Council, especially in defining roles and responsibilities; and suggested that language may be added to other advisory commissions as well related to a minimum standard number of meetings, allowing them to meet more as they felt appropriate.

Councilmember McGehee stated she liked the idea of minimum meetings and specific policies to determine that frequency. Councilmember McGehee used the

Police Civil Service and Ethics Commissions as examples. Councilmember McGehee agreed with seeking input from the HRC. In terms of advisory versus performance, Councilmember McGehee noted there were differences depending on their general function in the community and whether or not it was applicable for them to advise the City Council or perform certain duties or functions as appropriate. Councilmember McGehee opined that some of that failure to clarify that was a failing on the part of the City Council in being more specific.

Councilmember Etten agreed with the comments of Councilmember McGehee.

Councilmember Laliberte expressed her concern in setting a minimum versus monthly or quarterly meeting schedule was in a lack of consistency for the benefit of the public on specific areas of importance or interest to them. Councilmember Laliberte questioned how the community could be expected to engage with advisory commissions if they were meeting randomly, and suggested some base or consistent time requirement.

Mayor Roe noted that another piece of the discussion was the Uniform Commission Code and requirements included requiring commissions to establish a meeting schedule for each year. Mayor Roe opined that this put some onus on those commissions to provide that consistent public information.

Mayor Roe suggested consideration by the City Council as to whether or not to fill the HRC vacancies as part of the January 2016 application process.

McGehee moved, Etten seconded, filling the three vacancies to the HRC.

City Manager Trudgeon clarified the motion, whether to fill those three vacancies now or in April 2016 with the next round of appointments.

By consensus, the City Council confirmed that the intent was to fill the positions on the HRC for appointment in April of 2016.

Roll Call

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

Nays: None.

Without objection, Mayor Roe directed staff to charge the HRC to begin a review of their current ordinance and role, and provide a recommendation to the City Council at their earliest convenience.

Broader Discussion

Councilmember Laliberte sought information on how many advisory commissions staff could sufficiently or realistically support.

Councilmember Willmus suggested starting with defining the charge and scope for the HRC and CEC and how to clarify their specific roles, as well as how they functioned related to a meeting schedule.

City Manager Trudgeon advised that staff could better help advisory commissions if not meeting monthly.

Councilmember Willmus asked staff to provide their recommendation, with concurrence by Mayor Roe, for meeting frequency of various commissions, and any other ideas or desires they wished to share with the City Council at this time.

Ethics Commission

Mayor Roe advised that since he'd been serving on the City Council in 2007, only one ethics complaint had been received and subsequently withdrawn, or at least with no formal action being taken. Therefore, Mayor Roe stated he had mixed emotions in appointing citizens to serve when not receiving complaints or no changes are indicated to the Ethics Code. Mayor Roe opined that staff could perform the training without a commission, but noted the process was in place in code that the Ethics Commission review complaints as they were received and help consider those complaints and their resolution. Mayor Roe stated he had given consideration to recommending demoting the Ethics Commission from a standing committee to an ad hoc committee, staffed by one member from each commission if and when a complaint or issue needed addressing based on the Ethics Code. Mayor Roe noted that direction could be provided to them at that time to seek their input and would serve as the reality of how the Ethics Commission could function and what serving residents actually received from their service on that Commission.

Councilmember Laliberte stated that her observations from the last two joint meetings with the Ethics Commission was a sense of frustration from them; and no charge to do anything other than enact monthly ethics tips and annual training put on by staff and the City Attorney. Councilmember Laliberte stated she shared Mayor Roe's concern in appointing people who in turn become disappointed or frustrated by a lack of meaningful work.

For the benefit of the public, Mayor Roe clarified that his comments in no way intended to suggest he was advocating getting rid of the Ethics Commission or not have a complaint process in place, but simply rethinking how it operated.

Councilmember Willmus noted that, using Mayor Roe's idea for members serving from standing commissions, they would still review complaints as currently done by the standing Ethics Commission.

Mayor Roe concurred, noting complaints would be received from the City Manager or City Attorney as applicable to pass on to the ultimate decision-maker, still the City Council.

Councilmember Etten asked if Mayor Roe still envisioned the Ethics Commission meeting annually to discuss their responsibilities as an educational piece as they understand their role in this situation or how they still functioned within the city.

Mayor Roe stated that wasn't a bad idea; and that would provide some orientation, unless that information was provided to commissions ahead of time to determine commissioner interest in volunteering for that role. Mayor Roe stated it would need defining what that role was if such a process was undertaken, such as a one-time meeting to get to the basics or mechanics of that role.

Councilmember Laliberte stated she envisioned it as something added to the Uniform Commission Code for annual appointment by each commission to appoint one person to serve in that capacity.

Mayor Roe suggested amending the Ethics Commission Code language to address establishment and membership and potential term, but deferred comment on that to staff or the City Attorney as to whether or not the Uniform Commission Code was the appropriate place.

Councilmember McGehee stated her agreement with the orientation idea and Councilmember Laliberte's idea whereby each commission packet would define a process with members coming from those various commissions to provide that function, along with a straightforward statement of how the City handled ethics complaints and the process for doing so. Councilmember McGehee opined that an additional benefit would be familiarizing one additional person on each commission with ethics issues and the process involved.

Mayor Roe agreed that was a good point.

Councilmember Willmus stated he was intrigued by the idea and could find no reservations at this time.

Mayor Roe suggested the next step would be to direct staff to return with proposed code language.

City Manager Trudgeon duly noted that directive, requesting additional thought on staff's part in how to translate that intent to code.

Without objection, Mayor Roe directed staff to review code language and recommend a process related to the concept of a standing Ethics Committee as outlined.

Public Safety Commission

Mayor Roe noted his long-time goal of getting more residents involved in public safety policy, which served as the biggest part of the City's public face and staffing. Mayor Roe noted previous discussions related to establishment of a Public Safety Commission, for which he remained an advocate, but without coming to fruition.

From his personal perspective, Mayor Roe suggested a good way for that to evolve would be from the existing Police Civil Service Commission and continuing their role with the Police Department staffing as a subcommittee. Mayor Roe clearly advised that he was in no way speaking to any role for them in public review of police officer complaints. In conjunction with the Fire Department's conversion from its current structure to paid on-call structure, Mayor Roe opined that having a public safety commission role may have proven helpful during that process, as well as in considering staffing levels of the Police Department and recent discussion for community service officers, and even back as far as the fire station study and other issues involving public safety. Mayor Roe stated that he continued to view that as a missing part of the process, even in dealing with traffic safety aspects and issues with city streets such as speed concerns.

Mayor Roe also suggested a role in the Public Works function and other departments, including nuisance code (junk and debris in yards) and general public safety and welfare issues for residents of and visitors to Roseville.

In light of that, Mayor Roe distributed his initial concept to initiate discussion via that he had prepared and entitled, "Chapter 203 Public Safety Commission (11/15 – Roe draft) replacing existing Chapter 203 Police Civil Service Commission, Based on her preliminary review, Councilmember McGehee stated she didn't agree with this serving as another Commission, since those functions listed were all task force jobs. Councilmember McGehee opined that the City Council had already gone overboard with commissions, and a task force could just as well advise them on traffic on residential streets, to look at full-time paid on-call firefighter staffing, or any number of things without having another standing commission. Councilmember McGehee stated there was a segment of Roseville's population having a considerable amount of interest and skills to share related to a specific interest or expertise that would be willing to share if not required to sign-up for three years of meetings, but only for short-term task forces for project-specific issues.

Councilmember Willmus expressed his willingness to look at the possibility, stating his support would hinge on the focus of such a commission's charge, or scope of their duties. Councilmember Willmus recognized that Mayor Roe had long had something like this in the back of his mind and frequently brought it forward for discussion. Councilmember Willmus stated he would not say "no" at this point, and would like to further explore it and define the scope, charge and duties.

Councilmember Laliberte agreed with Councilmember Willmus' comments, stating she was open to look at it and talk it through. Councilmember Laliberte further stated that she liked the idea of task forces, but if ideas within the scope and duties and function of such a commission could be clearly defined, she stated her preference to appoint a commission versus constantly putting out the call for another task force. Councilmember Laliberte noted one caution, stating that she thought the Police Civil Service Commission was subject to State Statute, and sought to make sure combining it with other duties would not be a conflict. If a commission could be structured in such a way to mandate statute and other advisory work, Councilmember Laliberte stated she would be interested in looking at it.

Councilmember Etten stated he was open to entertaining discussion for revising the Police Civil Service Commission, using the Variance Board to the Planning Commission as a model or example of how that might work. Councilmember Etten opined that sometimes a task force could work, but questioned if it took so long cycle their creation that it may slow down the actual discussion needed in a timely manner. Councilmember Etten agreed with Mayor Roe and expressed his lack of any interest in creating a civilian review board, and stated he would not consider entering that area at all, but expressed his interest in considering a standing Public Safety Commission.

Councilmember Laliberte suggested taking a broad look at staffing for such a commission and if put in place how it would change the Ethics function; and sought staff input on how that may play out and if they were supportive of the idea, with ideas for organization and other issues as part of their feedback.

Mayor Roe noted this touched on a minimum of two departments, and if the City Council was interested in a review, clarified that it was not his intent that it be up and running for April 1, 2016 appointments, but noted further discussion at City Council Work Sessions would be required if the City Council chose to pursue the possibility. As staff considers his initial proposal as presented in this bench handout, Mayor Roe asked staff to also review it for further discussion and dissemination later in 2016.

Without objection, the preliminary document drafted by Mayor Roe was provided to staff and City Councilmembers for their comment.

Councilmember McGehee opined that the City didn't have a good track record to-date in managing its commissions already in place; and expressed concern with other areas this might stumble into, suggesting considerable caution in considering such a commission.

Mayor Roe stated he was supportive about using caution, but asked for feedback from individual Councilmembers and staff for further consideration in 2016.

Community Engagement Commission (CEC)

Councilmember McGehee questioned if the City Council was going to look at its charge to or possibly reigning in the CEC or refocusing them more in line with what was originally intended when that charge was laid out. Absent that review, Councilmember McGehee opined there seemed to be a problem.

Councilmember Willmus asked Councilmember McGehee for more specifics on the problems she perceived to have with the CEC.

Councilmember McGehee opined that the CEC problem was that many things historically done by the HRC as they finished getting their website up and running, had now spread out into other areas for the CEC beyond getting citizens involved in civic government and was engaging them in things other commissions were already doing.

Based on his observation of their recent meetings, Councilmember Willmus opined their focus of late was regarding neighborhood associations, and therefore, he didn't know if he could share the same concern as Councilmember McGehee that there was an issue with neighborhood associations and the HRC in that regard.

While that may be true, Councilmember McGehee questioned if the City Council's charge was to have the CEC aggressively form neighborhood associations.

Councilmember Willmus questioned if that was what the CEC was doing, opining that from his observation they were looking into that and crafting recommendations to bring to the City Council, as had been discussed at the last joint meeting with them.

Mayor Roe agreed that had been discussed the last few times the CEC had met with the City Council. Mayor Roe opined that from his perspective he saw the challenge for the CEC was not with their scope, duties or functions or that they were wrong but there was an expectation issue. Mayor Roe opined that the challenge appeared to be members wanting to be more involved in engaging residents versus advising the City Council on processes and policies, even though that message had been relayed repeatedly. Mayor Roe questioned if there was more the City Council needed to do or how that directive may look. However, Mayor Roe opined that the CEC's review of neighborhood associations was exactly what they reported they were working on and the City Council gave them the go ahead to do so. Mayor Roe advised that he was not aware of the CEC aggressively seeking to form neighborhood associations, but stated his expectation anticipated their return to the City Council with their recommendations.

Councilmember Laliberte stated, at this point, she thought the CEC was finding its way as a new CEC; and noted the City Council's original intent was clearly defined in the CEC's charge in their enabling ordinance. While considering that status, Councilmember Laliberte did not that the one thing the City Council had specifically asked the CEC to work on was the comprehensive plan update process and to bring specific recommendations back for that process, a very important piece for them to provide advice on. Councilmember Laliberte stated she was looking forward to the CEC completing some of their preliminary work and address that important issue. From her observation of the CEC meetings to-date, Councilmember Laliberte noted some conversations about planning or hosting some events to make recommendation to the City Council on how they should be done; and advised that was an area of concern that there may be some overlap occurring between the HRC and commission, with planning events or programs part of the same group or an off-shoot and not yet taking place. Councilmember Laliberte noted the importance to check-in and make sure those efforts were not being duplicated.

Mayor Roe agreed that made sense.

Councilmember McGehee agreed with Councilmember Laliberte and specific assignments, such as the process of engagement or the comprehensive plan update process as something the City Council could use help with, noting that was a big topic coming up in the very near future, with many options of how best to do handle the process. Councilmember McGehee stated the need to be clear that the City Council expected a periodic check-in for at least those two very specific charged when first enabling the CEC. While agreeing with Councilmember Laliberte that the CEC is still finding its way, Councilmember McGehee stated the City Council needed to mark the pathway more clearly to facilitate their efforts.

Mayor Roe agreed that was well-stated by Councilmember McGehee, and noted the CEC had also been charged with observing the SE Roseville process and how to engage people in that. Mayor Roe suggested perhaps an early 2016 joint meeting and presentation by the CEC of their respective work plan was needed to provide that check-in.

Councilmember McGehee noted part of the human rights is the diverse community piece, not just community engagement.

Mayor Roe opined that the difference was human rights not looking specifically to engage people in city activities, but viewing the broader community.

Mayor Roe reiterated the next step to schedule a joint meeting early in 2016.

Councilmember Etten suggested sitting down with the HRC and review their charge and that of the CEC as part of the anticipated recommendations from the HRC as previously noted, and before meeting with the CEC to allow the City Council to have that discussion among themselves to find clarity and ideas without crisscrossing that process and ramifications to each commission.

To be fair to the CEC, Mayor Roe suggested asking the CEC to also review their scope or function, as previously directed to the HRC, to allow the City Council to take that into consideration during their discussions as well.

Councilmember Laliberte agreed to have both the HRC and CEC review their respective enabling ordinances, sooner rather than later, and to plan on more frequent check-ins with the CEC rather than only once or twice annually.

Without objection, Mayor Roe asked staff to include the CEC along with the HRC directive in charging them to look at their scope and functions and to provide their feedback to the City Council.

City Manager Trudgeon duly noted that revised directive.

As part of this broader review, Councilmember Willmus asked that City Manager Trudgeon also consult with commission staff liaisons as assigned and provide feedback on whether those positions were good fits, and a sense from staff on their level of commitment. Councilmember Willmus opined that aspect could have great impact on the success of an advisory commission.

e. Consider Purchase of Transit Shelters

Written comment was provided as a bench handout, attached hereto and made a part hereof, via email dated November 25, 2015 from Roger Hess, Jr., 1911 Rice Street, generally in opposition to expend taxpayer dollars of any amount over \$1.00 each for purchase of the bus shelters.

Public Works Director Marc Culver initiated discussion of the current transit shelter franchise expiration at the end of 2015; and provided a presentation to detail those aspects, and substantially included in the RCA dated November 30, 2015.

As recommended by the Public Works, Environment and Transportation Commission (PWETC), by unanimous vote at their November 24, 2015 meeting, recommended to the City Council that the City not purchase the shelters; that they authorize staff to examine the potential removal and related costs of the concrete pads at a future date; that staff be authorized to consult with the firm(s) having the bus bench franchise for their interest in movement or replacement of those benches near or on those pads; and that staff be directed to make site-specific recommendations on those sites they feel should be maintained as concrete slabs or natural restoration.

CHAPTER 207

ETHICS COMMISSION

SECTION:

207.01: Establishment and Membership

207.02: Scope, Duties and Functions

207.01: ESTABLISHMENT AND MEMBERSHIP:

There is established an ethics commission of the City which shall consist of ~~five-Chair~~ members from all other City advisory commissions. appointed by the City Council and which shall be subject to Chapter 201 of the City Code.

The ethics commission shall meet on an as needed basis or when an ethics complaint is filed.

207.02: SCOPE, DUTIES AND FUNCTIONS:

The duties and functions of the Commission shall be as follows:

- A. Serve in an advisory capacity to the City Council on matters involving any ethics code adopted by the City Council.
- B. Administer any ethics code adopted by the City Council.
- C. Perform other duties and functions or conduct studies as specifically directed or delegated by the City Council. (Ord. 1338, 6-12-2006) (Ord. 1481, 07-20-2015)