5:30 p.m. PICKLEBALL COURTS RIBBON CUTTING – Wolfe Park

6:20 p.m. SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL MEETING – Community room

1. Call to order
   1a. Roll call

8. Resolutions, ordinances, motions and discussion items
   8a. Second reading of interim ordinance extending moratorium on use and development of 3745 Louisiana Ave S

   **Recommended action:** Motion to approve second reading and Adopt Ordinance extending the moratorium temporarily restricting development at 3745 Louisiana Avenue South, St. Louis Park (“Subject Property”) and approve summary ordinance for publication.

6:30 p.m. STUDY SESSION – Community room

   **Discussion items**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Arts and culture strategic framework development process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Connect the Park status update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Future study session agenda planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Communications/updates (verbal)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8:35 p.m. Adjourn

**Written reports**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>July 2019 monthly financial report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Connect the Park - 28th Street pedestrian improvements update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Food security and access study update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Overhead utility undergrounding discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Needs assessment for cable television franchise renewal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Update - PLACE Via Sol and Via Luna projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Telecommunication advisory commission transition update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Environment and Sustainability Commission (ESC) Quarterly Report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Auxiliary aids for individuals with disabilities are available upon request. To make arrangements, please call the administration department at 952/924-2525 (TDD 952/924-2518) at least 96 hours in advance of meeting.
Executive summary

**Title:** Second reading of interim ordinance extending moratorium on use and development of 3745 Louisiana Ave S

**Recommended action:** Motion to approve second reading and Adopt Ordinance extending the moratorium temporarily restricting development at 3745 Louisiana Avenue South, St. Louis Park (“Subject Property”) and approve summary ordinance for publication.

**Policy consideration:** Does city council support extending the moratorium temporarily restricting the use and development of the building and lands located on the Subject Property for up to 120 days to allow more time for the city to enact changes to the land use and other city’s official controls that were recommended in the land use and development study?

**Summary:** The Subject Property is a 13-acre site and contains an approximately 150,000-square-foot building located adjacent to a future light rail transit station. The building has been vacant since Sam’s Club closed on January 26, 2018. It is currently guided for commercial use and zoned C-2 General Commercial. The city, through the process to update the comprehensive plan, proposed a change to the land use. City council directed staff to conduct a study of the site conditions, land use and the city’s official controls for the Subject Property on August 20, 2018. Council received reports regarding the study progress and findings on March 11 and May 28, 2019.

There are substantial concerns that the city’s official comprehensive plan future land use map and zoning ordinance provisions relating to the Subject Property do not adequately address issues relating to the present use, future land use, development or redevelopment of this vacant property. The city’s concerns include, and are not limited to, compatibility with existing uses, recent public improvements, planned future land uses, and the planned light rail transit station in the area surrounding the Subject Property.

Temporary restrictions on the use and development of the Subject Property are needed to prevent use and development that might be inconsistent with potential changes to the city’s official controls resulting from the study. The original moratorium expires September 14, 2019.

**Financial or budget considerations:** The study costs were paid with existing budgeted resources and did not require separate city council authorization.

**Strategic priority consideration:** St. Louis Park is committed to providing a broad range of housing and neighborhood oriented development.

**Supporting documents:** Interim ordinance

Summary ordinance for publication

**Prepared by:** Sean Walther, planning and zoning supervisor

**Approved by:** Tom Harmening, city manager
The City of St. Louis Park does ordain:

Section 1. Findings.

1.01. The City adopted Ordinance No. 2542-18 An Interim Ordinance Establishing a Moratorium on the Use and Development of the Building and Lands Located at 3745 Louisiana Avenue South on August 27, 2018.

1.02. The City made the following findings in support of adopting Ordinance No. 2542-18:

- There are substantial concerns that the city’s official comprehensive plan future land use map and zoning ordinance provisions relating to the Subject Property do not adequately address issues relating to the present use, future land use, development or redevelopment of this vacant property.

- The city’s concerns include, and are not limited to, compatibility with existing uses, recent public improvements, planned future land uses, and the planned light rail transit station in the area surrounding the Subject Property.

- As a result of the important land use and zoning issues cited above the city council finds that it is necessary to conduct a study to address the types of developments and land uses that are appropriate on the Subject Property. The study may also identify appropriate changes, if any, that should be made to the city’s official land use controls, including but not limited to the city’s zoning ordinance and comprehensive plan.

- The city council directs the planning and zoning division staff to conduct a study for the purpose of consideration of possible amendments to the city’s official controls to address the issues concerning the subject property.

- The city finds that this interim ordinance must be adopted to protect the planning process and the health, safety and welfare of the citizens.

1.03. Ordinance No. 2542-18 expires on September 14, 2019.
1.04. The City is considering a Comprehensive Plan Amendment for 3745 Louisiana Avenue South.

1.05. The City held a neighborhood meeting on the Comprehensive Plan Amendment for 3745 Louisiana Avenue South on August 8, 2018.

1.05 Minn. Stat. § 462.355 subd. 2 requires a planning commission to hold a public hearing before a city adopts a comprehensive plan amendment.

1.06 A City Planning Commission Public Hearing on the Comprehensive Plan Amendment for 3745 Louisiana Avenues South is scheduled for August 21, 2019.

1.07 Minn. Stat. § 462.355 subd. 4 (d) permits cities to extend an interim ordinance “up to an additional 120 days following the completion of any other process required by state statute, federal law, or court order, when the process is not completed at least 30 days before the expiration of the interim ordinance.”

1.08 The public hearing required by Minn. Stat. § 462.355 subd. 2 will not be completed 30 days before the expiration of Ordinance 2542-18.

1.09 The City Council will not be able to review the Planning Commission’s recommendation on the proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment until after September 14, 2019.

Section 2. Interim Ordinance Extension. Ordinance No. 2542-18 is hereby extended for 120 days.

Section 3. Duration. This Ordinance takes effect fifteen days after its publication and shall remain in effect January 12, 2020.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Reading</td>
<td>August 19, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Reading</td>
<td>August 26, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Publication</td>
<td>August 29, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Ordinance Takes Effect</td>
<td>September 13, 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reviewed for administration: Adopted by the City Council August 26, 2019

Thomas K. Harmening, city manager

Attest:

Approved as to form and execution:

Melissa Kennedy, city clerk

Soren Mattick, city attorney

Jake Spano, mayor
An interim ordinance extending a moratorium on the use and development of the building and lands located at 3745 Louisiana Avenue South

This ordinance states that a previous 12-month moratorium is extended for up to 120 days on the property at 3745 Louisiana Avenue South (“Subject Property”). The moratorium establishes temporary restrictions on the use and development of the Subject Property that require approval of most zoning or land use applications. A few exceptions are allowed. Applications for development of office, medical office, dental office, medical and dental laboratories and business/trade schools/colleges would be allowed; provided the development results in buildings(s) at least four stories tall and a floor area ratio of at least 1.0.

This ordinance shall take effect 15 days after publication.

Adopted by the City Council August 26, 2019

Jake Spano /s/
mayor

A copy of the full text of this ordinance is available for inspection with the City Clerk.

Published in St. Louis Park Sailor: August 29, 2019
Executive summary

Title: Arts and culture strategic framework development process

**Recommended action:** None currently. The purpose of this topic is to introduce a proposed process for the development of an arts and culture strategic framework and outline next steps for the city council.

**Policy consideration:** Does the city council need more information on the development of the arts and culture strategic framework?

**Summary:** The St. Louis Park Friends of the Arts (FOTA) was recently awarded a grant by the Metropolitan Regional Arts Council to complete a strategic framework outlining the future development of arts and culture in the community. The city is working with FOTA on this initiative. FOTA has hired Sharon Rodning Bash to facilitate this process.

The city has several public art programs currently, and has worked closely with FOTA over the years, including providing annual funding to the organization. In addition, the city has benefited for many years from the contributions of many artists and arts organizations, galleries, and businesses that contribute to art in the community. This project seeks to provide a cohesive roadmap for arts and culture to continue to grow and thrive in the community. The framework will identify key assets and opportunities within St. Louis Park that benefit the quality of life and seek realization of the city’s five strategic priorities using the arts. This plan also seeks to create opportunities for leaders across sectors in the community to work together in establishing a common set of goals and vision for their collective future.

A follow-up meeting on this topic will be scheduled for October 2019.

**Financial or budget considerations:** The development of the strategic framework is funded by a Metropolitan Regional Arts Council grant.

**Strategic priority consideration:** All five strategic priorities are impacted by this process.

**Supporting documents:** Arts & Culture Strategic Framework Development Project Scope

**Prepared by:** Maria Carrillo Perez, senior management analyst  
**Reviewed by:** Nancy Deno, deputy city manager  
**Approved by:** Tom Harmening, city manager
## Early November, 2019: Outline our Strategic Priorities—Strategy Formation
- What is our vision?
- What is our strategic focus, our trajectory, our path forward?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Late July, 2019: Contextualize and Dream—External and Internal Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Late September, 2019: Distill Strategic Issues and Find Common Cause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early January, 2020: Setting our Goals – Identifying the path to success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steer Committee Retreats</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| July 30, 1-5pm Wat Promwichirayan |
| Half-day September 24-26 |
| Half-day November 5-7 |
| Half-day January 7-9 |

- Map arts and culture in the community – our history, our triumphs, our relationships, our resources and assets
- What are the trends, competitions, obstacles to building a strong arts economy? What are the strengths? The big possibilities?
- How does the arts and culture map overlay with the city’s strategic priorities?

- Who are our key stakeholders?
- What key long term outcomes can we name in common with key stakeholders?
- How can these outcomes be tested?

- What is our vision?
- What is our strategic focus, our trajectory, our path forward?

- Constituencies: What work must we do in audience development? What ownership must be cultivated that is critical to achieving this plan?
- Programs: Where must we focus in mission/program advancement?
- Operations: Where must we strengthen our organizational capacity?
- Finance: What resources are required; how must we achieve financial goals?
- Leadership: How must we develop as a strategically focused, learning organization?

- Creation of final document
- Final approval process
- Planning launch communications
Title: Connect the Park status update

Recommended action: No action required at this time. Staff desires direction on the policy question noted below.

Policy consideration: Should staff to continue to pursue the installation of the sidewalk, trail, and bikeway segments identified in this report?

Summary: The original 10 year Connect the Park plan was approved in 2013 and 2019 marks the halfway point of this initiative. This report and presentation will provide the city council with an overview of the entire Connect the Park initiative and highlight the evolution of the plan since its approval.

Connect the Park is the city's 10-year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) to add additional sidewalks, trails, and bikeways throughout the community.

The primary goal of Connect the Park is to develop a comprehensive, city-wide network of sidewalks, trails, and bikeways that provides local and regional connectivity, improves safety and accessibility, and enhances overall community livability. This is achieved by creating a system plan that provides sidewalks approximately every 1/4-mile and bikeways every 1/2-mile in order to improve pedestrian and bicycle connectivity throughout the community.

Financial or budget considerations: The original estimated cost for implementing the entire 10-year plan was $26,672,915. To date, $15,275,164 has been spent on Connect the Park projects, including the segments approved for construction. Information regarding the cost of future projects is included in the discussion section. The funding source for these improvements is primarily General Obligation bonds.

Strategic priority consideration: St. Louis Park is committed to providing a variety of options for people to make their way around the city comfortably, safely and reliably.

Supporting documents:
- Discussion
- Original Connect the Park approved map (attached)
- Connect the Park construction status map (attached)
- June 17, 2013 public hearing council report (page 318 – 354)
- The Active Living Sidewalk and Trails Plan

Prepared by: Jack Sullivan, senior engineering project manager
Ben Manibog Jr., transportation engineer

Reviewed by: Deb Heiser, engineering director

Approved by: Tom Harmening, city manager
Discussion

**Background:** At the conclusion of an extensive public process, the Connect the Park Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) was approved by council on June 17, 2013. In 2014, the CIP was modified in order to take advantage of some of the other projects already identified in the city’s CIP and minimize construction scheduling impacts from other transportation projects proposed by the city, Hennepin County, MnDOT and SWLRT.

To ensure the city is being responsive to the momentum caused by this initiative and keeping the plan updated considering community feedback, the city council developed a process to amend the Connect the Park CIP at the September 22, 2014 study session. The Connect the Park CIP is now updated annually, usually within the first quarter of the year.

**Projects completed:** The Connect the Park CIP included the construction of 32 miles of bikeway, 10 miles of sidewalk, 3 miles of trail and two bridges throughout the community. 2019 marks the halfway point for this initiative. 14.2 miles of bikeways, 8.6 miles of sidewalk, and 2.15 miles of trails have been constructed to date.

**Update on pending Connect the Park projects:** There are several Connect the Park efforts that are in various stages of the public engagement process but are not yet constructed. Based on council direction, staff was not intending on discussing these projects at the study session.

- **Southeast bikeway improvements:** This proposal includes the installation of bikeways on Wooddale Avenue from 44th Street to 42nd 1/2 Street, along Princeton Avenue/Quentin Avenue to Park Commons Drive and then through Wolfe Park to the intersection of Monterey Drive and 36th 1/2 Street. In addition, the segment of 38th Street from Excelsior Boulevard to France Avenue. This project is proposed to be constructed in 2020.

- **Dakota Avenue bikeway:** This proposal includes a bikeway on Dakota Avenue from Lake Street through Dakota Park, on a bridge over the BNSF railroad and the North Cedar Lake trail, then along the east side of Edgewood Avenue to Cedar Lake Road. The segment from Minnetonka Boulevard to Cedar Lake Road has been approved by council. The segment to the south is still in the public engagement phase. Both segments are proposed to be constructed in 2020.

- **Monterey Drive/ Beltline Boulevard/36th Street bikeway improvements:** This proposal includes the installation of various bikeways on the following roadway segments:
  - **Monterey Drive (between Excelsior Boulevard and Beltline Boulevard)**
    - **From Excelsior Boulevard to just north of Park Commons Drive:** Rehabilitation anticipated to take place in 2020 to add on-street bike facilities to the corridor. This includes changes to the intersections at Excelsior Boulevard and Park Commons Drive.
    - **From Park Commons Drive to the intersection of Beltline Boulevard and 36th Street:** Rehabilitation anticipated to take place in 2021 to add on-street bike facilities to the corridor. This includes changing the intersection at 36th Street and Beltline Boulevard to a roundabout.
− **Beltline Boulevard (between 36th Street to Park Glen Road):** Rehabilitation anticipated to take place in 2021 to add on-street bike facilities to the corridor and connect with the SWLRT project.

− **36th Street (between Beltline Boulevard to Wooddale Avenue):** Rehabilitation anticipated to take place in 2022 to add bike facilities to the corridor. This is expected to be a combination of on-street and off-street facilities.

**Evolution of the Connect the Park initiative since 2013:** The initiative, as it was originally proposed, was estimated to cost $24 million to install. The estimate was based on the following:

- On-street bikeways – via on-road striping and signs.
- Sidewalks - within the right-of-way between the curb and property line.
- Trails - within the right-of-way between the curb and property line.

There has been considerable community input and council policy changes since the plan was approved in 2013 that have influenced the scope and cost of the plan.

**Additional city council policy direction:** The following timeline outlines the history of the initiative.

- **June 17, 2013** - Connect the Park CIP approved by council.

The goals and objectives of the plan are to:

- Develop an interconnected network of pedestrian and bicycle routes throughout the city and linked to transit systems.
  - Establish a citywide grid-system of sidewalks approximately every 1/4-mile.
  - Establish a citywide grid-system of bicycle facilities approximately every 1/2-mile.
  - Close gaps in the existing neighborhood sidewalk network.

- Provide active connections to transit, including buses and light rail.
- Establish safe crossings of highways, arterial roads and rail corridors.
- Develop safe connections to schools, commercial hubs, employment centers, institutions, and transit.
- Develop links from neighborhoods to parks and natural areas, providing opportunities to improve the health and well-being of residents and workers.
- Improve connections to regional trails to link the city to larger metropolitan open space systems and destinations.
- Provide safe and easily accessible routes for residents and workers in the community, including children, seniors and the disabled.
- Create a cohesive, well-designed system that includes a coordinated approach for signs, wayfinding and other "user-friendly" amenities such as rest areas, information kiosks, and upgraded landscaping.
• **June 17, 2013** - Complete Streets policy approved by council.

The Complete Streets policy encompasses the planning, scoping, design, implementation, operation, and maintenance of roads in order to reasonably address the safety and accessibility needs of users of all ages and abilities. Complete Streets considers the needs of motorists, pedestrians, transit users and vehicles, bicyclists, and commercial and emergency vehicles moving along and across roads, intersections, and crossings in a manner that is sensitive to the local context and recognizes that the needs vary in urban, suburban, and rural settings.

• **Spring 2014** - To ensure that the city was being responsive to the momentum caused by this initiative and keeping the plan updated considering community feedback, the city council requested that the Connect the Park CIP be updated annually, usually within the first quarter of the year. This has led to the inclusion of several additional pedestrian and bicycle improvements:
  - 41st Street Sidewalk (Princeton Avenue to Ottawa Avenue) – constructed in 2014.
  - France Avenue pedestrian signal (at Cedarwood) - constructed in 2016.
  - Xenwood Avenue sidewalk (27th Street to 29th Street) - constructed in 2017.
  - Monterey Avenue pedestrian signal (at 36 1/2 Street) – constructed in 2017.
  - 16th Street pedestrian signal (at West End) – constructed in 2018.
  - 38th Street pedestrian signal (at France Avenue) – constructed in 2018.
  - Monterey Drive sidewalk (across from Park Commons Drive to 36th 1/2 Street) – proposed for 2020.

• **March 2014** - Council directed that all sidewalks proposed as a part of Connect the Park plan be city maintained (defined as community sidewalks).

This action required that the city remove snow from all future sidewalks proposed as part of Connect the Park. This policy increased the mileage, labor hours and equipment of the city’s Operations and Recreation Department to clear these walks.

• **June 2014** - Council directed staff to identify gap segments near Connect the Park sidewalk segments and add to the implementation plan.

A gap is a sidewalk segment that if completed would create continuous connections from the neighborhood sidewalk system to the community sidewalk system. To date, the city has constructed 1.4 miles of gap sidewalk segments. It is anticipated that there is an additional 0.9 miles remaining. This added about $1.5 million to the overall cost.

• **2016** - Living Streets policy added to the Environment and Sustainability Commission work plan.

Living Streets principles are first discussed and are being implemented on all transportation projects. This includes infill sidewalk gaps on all transportation projects, not just Connect the Park projects. In addition, many of the Climate Action goals set by the council are inherent to the Living Streets policy.
• **2016** - NACTO (National Association of City Transportation Officials) standards become the city’s “best practices” for the implementation of sidewalks, bikeways and trails within urban environments.

These standards represent a significant increase in the level of comfort and safety for non-motorized users of the right-of-way. The phrase “all ages, all abilities” is used to illustrate that bike facilities should be constructed commensurate with the type of roadway to allow users of all ages and all abilities to safely bike on the facility with a high level of safety and low level of stress.

A bikeway designed for all ages and abilities usually is more than on-street paint and signage. The first project that incorporated these design standards was the Louisiana Avenue bridge project. The cost for this bikeway as proposed in 2013 was $70,000. The cost for the cycle track that was included in the project approval is $1,850,000.

• **2017** - Bicycle Friendly Community (BFC) designation.

Staff began the application process for the city to be designated as a bronze level BFC in 2016. According to The League of American Bicyclists, who run BFC program, “[The program] provides a roadmap to improving conditions for bicycling and guidance to help make your community’s vision for a better, bikeable community a reality”. Cities that demonstrate a commitment to bettering safe bicycling receive this designation.

• **2018** - Definition of sidewalk gap expanded to include connections from naturally occurring affordable housing (NOAH) to the community sidewalk system.

At the request of the city council, staff took a closer look at the city’s sidewalk network with a racial equity lens. Staff was asked to locate all the sidewalk gaps between NOAH properties and transit corridors, which often coincide with our community sidewalk system. Staff included these gaps into existing projects in the CIP. The cost of construction also includes the installation of new street trees in the boulevards adjacent to the sidewalks. This added about $1.6 million to the CIP.

• **2018** - Comprehensive Plan incorporates the policy, “The city will plan, design, build, and operate the city’s mobility system in a way that prioritizes walking first, followed by bicycling and transit use, and then motor vehicle use”.

This is a significant change from previous comprehensive plan priorities. Flipping the prioritization enables staff to plan, design and implement projects to optimize the pedestrian and bicycle experience.

• **2018** – Climate Action Plan approved by council. The plan sets the goal of achieving carbon neutrality — having a net-zero carbon footprint — by 2040.

The plan provides guidance for residents, businesses, and the city on reducing the greenhouse gas emissions and impacts of climate change. The Connect the Park plan will help in achieving the goals set forth in the Climate Action Plan goal #6:
o Reduce vehicle emissions by 25%, as compared to the business-as-usual forecast.
  - **6.4**: Enable reduction of vehicle miles traveled [VMT] from single-occupancy vehicles.
  - **Action 6.4.1**: Continue to modify land use to encourage alternative modes of transportation, consistent with the city’s complete streets policy and any future living streets policy.

Making non-vehicle travel safer and more attractive encourages people to drive less. Designing in this way also increases safety for all road users.

- **August 19, 2019** - Living Streets policy formally adopted.

There are six principles that guide the implementation of the Living Streets policy. These principles will be incorporated into the planning and design of transportation projects and referenced when making land use decisions.

1. Enhance walking/biking conditions and connections
2. Traffic management
3. Stormwater management
4. Support the urban forest
5. Create a sense of place
6. Ensure cost-effective and practical solutions

**Community input related to Connect the Park**: There has been considerable community input since the initiative was approved in 2013, which has shaped the design considerations staff uses for the implementation of projects. This communication has come about via community engagement related to many of the projects constructed in the last five years. Many times, the design solution proposed, and eventually implemented, created a new standard for project implementation and increased project costs. Some examples are as follows:

- **2014 Connect the Park project**: Concern over loss of trees on 39th Street caused the city to look to narrowing streets in order to install sidewalk segments. Now, this is routinely proposed to limit the impact to existing trees, homes, and driveways.

- **2016 Connect the Park project**: Concern regarding pedestrian crossing safety near St. Louis Park Middle School prompted the city to add a pedestrian signal to the Texas Avenue sidewalk project. Now, these are routinely recommended for crosswalks where a high volume of crossings is expected.

- **2017 Connect the Park project**: Loss of parking along 28th Street at Ainsworth Park prompted the city to widen the street and install a parking bay. Now, parking bays are routinely proposed to address neighborhood parking loss concerns as a result of bikeway projects.

**Looking ahead to future Connect the Park projects**: The straightforward projects have already been implemented. The projects that remain have a significantly higher level of complexity in the design and execution, thus increasing the impacts and associated costs to achieve the original goals of Connect the Park. This is due to the volume of traffic, width of existing roadway, available right-of-way, on-street parking, mature trees and grades adjacent to the road. In
addition, many of the remaining projects will include some level of parking restrictions to implement, making these projects much more complex and expensive than envisioned in 2013.

Two examples of projects programmed in the next 5 years:

- **Alabama Avenue from Excelsior Boulevard to 36th Street**: This roadway has parking on both sides and the demand for available parking is very high. Installing a bikeway on this segment, as it was originally proposed in 2013, will likely require a partial or full restriction of parking.

- **Louisiana Avenue from Cedar Lake Road to Wayzata Boulevard**: Connect the Park envisions a sidewalk on the east side of the road and a bikeway. The road has between 15,000 and 20,000 vehicles a day. While there is currently parking restrictions along the entire length, NACTO design standards recommend a protected bicycle facility (cycle track) for a low-stress facility. There is not adequate room between the curbs on the existing roadway to accommodate this design. In addition, there is not enough right-of-way to widen the road and install a sidewalk on the east side as well. Also due to existing grades, there would be extensive tree loss and retaining wall construction.

**Financial considerations**: When the project was approved in 2013, the estimate for the full build-out of Connect the Park was $26,672,915. The original plan was to complete all segments by 2023. The funding is provided for the most part by general obligation bonds.

The Capital improvement plan is updated, reviewed, and approved by the city council annually. As a part of the 2019 update staff has carefully reviewed each Connect the Park segment included in the CIP and updated the costs to reflect the council policy direction summarized above and past project experience. The result of this is a significant change to the cost estimate for plan build-out. In addition, the public engagement process for each project is taking more time, as a result, staff recommends that the plan completion date be extended to at least 2027.

A breakdown of the costs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complete segments</td>
<td></td>
<td>$9,974,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segments approved or under construction</td>
<td>$5,300,194</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cost to date</td>
<td>$15,275,164</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimate for segments completed to date</td>
<td>$8,150,637</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future projects</td>
<td>$18,522,278</td>
<td>$36,306,327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$26,672,915</td>
<td>$51,581,491</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To provide the council with a full snapshot of the anticipated general obligation costs in our CIP related to transportation projects, we also wanted to include our estimated cost to implement the Living streets policy. Living streets elements funded through general obligation bonds include Gap sidewalks, NOAH sidewalks, Traffic management, and street trees. The estimate for these elements for the next 10 years is $6,212,789.
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Experience LIFE in the Park.
Executive summary

**Title:** Future study session agenda planning and prioritization

**Recommended action:** The city council and city manager to set the agenda for the special study session scheduled for Sept. 3, 2019 and the regularly scheduled study session on Sept. 9, 2019 and to provide time for the city council to discuss future study session prioritization.

**Policy consideration:** Not applicable.

**Summary:** This report summarizes the proposed agenda for the special study session scheduled for Sept. 3.

You will note that no topics are proposed for the September 9 study session at this time. Staff proposes to review the results of the recent study session prioritization survey completed by council as part of planning the September 9 agenda and beyond.

**Financial or budget considerations:** Not applicable.

**Strategic priority consideration:** Not applicable.

**Supporting documents:** Tentative agenda – Sept. 3
Study session discussion topics and timeline

**Prepared by:** Debbie Fischer, administrative services office assistant
Maria Carrillo Perez, senior management analyst

**Approved by:** Tom Harmening, city manager
Sept. 3, 2019

5:20 p.m. Special study session – Community room

Tentative discussion items
1. **2020 Budget** – Administrative services (60 minutes)
   As the 2020 budget process continues staff will update city council on the current preliminary levy and adjustments since the last meeting.

Sept. 9, 2019

6:30 p.m. Study session – Community room

Tentative discussion items
1. **Future study session agenda planning** – Administrative services (5 minutes)

2. **TBD**

   **Communications/meeting check-in** – Administrative services (5 minutes)
   Time for communications between staff and council will be set aside on every study session agenda for the purposes of information sharing.
# Study session discussion topics and timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discussion topic</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Date Scheduled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C-1 zoning district retail and service use restrictions</td>
<td>Discussed on 6/11/18; referred to PC. Discussed 11/26/18; SS report 2/25/19; Discussed 3/11/19 – further discussion requested by council; SS discussion 7/8/19; PC public hearing late Aug.</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; reading 9/3/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessory dwelling units/home-based businesses</td>
<td>SS discussion 6/10/2019. Referred to planning commission. Staff to prepare ADU ordinance for pc discussion Qtr. 3 2019. Home occupation-based businesses pc discussion Qtr. 4 2019 or Qtr. 1 2020</td>
<td>Qtr. 4 2019 and Qtr. 2 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revitalization of Walker Lake area</td>
<td>Part of preserving Walker building reports: 8/28/17, 9/25/17, 1/22/18, design study 2/12/18, update 4/23/18, design study update 8/27/18; SS report 2/11/19; SS discussion 5/28/19, planning commission to review ordinances for implementation Qtr. 3 &amp; 4 2019</td>
<td>Qtr. 4 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Election holiday discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; Qtr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community and neighborhood sidewalk designations</td>
<td></td>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; Qtr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime free ordinance/affordable housing strategies</td>
<td>Discussed 5/14/18. 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; reading housing trust fund 10/1/18; Other affordable housing strategies/Crime Free Ordinance – Nov/Dec, 12/10 and 12/17/18 and 1/14/19 council discussion; Certain provisions of crime free ord. suspended; Work group being formed; CFO work group discussed on 3/25/2019; Work group had first meeting in May, two meetings in June, one in July. Next meeting is August 28&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>TBD; Pending workgroup recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarterly public forums at city council meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revisit housing setback, FRA, and more to maintain and create more affordable housing</td>
<td></td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration &amp; supporting families</td>
<td>Discussed 8/6 and referred to HRC. HRC held comm. mtg. in Oct. Council/HRC discussion on 12/10; referred back to HRC for refinement of recommendations</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss public process expectations and outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy access to nature, across city, starting with low-income neighborhoods</td>
<td></td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEP discussion: facilities</td>
<td>Discussed on 1/14/19; city, STEP &amp; school toured Central Community Ctr and continuing discussions</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prioritizing transit options through investments, and engineering and operations decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westwood Hills Nature Center Access Fund</td>
<td>*On hold pending discussion with school district.</td>
<td>*On hold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEED’s community greenhouse/resilient cities initiative</td>
<td>*On hold until Food Access and Security study is complete and recommendations have been made.</td>
<td>*On hold</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Executive summary

Title: July 2019 monthly financial report

Recommended action: No action required at this time.

Policy consideration: Monthly financial reports are part of our financial management policies.

Summary: The monthly financial report provides a summary of general fund revenues and departmental expenditures and a comparison of budget to actual throughout the year. A budget to actual summary for the four utility funds is also included in this report.

Financial or budget considerations: At the end of July, general fund expenditures were at approximately 56.5% of the adopted annual budget, which is about 2% under budget.

Strategic priority consideration: Not applicable.

Supporting documents: Discussion
  Summary of revenues and expenditures – general fund
  Budget to actual – enterprise funds

Prepared by: Darla Monson, accountant
Reviewed by: Tim Simon, chief financial officer
  Nancy Deno, deputy city manager/HR director
Approved by: Tom Harmening, city manager
Discussion

Background: This monthly report provides summary information of the overall level of revenues and departmental expenditures in the general fund compared to the adopted budget throughout the year. A budget to actual summary for the four utility funds is also included in this report.

Present considerations:

General Fund
Actual expenditures should generally be at 58% of the annual budget at the end of July. General Fund expenditures were at 56.5% through July. Revenues are harder to measure in the same way due to the timing of when they are received, examples of which include property taxes, grants and State aid payments.

License and permit revenues combined are at almost 94% of the budget through July. Nearly 90% of the 2019 business and liquor license revenue has been received, which is typical of prior years since the majority are renewals paid early in the year. Permit revenues increased to 95% of the annual budget. Larger building permits issued to date in 2019 include PLACE, Bridgewater Bank, Yeshiva School, St. Louis Park School District, Elan West End Apartments, Urban Park Apartments, The Block restaurant, Aldi and the nature center.

There are no significant expenditure variances through July.
### General Fund Revenues:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Property Taxes</td>
<td>$24,748,436</td>
<td>$24,837,901</td>
<td>$25,705,886</td>
<td>$26,597,928</td>
<td>$26,880,004</td>
<td>$13,895,097</td>
<td>$12,984,907</td>
<td>51.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licenses and Permits</td>
<td>3,745,736</td>
<td>3,985,517</td>
<td>3,924,648</td>
<td>4,001,644</td>
<td>4,103,424</td>
<td>3,844,970</td>
<td>258,454</td>
<td>93.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fines &amp; Forfeits</td>
<td>254,200</td>
<td>293,236</td>
<td>269,200</td>
<td>282,146</td>
<td>279,700</td>
<td>176,962</td>
<td>102,738</td>
<td>63.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergovernmental</td>
<td>1,631,669</td>
<td>1,899,006</td>
<td>1,864,877</td>
<td>2,006,435</td>
<td>1,760,900</td>
<td>669,263</td>
<td>1,091,637</td>
<td>38.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charges for Services</td>
<td>2,027,637</td>
<td>2,051,552</td>
<td>2,162,410</td>
<td>2,180,589</td>
<td>2,187,319</td>
<td>1,289,169</td>
<td>898,150</td>
<td>58.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Revenue</td>
<td>1,274,415</td>
<td>1,294,452</td>
<td>1,318,037</td>
<td>1,427,744</td>
<td>1,367,012</td>
<td>791,363</td>
<td>575,649</td>
<td>57.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers In</td>
<td>1,899,927</td>
<td>1,951,218</td>
<td>1,929,090</td>
<td>1,929,076</td>
<td>1,999,877</td>
<td>1,137,428</td>
<td>862,449</td>
<td>56.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment Earnings</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>125,984</td>
<td>160,000</td>
<td>251,494</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Income</td>
<td>30,450</td>
<td>54,303</td>
<td>40,950</td>
<td>35,802</td>
<td>31,300</td>
<td>29,085</td>
<td>2,215</td>
<td>92.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Fund Balance *</td>
<td>58,541</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>523,835</td>
<td>298,156</td>
<td>298,156</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total General Fund Revenues</strong></td>
<td><strong>$35,811,011</strong></td>
<td><strong>$36,493,169</strong></td>
<td><strong>$37,898,933</strong></td>
<td><strong>$38,712,858</strong></td>
<td><strong>$39,087,692</strong></td>
<td><strong>$21,833,337</strong></td>
<td><strong>$17,254,355</strong></td>
<td><strong>55.86%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### General Fund Expenditures:

**General Government:**
- Administration: $1,049,123
- Finance: $957,275
- Assessing: $707,139
- Human Resources: $754,699
- Community Development: $1,366,055
- Facilities Maintenance: $1,132,774
- Information Resources: $1,570,712
- Communications & Marketing: $646,841
- Community Outreach: $26,553
- Engineering: $376,601

**Public Safety:**
- Police: $9,217,988
- Fire Protection: $4,407,656
- Building & Energy: $2,419,073

**Operations & Recreation:**
- Public Works Administration: $266,249
- Public Works Operations: $3,019,017
- Organized Recreation: $1,472,996
- Recreation Center: $1,744,651
- Park Maintenance: $1,721,732
- Westwood Nature Center: $602,400
- Natural Resources: $550,235
- Vehicle Maintenance: $1,384,038

**Total Operations & Recreation:** 10,761,318

**Non-Departmental:**
- General: $31,909
- Transfers Out: $885,000
- Council Programs: $385,295

**Total Non-Departmental:** 417,204

**Total General Fund Expenditures:** 35,811,011

*Primarily related to E911 capital items from restricted fund balance.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Current Budget</th>
<th>Jul Year To Date</th>
<th>Budget Variance</th>
<th>% of Budget</th>
<th>Current Budget</th>
<th>Jul Year To Date</th>
<th>Budget Variance</th>
<th>% of Budget</th>
<th>Current Budget</th>
<th>Jul Year To Date</th>
<th>Budget Variance</th>
<th>% of Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating revenues:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User charges</td>
<td>$6,857,853</td>
<td>$3,280,938</td>
<td>$3,576,915</td>
<td>47.84%</td>
<td>$7,513,922</td>
<td>$3,514,346</td>
<td>$3,999,576</td>
<td>46.77%</td>
<td>$3,409,250</td>
<td>$1,592,941</td>
<td>$1,816,309</td>
<td>46.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>375,750</td>
<td>477,569</td>
<td>(101,819)</td>
<td>127.10%</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>14,110</td>
<td>15,890</td>
<td>47.03%</td>
<td>153,500</td>
<td>73,959</td>
<td>79,541</td>
<td>48.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7,233,603</td>
<td>3,758,507</td>
<td>3,475,096</td>
<td>51.96%</td>
<td>7,543,922</td>
<td>3,528,456</td>
<td>4,015,466</td>
<td>46.77%</td>
<td>3,562,750</td>
<td>1,666,900</td>
<td>1,895,850</td>
<td>46.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating expenses:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal services</td>
<td>1,397,512</td>
<td>827,849</td>
<td>569,663</td>
<td>59.24%</td>
<td>717,237</td>
<td>479,673</td>
<td>237,564</td>
<td>66.88%</td>
<td>599,774</td>
<td>328,833</td>
<td>270,941</td>
<td>54.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies &amp; non-capital</td>
<td>324,800</td>
<td>156,853</td>
<td>165,947</td>
<td>48.91%</td>
<td>68,600</td>
<td>14,422</td>
<td>54,178</td>
<td>21.02%</td>
<td>222,550</td>
<td>61,094</td>
<td>161,456</td>
<td>27.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services &amp; other charges</td>
<td>1,736,196</td>
<td>1,252,405</td>
<td>483,791</td>
<td>72.14%</td>
<td>4,784,255</td>
<td>2,822,945</td>
<td>1,961,310</td>
<td>59.00%</td>
<td>2,962,323</td>
<td>1,318,076</td>
<td>1,634,247</td>
<td>44.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,458,508</td>
<td>2,239,107</td>
<td>1,219,401</td>
<td>64.74%</td>
<td>3,774,647</td>
<td>1,708,003</td>
<td>2,066,644</td>
<td>45.25%</td>
<td>1,755,191</td>
<td>961,741</td>
<td>793,450</td>
<td>54.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating income (loss)</td>
<td>3,311,298</td>
<td>1,054,789</td>
<td>2,256,509</td>
<td>40.25%</td>
<td>1,973,830</td>
<td>211,416</td>
<td>1,762,414</td>
<td>10.17%</td>
<td>(211,897)</td>
<td>(41,103)</td>
<td>(170,794)</td>
<td>19.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonoperating revenues (expenses):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest income</td>
<td>15,172</td>
<td>15,172</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,200</td>
<td>7,200</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td>18,100</td>
<td>18,100</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt issuance costs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest expense/bank charges</td>
<td>(478,969)</td>
<td>(464,611)</td>
<td>(14,358)</td>
<td>97.00%</td>
<td>(137,428)</td>
<td>(82,209)</td>
<td>(55,219)</td>
<td>98.22%</td>
<td>(25,500)</td>
<td>(8,701)</td>
<td>(16,799)</td>
<td>54.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total nonoperating rev (exp)</td>
<td>(463,797)</td>
<td>(464,611)</td>
<td>814</td>
<td>100.18%</td>
<td>(130,228)</td>
<td>(82,209)</td>
<td>(48,019)</td>
<td>63.13%</td>
<td>(7,400)</td>
<td>(8,701)</td>
<td>1,301</td>
<td>117.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income (loss) before transfers</td>
<td>3,311,298</td>
<td>1,054,789</td>
<td>2,256,509</td>
<td>31.85%</td>
<td>1,933,022</td>
<td>211,416</td>
<td>1,721,606</td>
<td>10.17%</td>
<td>(211,897)</td>
<td>(41,103)</td>
<td>(170,794)</td>
<td>19.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers out</td>
<td>(620,034)</td>
<td>(361,687)</td>
<td>(258,347)</td>
<td>58.33%</td>
<td>(848,335)</td>
<td>(494,862)</td>
<td>(353,473)</td>
<td>58.33%</td>
<td>(241,057)</td>
<td>(140,617)</td>
<td>(100,440)</td>
<td>58.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NET INCOME (LOSS)</td>
<td>2,691,264</td>
<td>693,102</td>
<td>1,998,162</td>
<td>25.75%</td>
<td>998,657</td>
<td>(365,655)</td>
<td>1,360,222</td>
<td>-36.74%</td>
<td>(460,354)</td>
<td>(190,421)</td>
<td>(269,933)</td>
<td>41.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items reclassified to bal sht at year end:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Outlay</td>
<td>(5,383,474)</td>
<td>(414,550)</td>
<td>(4,968,924)</td>
<td>7.70%</td>
<td>(1,530,238)</td>
<td>(52,036)</td>
<td>(1,478,202)</td>
<td>3.40%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues over/(under) expenditures</td>
<td>(2,692,210)</td>
<td>278,552</td>
<td>(2,970,762)</td>
<td>25.75%</td>
<td>(534,971)</td>
<td>(417,691)</td>
<td>(117,280)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(460,354)</td>
<td>(190,421)</td>
<td>(269,933)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Depreciation is recorded at end of year (non-cash item).
Executive summary

Title: Connect the Park - 28th Street pedestrian improvements update

Recommended action: Staff is recommending to not move forward with pedestrian improvements along 28th Street and Jordan Avenue for the foreseeable future due to the high project costs and complications of the project.

Policy consideration: Does the city council accept staff's recommendation to remove this segment from the Connect the Park CIP?

Summary: Council amended the Connect the Park capital improvement plan in 2015 to include the segment of 28th Street and West Jordan Avenue south of Cedar Lake Road and east of Highway 169. The objective was to find ways to improve pedestrian and biking connections from the dead-end roadway that has 18 residential properties past the Hwy 169 ramp terminals to gain better access to Cedar Lake Road. At that time staff recommended implementation in 2018.

Staff began the feasibility analysis and public engagement in late 2017 with the 18 property owners and the state of Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT). Staff took the next six months to engage stakeholders in the design analysis and preliminary concept development. MnDOT owns and manages a significant portion of the right-of-way and design would have to have to adhere to their design standards to receive approval.

The final concepts that MnDOT supports are considerably more expensive than typical pedestrian improvements and were not consistent with the feedback we heard from the community. With the high estimated costs of a project and the limited support from MnDOT, staff is recommending that pedestrian improvements along 28th Street be postponed until there are projects proposed by MnDOT that would address some of the major design challenges at the northbound Highway 169 ramp terminals.

Financial or budget considerations: The design options presented in the attached project report range in estimated construction costs from $300,000 to $720,000. These design options are significantly higher than typical pedestrian improvements. General obligation bonds are typically used to fund Connect the Park projects.

Strategic priority consideration: St. Louis Park is committed to providing a variety of options for people to make their way around the city comfortably, safely and reliably.

Supporting documents: Discussion
28th Street project map
Project Report

Prepared by: Jack Sullivan, senior engineering project manager
Reviewed by: Debra Heiser, engineering director
Approved by: Tom Harmening, city manager
Discussion

**Background:** 28th Street and West Jordan Avenue south of Cedar Lake Road and east of Highway 169 is a unique dead-end roadway that is a mix of residential lots along Hannan Lake paired with Highway 169 on/off ramps for northbound traffic which ultimately connects to Cedar Lake Road at a traffic signal. This unique configuration experiences high levels of traffic on the MnDOT ramp segments and very low traffic on the neighborhood segment further to the south. (See the attached 28th Street project map.)

**Public Engagement:** Staff held the first open house on November 28, 2017, to gather feedback from the community regarding the desired safe option for getting from the homes along 28th Street to Cedar Lake Road. The input gathered was valuable in understanding and prioritizing the concerns of the community.

Staff was able to utilize the feedback from the community to engage MnDOT to discuss how to safely connect pedestrians and bicyclists from the 18 homes along 28th Street to Cedar Lake Road. Most of the ideas and preliminary concepts discussed at the first open house were not supported by MnDOT. MnDOT was able to provide minimum design parameters for their ramps, unfortunately, the design requirements create scientifically higher construction costs and aren’t necessarily constant with the community feedback.

Staff held a second public meeting on April 9, 2019, to present the concept designs, project costs and project impacts to the public and to inform the community that staff is not recommending moving forward with a project at this time. A detailed overview of the design concepts, project costs, and MnDOT’s comments can be found in the attached project report.

The community was informed via letter on August 2, 2019, that staff would be bringing this item to the council study session on August 26, 2019. It was stated that staff’s recommendation to council is to not move forward with a project at this time due to the high cost of construction.

**Financial considerations:** The design options presented in the attached project report range in estimated construction costs from $300,000 to $720,000. The options allowable by MnDOT are 4 to 7 times the cost of a typical sidewalk or trail project. It is for this reason that staff is not recommending moving forward with construction at this time. Refer to the linked project report for additional cost details.
Executive summary

Title: Food security and access study update

Recommended action: No action at this time. The purpose of this report is to update the city council about the community assessment study of food security and access that is underway by the city’s consultant, Wilder Research.

Policy consideration: This study is consistent with the goals and strategies identified in the 2040 Comprehensive Plan.

Summary: One of the goals in the city’s health section of the 2040 Comprehensive Plan is to “Ensure all in our community have access to healthy food.” The strategies associated with this goal are to:

1) Conduct a detailed study to assess food accessibility and security in the community, and determine if there are any gaps; and
2) Determine what steps the city can take to address gaps in food access and security.

For the first part of the study, Wilder Research staff completed interviews with key informants around the community to gain an understanding of the issues surrounding this topic. Wilder is currently conducting focus groups and surveys with residents who may be impacted by food insecurity, as well as interviewing individuals who can share their personal experiences with food insecurity and access in St. Louis Park. They have had focus groups at STEP and Oak Park Village apartments recently. Wilder is experiencing some difficulties in engaging some of the groups it would like to talk to, such as elderly and youth, and is taking some additional time to ensure they are able to include them. For example, they are looking at some options to engage high school students when school begins. Wilder is also in the process of researching what other cities have done and what has been effective in increasing food access and security.

From the research and information, Wilder will develop recommendations and strategies around ways in which the city can support greater food access and security for residents. The study is expected to be finalized by the end of the year.

Financial or budget considerations: The budget for this work is $50,000 and will be paid for through the 2019 Development Fund budget.

Strategic priority consideration: St. Louis Park is committed to providing a broad range of housing and neighborhood oriented development.

Supporting documents: None

Prepared by: Meg J. McMonigal, principal planner
Reviewed by: Laura Smith, wellness & volunteer coordinator
Approved by: Tom Harmening, city manager
Executive summary

Title: Overhead utility undergrounding discussion

Recommended action: No action currently. This report is intended for information purposes only.

Policy consideration: Should the city actively pursue the undergrounding of overhead utilities as a part of transportation projects?

Summary: During the January 7, 2019 public hearing for the Historic Walker Lake Street project, the city council asked staff questions regarding the costs to underground the overhead utilities in this area. This question has been asked in the past by council and residents. In the interest of understanding what this would entail, staff has been exploring this policy question and has put together our findings in this report.

Financial or budget considerations: The cost to underground the utilities varies depending on how many utilities are on the utility poles and the type of facility on the poles. Cost for distribution lines generally range from $30,000 to $100,000 per 100 feet. The cost to underground a high voltage transmission line is considerably more expensive. In addition to the public cost, there is also a private cost to homes or businesses to modify their wiring to accommodate underground service. Typical residential cost is $2,000; however, the cost for businesses can be far greater. More information on the cost is in the discussion section.

Strategic priority consideration: Not applicable.

Supporting documents: Discussion
Historic Walker Lake location map

Prepared by: Debra Heiser, engineering director
Reviewed by: Joe Shamla, sr. engineering project manager
Approved by: Tom Harmening, city manager
Discussion

Background: A majority of the electric utility power lines in St. Louis Park are constructed “overhead”. These poles are owned by utility companies and are used to distribute electric, cable, fiber, and telephone cables. Lights are attached to many of the overhead utility poles.

Staff has identified the following benefits associated with having underground utilities.

- Visual aesthetics of the corridors.
- Available space in the right of way for sidewalks, bikeways and bus stops.
- Impacts to street trees due to trimming around lines.
- More flexibility in tree species selection.
- Reduction in potential outages during a storm.
- Providing sidewalks that are not blocked or narrowed by the presence of a utility pole.
- More room for sidewalk snow removal and storage.

In general, in Minnesota, the cost to convert an overhead utility to underground is the responsibility of the government agency requesting the change. This cost is only shared when the pole needs to be relocated for a transportation project. If the pole needs to be relocated, the utility will deduct the cost of pole relocation from the overall cost of undergrounding. As a result, the best time to ask is early in the project design so that these cost savings can be realized.

Public cost: The cost of underground the utilities vary depending upon how many utilities are on the utility poles and the type of facility on the poles. Cost for distribution lines generally range from $30,000 to $100,000 per 100 feet. The cost to underground a high voltage transmission line is considerably more expensive.

Location: The overhead lines are generally placed underground in utility conduits. Electric transformers, which are generally on the poles, must be replaced with pad-mounted transformers. These pad-mounted transformers occupy about a five-foot by five-foot space. The utilities must be located on an easement or right-of-way, if there is not adequate room in the right-of-way, the cost of an easement on private property is borne by the city. In addition, service pedestals are often required for each utility and aesthetics can be a concern when adding transformer boxes and pedestals.

Private cost: Services to homes and businesses, which were above ground, are routed below ground and the wiring may have to be modified in the home or business to accommodate the new underground service. When the home or business owner is required to modify the wiring in the building, typical costs are about $2,000. However, in some instances, costs can be far greater.

Funding: There are two ways to fund the public cost for undergrounding. Funding can be provided by a City Requested Special Facilities Surcharge (CRFS) or city funds. A CRFS is a pass-through charge that Xcel will add to the bills of all St Louis Park electric customers. The fee has a set duration and a maximum total allowed. We have estimated that the maximum fee that could be recovered in a one-year period is $1,567,380. The CRFS cannot be used to fund private costs.

The other way to fund undergrounding would be to use city funding. This could be provided through the development fund or general obligation bonds.
The private costs associated with underground service could be funded in one of the following ways:

- Expand our Business loan program to include these as eligible costs.
- Work with property owners on an agreement to have the costs assessed to their properties.

**Present considerations:** City code requires all new utility services to be underground. In addition, new subdivisions must install private utilities underground.

In the last 10 years, the city has only undergrounded utilities for one transportation project - the Highway 7/Louisiana interchange. The overhead utilities conflicted with the proposed design, so the poles had to be relocated. For aesthetic reasons, the city requested that Xcel bury the lines. There were 5 private services off this line which added up to a private cost of undergrounding of $17,383. The total cost for undergrounding the public lines was $871,986. These costs were paid for using the development fund.

Hennepin County plans to reconstruct Minnetonka Boulevard in 2024. Throughout the corridor the overhead utility line poles are placed in such a way that they narrow the sidewalk to less than 4 feet which makes it difficult to remove snow and for people to use the facility. Due to right of way constraints, staff believes that undergrounding the electric will be necessary to rebuild the sidewalk to meet ADA minimum requirements.

**Case study:** To get a better understanding of the cost to underground overhead utilities, staff asked Xcel Energy to develop a cost to underground the distribution lines in and around the Historic Walker Lake area. Specifically, on Library Lane between Lake Street and Walker Street and on Walker Street between Lake Street and Dakota Avenue. The estimated costs are shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Private</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$119,064.50</td>
<td>$156,308.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Public cost:** We had Xcel Energy run the CRFS for the estimated cost for this project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Customer Class</th>
<th>Customers</th>
<th>Surcharge$^{(1)}$</th>
<th>Months</th>
<th>Recovery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>21,892</td>
<td>$0.39</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$102,454.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res Low Income</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>$0.39</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$2,808.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small C&amp;I ND</td>
<td>1,369</td>
<td>$0.39</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$6,406.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small C&amp;I</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>$1.17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$9,196.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large C&amp;I</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>$1.56</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$2,920.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Lighting</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>$0.39</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$360.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sm Mun Pump ND</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>$0.39</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$98.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Mun Pump</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$1.17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$182.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Mun Pump</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1.56</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$74.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>24,787</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$124,502.04</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Carrying Charges included in recovery amount$^{(2)}$ | **$5,812.00**
### Allowable Class Surcharge Levels per Month Under CRSF Tariff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Surcharge Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>$0.25 up to $5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income Residential</td>
<td>$0.25 up to $1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small C&amp;I Non-Demand</td>
<td>$0.25 up to $5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small C&amp;I - Demand</td>
<td>3 Times Residential Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large C&amp;I - Demand</td>
<td>4 Times Residential Amount</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Adjustment possible in final months of recovery period for more precise cost recovery.
2. Monthly carrying charge of 0.9616% applies to outstanding balance, equal to compounded rate based on 8.32% overall rate of return from the last general rate case (2010) and 3.85% tax factor.

**Private cost:** Please see below for the estimated costs to the businesses in the area. These costs are high because of the age of the buildings and the equipment being supplied power.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6416 Walker Street Building</td>
<td>$65,165.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3546 Walker Street Building</td>
<td>$28,815.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6415 Walker Street Building</td>
<td>$18,048.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6509 Walker Street Building</td>
<td>$31,175.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6500 Library Street Building</td>
<td>$13,105.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$156,308.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Next steps:** Before proceeding staff recommends that the city develop a policy that addresses utility undergrounding. This policy would explore the following:

- Under what circumstance utility undergrounding would be pursued.
- Funding
Executive summary

Title: Needs assessment for cable television franchise renewal

Recommended action: The information presented is for information only. No action is required. Please inform staff of any questions you might have.

Policy consideration: As franchise renewal discussions continue, staff will ask council for its input on the items of most importance in the franchise agreement. The needs assessment will allow for council and staff to make informed decisions throughout that process.

Summary: The city's current franchise agreement with Comcast is set to expire in January 2021. The city has notified Comcast of its intent to conduct informal renewal negotiations in accordance with the federal Cable Act. In preparation for negotiations, the city intends to assess Comcast’s past performance under the existing franchise and the future cable-related Public-Educational-Government (PEG) community needs and interests of the city which is the criteria prescribed by the Cable Act.

A request for proposal for consulting services was issued in May 2019, with proposals received from two consulting firms. The city has hired The Buske Group due to its: 1) plan for gathering insightful community engagement; 2) technical expertise in assessing current and future equipment and technology needs; and 3) approach to planning for the future of cable television and PEG programming produced by the city.

Financial or budget considerations: The cost for the assessment is not to exceed $32,020, an expense that was budgeted for in the cable television (franchise) fund as part of the franchise renewal process.

Strategic priority consideration: St. Louis Park is committed to creating opportunities to build social capital through community engagement.

Supporting documents:
- Discussion
- Agreement between the City of St. Louis Park and The Buske Group
- Request for proposal for consulting services
- Letter to Comcast about informal renewal proceedings
- Letter from Comcast about franchise renewal

Prepared by: Jacque Smith, communications and marketing manager
Reviewed by: Clint Pires, chief information officer
              Brian Grogan, attorney at law, Moss & Barnett
Approved by: Tom Harmening, city manager
Discussion

**Background:** The city’s current franchise agreement with Comcast is set to expire in January 2021. The city has notified Comcast of its intent to conduct informal renewal negotiations in accordance with the federal Cable Act. In preparation for negotiations, the city intends to assess Comcast’s past performance under the existing franchise and the future cable-related Public-Educational-Government (PEG) community needs and interests of the city which is the criteria prescribed by the Cable Act.

A request for proposal for consulting services was issued in May 2019, with two proposals received. The city has hired The Buske Group due to its approach to gathering insightful community engagement as well as technical expertise in assessing current and future equipment and technology needs.

The assessment began in August and will continue into 2020, with a final report issued in April 2020. Equipment assessments, review of the current franchise and meetings with staff will take place in 2019. Community engagement activities, including focus groups and online surveys, will be held in early 2020.

**Present considerations:** In August 2019, the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) approved changes to cable franchise fees collected by cities. This is likely to have a negative effect on the franchise fees collected by the city from cable operators and may affect the city’s approach to negotiating future franchise agreements, as well as operational capabilities.

The League of Minnesota Cities summarized the order at [https://www.lmc.org/page/1/FCC-CableFranchise.jsp?ssl=true](https://www.lmc.org/page/1/FCC-CableFranchise.jsp?ssl=true). The main feature of the order affecting St. Louis Park is that “in-kind” provisions will be considered as franchise fees. According to the LMC, “The fair market value of non-monetary provisions, including complimentary or discounted cable service to public buildings, must be calculated in the 5% franchise fee cap. The order specifies that fair market value will be determined by the cable operators based on rate cards utilized to set rates they charge customers for services. With these changes, cities and other local franchising authorities could take a substantial financial hit.” However, the city can also seek to reduce the financial impact of the FCC order by modifying the provisions it seeks to include in a renewed cable franchise thereby mitigating some of the potential adverse impact to franchise fee revenue received by the city.

In St. Louis Park, preparation for this anticipated change will require:

- Assessment of program origination sites at city and school district facilities that are currently provided at no charge as part of the franchise agreement as the new FCC order may permit Comcast to assess “maintenance costs” for each fiber connection;
- Assessment of the community and business need for each of the five ParkTV channels; and
- Inventory of the various free and discounted Comcast cable viewing services provided to city buildings and ranking of those services according to business need.

The proposal submitted by The Buske Group will assist with the first and second items; city staff will work with departments on the third item. City staff is working in close partnership with Brian Grogan, attorney at law, Moss & Barnett, throughout this process.
**Next steps**: The needs assessment is underway with review of current franchise documents. In October, The Buske Group will meet with city staff and will begin its review of equipment, facilities and services as well as planning for focus groups and the online survey.
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AGREEMENT

BETWEEN THE CITY OF ST. LOUIS PARK, MINNESOTA AND THE BUSKE GROUP
FOR COMMUNITY NEEDS ASSESSMENT AND PEG ACCESS REVIEW

THIS AGREEMENT is made this 5th day of August, 2019, by and between the City of St. Louis Park, Minnesota (“City”) and The Buske Group (“Consultant”). The City and the Consultant are hereinafter collectively referred to as the “Parties”. In consideration of the mutual covenants set forth herein, the Parties agree as follows:

1. CONTRACT DOCUMENTS. The following documents shall be referred to as the “Contract Documents”, all of which shall be taken together as a whole as the contract between the Parties as if they were set verbatim and in full herein:

   A. This Agreement.

   B. The Buske Group Proposal dated August 5, 2019 (attached hereto).

2. OBLIGATIONS OF THE CONSULTANT. The Consultant shall provide the goods, services, and perform the services (the “Work”) in accordance with the Contract Documents.

3. CONTRACT PRICE. The City shall pay Consultant for completion of the Work in accordance with the Contract Documents not to exceed the amount determined below:

   A. For all Work, Project Fees and Expenses, a sum not to exceed $32,020 (as specified in The Buske Group Proposal).

4. PAYMENT PROCEDURES.

   A. Consultant shall submit detailed monthly invoices to the City for payment. Each invoice will be processed by the City and payment shall be delivered to Consultant no later than 30 days after receipt of the invoice.

   B. All invoices shall be addressed to:
      Jacque Smith, Communications and Marketing Manager
      City of St. Louis Park
      5005 Minnetonka Blvd.
      St. Louis Park, MN 55416

5. CONSULTANT REPRESENTATIONS.

   A. Consultant has examined and carefully studied the Contract Documents and other related data identified in the Contract Documents.

   B. Consultant is familiar with and is satisfied as to the conditions that may affect cost, progress, and performance of the Work.

   C. Consultant is familiar with and is satisfied as to all federal, state, and local Laws and Regulations that may affect cost, progress, and performance of the Work.
D. Consultant is aware of the general nature of work to be performed by the City that relates to the Work as indicated in the Contract Documents.

6. INDEMNITY AND INSURANCE. The Consultant agrees to indemnify and hold the City harmless from any claim made by third parties as a result of the services performed by Consultant. Consultant shall provide to the City a certificated demonstration proof of insurance of $2 million dollars general liability insurance and $1 million dollars professional liability coverage.

7. MISCELLANEOUS.

A. Binding Agreement. The City and the Consultant each binds itself, its partners, successors, assigns and legal representatives to the other party hereto, its partners, successors, assigns and legal representatives in respect to all covenants, agreements, and obligations contained in the Contract Documents.

B. Data Practices/Records. All books, records, documents and accounting procedures and practices to the Consultant and its subcontractors, if any, relative to this Agreement are subject to examination by the City. All reports and documents provided to the City under this Agreement shall be the property of the City.

C. Assignment. Neither party may assign, sublet, or transfer any interest or obligation in this Agreement without the prior written consent of the other party, and then only upon such terms and conditions as both parties may agree to and set forth in writing.

D. Waiver. In the particular event that either party shall at any time or times waive any breach of this Agreement by the other, such waiver shall not constitute a waiver of any other or any succeeding breach of this Contract by either party, whether of the same or any other covenant, condition or obligation.

E. Governing Law/Venue. The laws of the State of Minnesota govern the interpretation of this Agreement.

F. Severability. If any provision, term or condition of this Agreement is found to be or become unenforceable or invalid, it shall not effect the remaining provisions, terms and conditions of this Agreement, unless such invalid or unenforceable provision, term or condition renders this Agreement impossible to perform. Such remaining terms and conditions of this Agreement shall continue in full force and effect and shall continue to operate as the Parties' entire Agreement.

G. Entire Agreement. This Contract represents the entire agreement of the Parties and is a final, complete and all inclusive statement of the terms thereof, and supersedes and terminates any prior agreement(s), understandings or written or verbal representations made between the parties with respect thereto.
CITY

By: Tom Harmeling
Its: City Manager

Date: 8/14/19

Address for giving notices:
City of St. Louis Park
5005 Minnetonka Blvd.
St. Louis Park, MN 55416

CONSULTANT:

THE BUSKE GROUP

By: Sue Miller Buske
Its: General Partner

Date: August 5, 2019

Address for giving notices:
The Buske Group
4808 T Street
Sacramento, CA 95819
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THIS AGREEMENT is made this 5th day of August, 2019, by and between the City of St. Louis Park, Minnesota (“City”) and The Buske Group (“Consultant”). The City and the Consultant are hereinafter collectively referred to as the “Parties”. In consideration of the mutual covenants set forth herein, the Parties agree as follows:

1. CONTRACT DOCUMENTS. The following documents shall be referred to as the “Contract Documents”, all of which shall be taken together as a whole as the contract between the Parties as if they were set verbatim and in full herein:
   A. This Agreement.
   B. The Buske Group Proposal dated August 5, 2019 (attached hereto).

2. OBLIGATIONS OF THE CONSULTANT. The Consultant shall provide the goods, services, and perform the services (the “Work”) in accordance with the Contract Documents.

3. CONTRACT PRICE. The City shall pay Consultant for completion of the Work in accordance with the Contract Documents not to exceed the amount determined below:
   A. For all Work, Project Fees and Expenses, a sum not to exceed $32,020 (as specified in The Buske Group Proposal).

4. PAYMENT PROCEDURES.
   A. Consultant shall submit detailed monthly invoices to the City for payment. Each invoice will be processed by the City and payment shall be delivered to Consultant no later than 30 days after receipt of the invoice.
   B. All invoices shall be addressed to:
      Jacque Smith, Communications and Marketing Manager
      City of St. Louis Park
      5005 Minnetonka Blvd.
      St. Louis Park, MN 55416

5. CONSULTANT REPRESENTATIONS.
   A. Consultant has examined and carefully studied the Contract Documents and other related data identified in the Contract Documents.
   B. Consultant is familiar with and is satisfied as to the conditions that may affect cost, progress, and performance of the Work.
   C. Consultant is familiar with and is satisfied as to all federal, state, and local Laws and Regulations that may affect cost, progress, and performance of the Work.
D. Consultant is aware of the general nature of work to be performed by the City that relates to the Work as indicated in the Contract Documents.

6. INDEMNITY AND INSURANCE. The Consultant agrees to indemnify and hold the City harmless from any claim made by third parties as a result of the services performed by Consultant. Consultant shall provide to the City a certificated demonstration proof of insurance of $2 million dollars general liability insurance and $1 million dollars professional liability coverage.

7. MISCELLANEOUS.

A. Binding Agreement. The City and the Consultant each binds itself, its partners, successors, assigns and legal representatives to the other party hereto, its partners, successors, assigns and legal representatives in respect to all covenants, agreements, and obligations contained in the Contract Documents.

B. Data Practices/Records. All books, records, documents and accounting procedures and practices to the Consultant and its subcontractors, if any, relative to this Agreement are subject to examination by the City. All reports and documents provided to the City under this Agreement shall be the property of the City.

C. Assignment. Neither party may assign, sublet, or transfer any interest or obligation in this Agreement without the prior written consent of the other party, and then only upon such terms and conditions as both parties may agree to and set forth in writing.

D. Waiver. In the particular event that either party shall at any time or times waive any breach of this Agreement by the other, such waiver shall not constitute a waiver of any other or any succeeding breach of this Contract by either party, whether of the same or any other covenant, condition or obligation.

E. Governing Law/Venue. The laws of the State of Minnesota govern the interpretation of this Agreement.

F. Severability. If any provision, term or condition of this Agreement is found to be or become unenforceable or invalid, it shall not effect the remaining provisions, terms and conditions of this Agreement, unless such invalid or unenforceable provision, term or condition renders this Agreement impossible to perform. Such remaining terms and conditions of this Agreement shall continue in full force and effect and shall continue to operate as the Parties’ entire Agreement.

G. Entire Agreement. This Contract represents the entire agreement of the Parties and is a final, complete and all inclusive statement of the terms thereof, and supersedes and terminates any prior agreement(s), understandings or written or verbal representations made between the parties with respect thereto.
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I. INTRODUCTION

The Buske Group is pleased to offer this proposal to the City of St. Louis Park, Minnesota (“City”), in response to its Request for Proposal. Based upon our review of the RFP, we understand that the City seeks consulting assistance to support the City during the cable franchise renewal process with Comcast. The desired consulting services include: (1) conduct a community needs assessment that will identify current and future public, educational and government (“PEG”) access needs and interests; (2) review the existing PEG access resources and related services provided by ParkTV, (3) review the existing PEG transmission capability (connections, equipment, maintenance and related services); and (4) provide a series of recommendations regarding the number and technical capabilities of the PEG access channels, adequate and appropriate fiber connections, and PEG capital equipment packages designed to meet community needs during the next ten years.

The activities associated with our proposed assessment of needs and interests will include:

- a review of current franchise agreements and other franchise related documents, the City’s cable ordinance (if applicable), and documents regarding PEG access, live two-way connections, service to public buildings, and other cable-related provisions;
- three focus groups;
- an online survey;
- a review of current PEG access resources, services and transmission capability; and
- information gathered through a public hearing.

All data obtained would be used in the preparation of a written report of findings and recommendations, for use in conjunction with the cable franchise renewal negotiations with Comcast.

The Buske Group – now in its 32nd year of providing cable communications consulting services to communities throughout the United States -- is highly qualified to provide such assistance. Our proposal provides a detailed description of our proposed tasks, information about our experience and qualifications, and an itemization of the costs associated with each task.
II. SCOPE OF SERVICES: COMMUNITY NEEDS ASSESSMENT AND PEG ACCESS REVIEW

1. Review of Current Franchise Documents, Reports, and Contracts

The Buske Group will review the current franchise agreements and cable ordinance (if applicable), other franchise documents and reports, and other cable-related documents. We anticipate that these documents might include reports regarding: [1] current PEG operations and resources; [2] the adequacy of existing live two-way connections and services provided by Comcast; and [3] reports submitted by Comcast as required by the franchise agreement.

After completing the review of these documents, we will contact City staff to discuss any concerns that arise from this review and how we propose to apply such findings to the other tasks that we will conduct as part of this project.

2. Meetings with City and ParkTV Staff and Telecommunications Advisory Commission

The community needs assessment will begin with a series of meetings conducted by Sue Buske with representatives of the City, ParkTV staff, and members of the Telecommunications Advisory Commission. One purpose of the meetings with these individuals would be to obtain their perspectives regarding the existing PEG access resources and services, and their thoughts regarding ways to improve the PEG access operations and services. Another purpose of these meetings would be to provide the participants information about the state-of-the art in PEG access/community media centers across the country, and the impact of the franchise renewal process on future opportunities. The comments, concerns and advice of those in attendance will be carefully considered in the development of the consultant’s findings regarding the current capabilities of the PEG access facilities and equipment, and our recommendations regarding the resources needed that would enable ParkTV to continue and expand its services.

These meetings will also be an opportunity to discuss the elements of the community needs assessment and PEG access review, especially the upcoming focus group sessions (as described below). We will work with representatives of the City, ParkTV staff, and members of the Telecommunications Advisory Commission to determine the makeup of the focus group sessions; discuss how they can be promoted to local residents, organizations, and public access producers; and identify the logistical support that we will need (e.g., reserve suitable meeting places, provide refreshments, promote the sessions, etc.). It will require a well-coordinated, team approach to plan for and promote the focus groups, thereby assuring the highest possible attendance.
3. **Review of Existing PEG Access Facilities, Equipment and Services**

An important service that The Buske Group is well-qualified to conduct is a review of the current PEG access resources and services in City. We will prepare questionnaires regarding PEG access operations/programming and facilities/equipment, and will rely on ParkTV staff to complete these questionnaires, including up-to-date equipment inventory lists and any materials that would describe the PEG access services, programming and activities. This information would be used to compare the existing PEG access facilities, services, programming and activities with the future community needs of the City, as identified through the focus groups and online survey.

After reviewing the information provided in the questionnaires completed by the ParkTV staff, we will conduct an on-site inspection of the PEG access facilities and equipment. We will draw upon the expertise of Todd Thayer (highly regarded as a technical expert in this field), who will develop recommendations to include the community needs assessment report regarding initial and ongoing upgrades to the current PEG access equipment packages over the 10-year franchise renewal term. Thayer is recognized as a reliable source of such information in the PEG access field.

4. **Review of Existing PEG Transmission Capability (Connectivity, Equipment, etc.)**

Todd Thayer, who will participate in the on-site inspection of the PEG access facilities and equipment as mentioned above, will also examine Comcast’s PEG access connections at City Hall, St. Louis Park High School, and the other locations specified in the RFP. Mr. Thayer will need to conduct this inspection with an appropriate member of the ParkTV technical staff, who could provide access to these connections and answer his questions about the maintenance of the PEG access transmission equipment and any performance issues. Mr. Thayer will also have questions about the existence of any City-owned fiber and associated equipment (or other transmission technology) that might be considered as a better option than the fiber connections and related resources provided by Comcast.

5. **Focus Group Sessions**

The Buske Group will conduct three structured focus group sessions organized by defined constituencies. One of the sessions will be limited to existing public access producers, as requested in the City’s RFP, and the intended audience(s) of other two will be determined during our meetings with representatives of the City, ParkTV staff, and members of the Telecommunications Advisory Commission.
In order to provide adequate time to conduct our other proposed tasks, make preparations for and promote participation in the focus groups, avoid scheduling them to occur during the busy year-end holiday periods, and complete our proposed tasks early next year, we suggest that the focus group sessions occur in mid- to late-January 2020.

Each focus group session will be overseen by Sue Buske, and will begin with an introduction that provides an overview of the cable and PEG access experience throughout the United States. In each session, Buske will emphasize the developments most pertinent to the participants and the experiences of similar cities throughout the United States. Current and developing governmental regulatory policies relating to cable, PEG access and community media will be summarized as needed. Ample opportunity for questions will be provided.

Following the introductory informational segment of each focus group session, a guided brainstorming process will allow participants to clarify their thinking about the uses of the cable communication system that they would most like to see maintained, or made possible, through the franchise renewal process; determine the PEG access services that they would most like to see maintained; and offer their opinions about the desirability of a variety of potential PEG access services that could be provided in the future as a result of the requirements of the renewed franchise agreement with Comcast.

These structured focus group sessions will help to assure that each participant's expression of needs, interests and concerns is well-informed. These sessions are frequently very helpful in developing significant involvement in the franchise renewal process by a wide variety of vitally interested groups. The method is efficient, because it will permit the City to obtain information relevant to a number of critical franchising tasks through a series of simple and inexpensive sessions. In short, the focus group sessions can create an informed and involved constituency, often useful in subsequent negotiations and in the political process. The information gathered during these sessions would complement the data obtained through the on-line survey, as described below.

6. **On-Line Survey**

The Buske Group proposes to work closely with representatives of the City, ParkTV staff, members of the Telecommunications Advisory Commission, and perhaps others to prepare a questionnaire for an interactive survey -- to be conducted via the Internet -- of residents and representatives of organizations within City.

The on-line survey would provide another mechanism for the public (especially those not able to attend a focus group session) to provide input to the franchise renewal process. Links to the on-line survey could be posted on the websites of the City, ParkTV, local schools, etc. Our experience
shows that active outreach via email blasts and website posts to the public and PEG access community partners helps to ensure that responses are obtained from as many residents as possible through this aspect of the community needs assessment.

The on-line survey will be designed to identify the desirable qualities and perceived shortcomings of the existing PEG access resources and services, and gather information regarding a wide variety of concerns and user needs that may be addressed during the cable franchise renewal process. This survey would also be designed to direct current public access producers to a set of questions that only they would be asked to answer. All survey participants could be asked a series of questions regarding cable-related community needs and interests, including:

A. whether they subscribe to the Comcast cable TV service, Comcast’s high definition and DVR options, the degree to which they rely on Comcast’s on-screen program guide for upcoming program information, etc.;

B. their level of satisfaction with the current programming offered by Comcast, signal quality, customer service, system reliability, etc.;

C. their awareness, level of understanding, and evaluation of the PEG access facilities and equipment, services, and programming as community resources;

D. their level of interest in seeing various types of local programs that could be provided on the PEG access channels in the future;

E. the degree to which they watch the PEG access channels and specific programs;

F. their level of interest in several types of local cable TV programs or services; and

G. their level of interest in other media-related resources or services.

The on-line survey would be made available on the web for responses to be provided by participants for a specified period (e.g., 30-45 days), after which the data would be downloaded and analyzed by The Buske Group.

7. Information Analysis and Report

The needs assessment will conclude with the preparation and submission of a detailed written report, which will compile and analyze all of the input gathered through the: (a) focus group sessions; (b) on-line survey; and (c) review of the existing PEG access facilities, equipment, services, and transmission capability. In addition, we will include information gathered through a public hearing that we suggest be conducted after completion of the focus groups. The public hearing would be convened by a designated City official as appropriate. If possible, a transcript or synopsis of the public hearing testimony would be provided to The Buske Group for analysis and inclusion in a section of the report.
The Needs Assessment Report will include an executive summary, and will detail all findings of the various information-gathering activities described in this proposal, including:

A. Subscriber services, satisfaction, customer service concerns
B. PEG access facilities, equipment, and transmission needs
C. PEG access services and activities

The recommendations section of the Needs Assessment Report will draw extensively from the findings described above, to address current and future cable distribution system needs, subscriber services and customer satisfaction matters, suggested upgrades to the current PEG access equipment packages, and potential PEG access activities and services for consideration. Estimated costs for recommended capital equipment upgrades will be provided.
### III. TIMELINE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Review Current Franchise Documents, Reports, and Contracts</td>
<td>Buske, VanDalsen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Meet with City and ParkTV Staff and Telecommunications Advisory Commission Members</td>
<td>Buske</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Review Existing PEG Access Facilities, Equipment and Services</td>
<td>VanDalsen, Thayer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Review Existing PEG Transmission Capability</td>
<td>VanDalsen, Thayer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Focus Group Sessions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Preparations and planning</td>
<td>Buske, City and ParkTV staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Conduct focus groups</td>
<td>Buske, VanDalsen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Prepare/Conduct On-Line Survey</td>
<td>VanDalsen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Hold Public Hearing</td>
<td>City staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Prepare Information Analysis and Report</td>
<td>VanDalsen, Buske, Thayer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 This suggested timeline is flexible, and depends upon the tasks selected, when the project actually begins, and other factors.
IV. COST ESTIMATE

The Buske Group fees and expenses for the proposed tasks are itemized below as a "menu," which permits the City to select the tasks that it wants to be provided by The Buske Group. Please examine the notes following the budget that explain the assumptions used for our cost estimates.

### PROPOSED PROJECT FEES AND EXPENSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Consultant</th>
<th>Prof. Hours</th>
<th>Fees (^{(1)})</th>
<th>Travel Expenses (^{(2)})</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Review Franchise Documents, Reports and Contracts</td>
<td>Buske</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VanDalsen</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$240</td>
<td></td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Meet with City and ParkTV Staff and Telecommunications Advisory Commission Members</td>
<td>Buske</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$1,800</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Review of Existing PEG Facilities, Equipment, Services and Transmission Capability</td>
<td>VanDalsen</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$480</td>
<td></td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thayer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>$900</td>
<td>1,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VanDalsen</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td></td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thayer</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$960</td>
<td></td>
<td>960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VanDalsen</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$960</td>
<td></td>
<td>960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thayer</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$1,600</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Focus Group Sessions</td>
<td>Buske</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>$4,800</td>
<td>(incl. in Task 2)</td>
<td>$4,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VanDalsen</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$480</td>
<td></td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Buske</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$1,800</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VanDalsen</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$1,440</td>
<td>$800</td>
<td>2,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. On-Line Survey</td>
<td>VanDalsen</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$2,880</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Information Analysis and Report</td>
<td>Buske</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$2,400</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VanDalsen</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>$4,800</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL FEES AND EXPENSES:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$32,020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FOOTNOTES TO PROPOSED PROJECT BUDGET:
1. Fee assumptions – Buske: $150/hr.; VanDalsen: $120/hr.; Thayer: $100/hr.
2. Expense assumptions: Air travel @ $700/trip; rental car/gas @ $75/day; lodging: $150/night; meals @ $35/day.
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RESUMES OF CONSULTING TEAM MEMBERS
REFERENCES

The Buske Group provides the following three references for which we have performed similar work to that described in this proposal. For each of these communities, we conducted community needs assessments as a part of the franchise/franchise renewal process, including the following activities: (a) conducted focus group sessions; (b) conducted on-line surveys; (c) evaluated PEG facilities, equipment and services; and (d) prepared reports documenting key findings and recommendations regarding community cable related needs and interests.

Jodie Miller, Executive Director
NDC4 Cable Commission & Town Square Television
5845 Blaine Avenue
Inver Grove Heights, MN 55076
(651) 450-9891 ext. 308
jmiller@townsquare.tv

Jon Funfar, Communication Specialist
City of Pasco, Washington
525 N. 3rd Avenue
Pasco, WA 99301
(509) 545-3485
FUNFARJ@pasco-wa.gov

Dana Healy, Executive Director
CTV North Suburbs
2670 Arthur Street
Roseville, MN  55113
(651) 792-7515
dhealy@ctvnorthsuburbs.org

(NOTE: Dana Healy was the Executive Director for Danvers Community Access Television when The Buske Group conducted a community needs assessment and PEG access review for the Town of Danvers, Massachusetts in 2016-2017. In 2018, Dana was hired by CTV North Suburbs, for whom we conducted a community needs assessment and PEG access review in 2011-2013.)
CABLE COMMUNICATIONS CONSULTING EXPERIENCE

The Buske Group offers a broad range of cable communication services. Our experienced team of media professionals meets the needs of our clients in many areas, including:

- Cable franchise/franchise renewal.
- Cable regulation and policy.
- Cable rate regulatory assistance.
- Cable company franchise/franchise compliance and performance reviews.
- Cable transfer of ownership
- Identification of community cable related needs and interests through focus groups and surveys
- Development of management plans for public, educational or government (PEG) channels and operations.
- Executive search processes
- Analysis of PEG policies, procedures and personnel policies.
- Compliance and performance reviews of cable company or nonprofit PEG operations, as well as educational and government access and local origination.
- Needs assessments associated with utilization of cable by nonprofit organizations, schools, universities and government agencies.
- Strategic and long range planning.

The Buske Group has provided cable communications consulting services since 1987 on behalf of over 200 governmental jurisdictions throughout the United States, including those listed on the following pages.
The Buske Group's Current and Past Clients (Governmental Jurisdictions)

* City of Aberdeen, South Dakota
* City of Alameda, California
* City of Albuquerque, New Mexico
* City of American Canyon, California
* City of Ann Arbor, Michigan
* City of Arcata, California
* City of Ashland, Oregon
* City of Atherton, California
* City of Auburn, California
* City of Berkeley, California
* City of Blue Lake, California
* City of Boulder, Colorado
* City of Bremerton, Washington
* City of Brunswick, Ohio
* City of Burnsville, Minnesota
* City of Calistoga, California
* City of Cambridge, Massachusetts
* City of Carpinteria, California
* City of Carson City, Nevada
* City of Clearlake, California
* City of Clovis, California
* City of Cohoes, New York
* City of Colonie, New York
* City of Columbia, Missouri
* City of Columbus, Ohio
* City of Cotati, California
* City of Davis, California
* City/County of Denver, Colorado
* City of Eagan, Minnesota
* City of East Palo Alto, California
* City of Eureka, California
* City of Evanston, Illinois
* City of Ferndale, California
* City of Flint, Michigan
* City of Fortuna, California
* City of Fresno, California
* City of Gilroy, California
* City of Glendale, California
* City of Gonzales, California
* City of Grand Rapids, Michigan
* City of Grass Valley, California
* City of Greenfield, California
* City of Hayward, California
* City of Healdsburg, California
* City of Hercules, California
* City of Hollister, California
* City of Hood River, Oregon
* City of Indianapolis, Indiana
* City of Iowa City, Iowa
* City of Issaquah, Washington
* City of Kansas City, Kansas
* City of King City, California
* City of Laredo, Texas
* City of LaVerne, California
* City of Lompoc, California
* City of Los Altos, California
* City of Los Angeles, California
* City of Los Banos, California
* City of Los Gatos, California
* City of Malden, Massachusetts
* City of Marina, California
* City of Menlo Park, California
* City of Milpitas, California
* City of Modesto, California
* City of Monterey, California
* City of Morgan Hill, California
* City of Morro Bay, California
* City of Napa, California
* City of Nashville, Tennessee
* City of Nevada City, California
* City of Newport Beach, California
* City of Norfolk, Virginia
* City of Novato, California
* City of Oceanside, California
* City of Pacifica, California
* City of Pacific Grove, California
* City of Palm Springs, California
* City of Palo Alto, California
* City of Pasco, Washington
* City of Petaluma, California
* City of Pico Rivera, California
* City of Pine, California
* City of Pontiac, Michigan
* City of Port Angeles, Washington
### The Buske Group’s Current and Past Clients (Governmental Jurisdictions)

* City of Reno, Nevada
* City of Rhinebeck, New York
* City of Richland, Washington
* City of Rio Dell, California
* City of Rohnert Park, California
* City of Rye, New York
* City of St. Helena, California
* City of Salina, Kansas
* City of Salinas, California
* City of San Jose, California
* City of San Juan Bautista, California
* City of San Luis Obispo, California
* City of Sand City, California
* City/County of Santa Cruz, California
* City of Santa Maria, California
* City of Santa Monica, California
* City of Santa Rosa, California
* City of Seaside, California
* City of Seattle, Washington
* City of Sebastopol, California
* City of Soledad, California
* City of Sonoma, California
* City of Sonora, California
* City of Sparks, Nevada
* City of Springfield, Illinois
* City of Stockton, California
* City of Syracuse, New York
* City of Tampa, Florida
* City of Topeka, Kansas
* City of Troy, New York
* City of Tucson, Arizona
* City of Union City, California
* City of Vallejo, California
* City of Ventura, California
* City of Wadsworth, Ohio
* City of West Linn, Oregon
* City of West Sacramento, California
* City of Winters, California
* City of Yuma, Arizona
* Town of Belmont, Massachusetts
* Town of Colma, California
* Town of Middletown, California
* Town of Truckee, California
* Town of Woodstock, New York
* Town of Yountville, California
* Anderson Township, Michigan
* Brunswick Hills Township, Ohio
* Independence Township, Michigan
* Waterford Township, Michigan
* Village of Harrison, New York
* Village of Larchmont, New York
* Village of Mamaroneck, New York
* Village of Scarsdale, New York
* Arlington County, Virginia
* Clackamas County, Oregon
* Contra Costa County, California
* Humboldt County, California
* King County, Washington
* Kitsap County, Washington
* Marin County, California
* Monterey County, California
* Montgomery County, Maryland
* Multnomah County, Oregon
* Napa County, California
* Nevada County, California
* Plumas County, California
* San Benito County, California
* San Luis Obispo County, California
* Santa Barbara County, California
* Santa Clara County, California
* Skamania County, Washington
* Sonoma County, California
* Thurston County, Washington
* Tuolumne County, California
* Washoe County, Nevada
* Fort Ord Reuse Authority, Monterey, California
* Lockport Community Cable Commission, Lockport, New York
* North Suburban Communications Commission, Roseville, Minnesota
* Northern Dakota County Cable Communications Commission, Inver Grove Heights, Minnesota
* SW Oakland Cable Commission, Farmington Hills, Michigan
Community Needs Assessment Experience

The Buske Group has conducted extensive needs assessments as part of the franchise/franchise renewal process on behalf of the local governments listed below, in communities served by the cable operators indicated. Our needs ascertainment duties included: (a) conduct focus group meetings; (b) conduct on-line surveys; (c) review all aspects of PEG access operations and channel management; and (d) prepare reports documenting key findings and recommendations regarding community cable related needs and interests.

CALIFORNIA:
American Canyon (1)
Arcata (2)
Auburn (1)
Blue Lake (2)
Carpinteria (2)
Clovis (1)
Colma (1)
Contra Costa County (1)
Davis (1)
Eureka (2)
Ferndale (2)
Fortuna (2)
Fresno (1)
Gilroy (3)
Gonzales (3)
Grass Valley (1)
Greenfield (3)
Healdsburg (1)
Hollister (3)
Humboldt County (2)
King City (3)
Lompoc (1)
Los Altos (1)
Los Angeles (1)(2)(4)
Los Gatos (1)
Monterey (1)
Monterey County (3)
Napa (1)
Napa County (1)
Nevada City (1)
Nevada County (1)
Newport Beach (2)
Oceanside (2)
Pacific Grove (1)
Pacific (1)
Palm Springs (4)
Palo Alto (1)
Petaluma (1)
Palo Alto (4)
Rio Dell (2)
San Jose (1)
San Juan Bautista (3)
San Luis Obispo County (3)
Santa Clara County (1)
Santa Maria (1)
Santa Rosa (1)
Seaside (1)
Soledad (3)
Sonora (1)
Tuolumne County (1)
Union City (1)
Ventura (3)(4)

FLORIDA: Tampa (4)

ILLINOIS: Evanston (5)

KANSAS: Salina (2)

MARYLAND: Montgomery County (1)

MASSACHUSETTS: Cambridge (1), Martha’s Vineyard (1), Belmont (1)(10), Malden (1)(10), Danvers (1)(10), Reading (1), Middleborough (1)(10), Fall River (1)

MICHIGAN: Ann Arbor (6), Independence Township (1)

MINNESOTA: North Suburban Communications Commission (1), Burnsville (1), Eagan (1), St. Paul (1), Northern Dakota County Cable Communications Commission (1)

MISSOURI: Columbia (3)(7)

MONTANA: Missoula (3)

NEW YORK: Manhattan (4)(11), Brooklyn (4)(8), Syracuse (4), Harrison (8), Larchmont (8), Mamaroneck (8), Rye (8), Scarsdale (8)(10)

OHIO: Brunswick (8)

 PENNSYLVANIA: Pittsburgh (1)(10)

 TENNESSEE: Nashville (1), Davidson County (1)

 VIRGINIA: Arlington County (1)

 WASHINGTON: King County (1), Pasco (3), Richland (3), Port Angeles (9), Kitsap County (1)(9)

(1)=Comcast; (2)=Cox; (3)=Charter; (4)=Time Warner; (5)=Continental; (6)=MediaOne; (7)=Mediacom; (8)=Altice/Cablevision; (9)=Wave Broadband; (10)=Verizon; (11)=RCN
QUALIFICATIONS OF CONSULTING TEAM MEMBERS

The Buske Group has assembled a highly qualified consulting team to provide the services described in this proposal. Following are brief synopses of their experience and qualifications.

1. Sue Buske, President of The Buske Group

Sue Buske has been involved in cable television field and local cable programming since 1972. Her practice includes providing advice in the areas of initial franchising, license/franchise renewal, ownership transfer, cable operator performance monitoring, assessment, and all aspects of local cable programming.

Ms. Buske served as the principal license/franchise consultant and negotiator to many cities, ranging from Santa Rosa and Monterey, California to Salina, Kansas and Cambridge, Massachusetts; and as a principal member of license/franchise renewal consulting teams that assisted scores of other communities. Her work has required her to analyze license/franchise agreements, develop and implement monitoring and compliance processes, develop franchising procedures, conduct needs assessments specific to license/franchise renewal, translate the outcome of those assessments to license/franchise and ordinance language, analyze proposals submitted to cities by cable companies, and serve as a principal negotiator during license/franchise renewal and compliance proceedings. Ms. Buske is recognized as one of the foremost national experts in the PEG field. Her background and experience in cable policy, regulation and PEG comes not only from the perspective of a consultant, but also from having served as a full-time cable administrator and also as a pioneer in the field of PEG management.

Prior to the creation of The Buske Group, Ms. Buske served for six years as the Executive Director of the National Federation of Local Cable Programmers (NFLCP, now known as the Alliance for Community Media), a Washington, DC based national organization serving cities, schools, and nonprofit PEG corporations. During those years she served as the coordinator for numerous projects undertaken by the organization. She conducted extensive research into all types of local cable programming and published numerous articles on PEG and telecommunications policy.

Ms. Buske's tenure at NFLCP was during a time when hundreds of Access corporations were being created in the United States. She assisted many of those entities via telephone or on a consulting basis as part of her duties as Executive Director of NFLCP.
Prior to her employment with NFLCP, Ms. Buske served as Regional Director at the Cable Television Information Center at the Urban Institute (also in Washington, DC) and was involved in supervising city franchising processes on behalf of C.T.I.C. While at C.T.I.C. she conducted in-depth analysis of cable proposals submitted during franchising processes.

From 1978-1980, Ms. Buske served as the first Executive Director of the Miami Valley Cable Television Council, a multi-city council of governments that included a cluster of cities and towns located in the south suburbs of Dayton, Ohio. While employed by M.V.C.T.C. she served as the Chief Regulatory Officer for the cities and established and coordinated all aspects of PEG operations. Ms. Buske's early years in the cable television field were spent as Director of Access and Local Origination in Dubuque, Iowa (1972-1977).

Ms. Buske is widely recognized as one of the leading experts in the United States on cable policy and local cable programming issues. She has received numerous national awards, including the George Stoney Award for Humanistic Communications. An award bearing her name, The Buske Leadership Award, is presented annually by the Alliance for Community Media to persons providing outstanding leadership in the field of local cable programming. She co-authored the Access Manager's Handbook and has written many articles for a number of publications.

2. **Randy VanDalsen, Vice President of The Buske Group**

Randy VanDalsen has one of the longest and most successful records of PEG management in the United States. He has been directly involved in the myriad of issues faced by PEG operations on the local, regional and national levels. With over 20 years of hands-on management experience in the PEG field, VanDalsen brings a unique perspective to such issues as organizational start-up concerns, facility design, policy formation, staff and volunteer development, outreach and promotion, etc.

As a partner in The Buske Group since 1991, he has had extensive experience in the preparation of focus group, telephone, and online survey research materials; analysis of the responses to such surveys; conducting performance evaluations of PEG centers; and the preparation of detailed written reports of findings and recommendations.
Prior to joining The Buske Group, VanDalsen was hired in 1985 as the initial Executive Director of Access Sacramento, now widely recognized as one of the nation's leading Public Access operations. During his six-and-a-half years there, Access Sacramento and its programming received 45 nominations as finalists and 23 First Place awards in national and regional competitions, including the prestigious "Overall Excellence in Public Access" award from the Hometown Video Festival in 1989 and 1991, and the first "Overall Commitment to Local Cable Programming" award from the Western Access Video Excellence awards competition in 1991.

Before his employment with Access Sacramento, VanDalsen gained a valuable national perspective on the NFLCP staff as Director of Membership Services and Finance from 1983 - 1985. He served as a member of the NFLCP Board of Directors for three years, Treasurer for one year, Central States Regional Coordinator for one year, and a member of the original By-Laws Committee in 1978. He has been a speaker at many NFLCP/Alliance for Community Media National Conventions to date and at conferences of six different NFLCP/Alliance regions.

VanDalsen received a Master's Degree in Telecommunications from Michigan State University, where he received that department's "Outstanding Student Award" in 1974. VanDalsen began his career in the PEG access field at Michigan State where he held cable-related staff positions with the University in 1973 and United Cable Television of Mid-Michigan in 1974. VanDalsen was promoted to Public Access Coordinator in East Lansing by United Cable in 1975, and developed that operation to one of national recognition. East Lansing was selected as the site of the NFLCP National Convention in 1980, and its Public Access facility received the NFLCP's first "Community Communication Award" in 1982.

In 2005, VanDalsen received the Brian Wilson Memorial Award for Outstanding PEG Mentorship from the Western Region of the Alliance for Community Media.

In 2009, he was honored as the recipient of the Dirk Koning-George Stoney Award for Humanistic Communication from the national Alliance for Community Media.
3. **Todd Thayer, Consulting Engineer**

Todd Thayer is a broadcast engineer with an extensive background in startup and relocation of broadcast and community media center operations, studio production, post production and new media technologies. He is conversant with all facets of technical facility design and build-out, systems design, integration, signal transmission, installation and training. He brings strong project management and problem solving skills to his work.

Thayer has worked with The Buske Group on many projects involving analysis of current public, education, and government facilities and equipment. His analysis of the condition, quality, and age of existing equipment and facilities, tied to information gathered during the community needs assessment, permits him to build detailed spreadsheets outlining the equipment needed to meet cable and community media needs throughout the term of a renewal franchise.

Thayer works with The Buske Group to analyze current PEG access equipment and facilities and recommend equipment packages that will be needed to meet future community media needs. This information will be useful to the City during its franchise renewal negotiations.

Todd currently works as an engineer with Costal Media Group. He served as the Executive Director of Community Access Partners of San Buenaventura for 11 years. His prior experience involved positions with several television stations in California.
RESUMES OF CONSULTING TEAM MEMBERS

Sue Buske
Randy VanDalsen
Todd Thayer
Ms. Buske has been involved in the field of cable television and local cable and community programming since 1972. In her practice she represents local governments, community media/PEG access organizations, and educational institutions. She has provided advice in the areas of communication policy relating to cable and telecommunications corporations and their delivery of video, voice, and data communications. This has included topics such as initial franchising, franchise renewal, transfer of ownership, cable operator performance monitoring, needs assessment, and all aspects of local cable programming.

Her work has required her to analyze franchise agreements, develop and implement franchise monitoring and compliance processes, develop franchising procedures, draft RFP documents for initial franchising and the franchise renewal process, analyze proposals submitted to cities by cable companies, conduct needs assessments specific to franchise renewal, translate the outcome of those assessments to specific and ordinance language, and serve as principal negotiator during franchise renewal and franchise compliance proceedings.

She has conducted in-depth communications studies analyzing the community communication needs and interests of citizens, local educational institutions, and community and civic organizations in communities such as Los Angeles, San Jose, Monterey, Fresno, Ventura, Gilroy, Hollister, Los Altos, Palo Alto, Pacifica, Santa Maria, Humboldt County, Contra Costa County and Santa Clara County, CA; Montgomery County, MD; Arlington County, VA; Cambridge and Belmont, MA; St. Paul, Roseville, Eagan, Burnsville, and numerous other Minneapolis/St. Paul, area cities; Tampa, FL; King County, WA; Columbia, MO; Ann Arbor, MI, and Manhattan and Brooklyn, NY.

With respect to local cable programming, Ms. Buske is recognized as one of the foremost national experts in the field of public, educational, and government access. She has written several books.
and numerous articles on access and is in demand as a consultant and speaker.

She has established or assisted in the establishment of public, educational, and government access channels in hundreds of communities, including San Jose, Monterey, Ventura, Sacramento, Santa Cruz, Berkeley, Napa, Petaluma, Auburn, Hollister, Gilroy, San Juan Bautista, Marin County, and Humboldt County, CA; Salina, KS; Grand Rapids, MI; Enid, OK; Gresham and Portland OR; Rockville, MD; Flushing and Staten Island, NY; and Milwaukee, WI.

**SIGNIFICANT PREVIOUS EMPLOYMENT:**

Executive Director of the National Federation of Local Cable Programmers (now known as the Alliance for Community Media), a Washington, D.C. based national organization serving cities, schools, and nonprofit access corporations. Lead consultant for the NFLCP’s Cable Utilization Services. Responsible for day-to-day operation of NFLCP. National spokesperson for the NFLCP on federal, state, and local cable legislation and regulatory issues. (1981-1987)


Executive Director, Miami Valley Cable Television Council. Responsible for all institutional and access programming. Cable regulatory officer for six-city council of government. (1978-1980)

Program Director, Group W Channel 10 Dubuque, Iowa. Development of access and local origination programming. (1972-1977)

Cable Fellow-Alternate Media Center- New York University School of the Arts (1972-76)

**SELECTED EXAMPLES OF SPEECHES:**

Alliance for Community Media-Midwest: Strategic Planning and Community Needs Assessment” and “PEG Access Operating Policies” (April 2015)

National Association of Telecommunication Officers and Advisors Annual Conference (1987-2018: Presentations at 26 of the past 32 annual conferences) Selected topics included:


Minnesota Association of Telecommunication Officers and Advisors: “Due Diligence Doing Your Homework: Needs Assessments (May 2012) and “Renewal Trends and Issues” (November 2011)


Symposium on the Los Angeles Cable System: Univ. of Southern California. (June 2004)


Festival International des Televisions Locales. Marne-la-Valle, France. (June, 1988)


SELECTED BOOKS & ARTICLES:

"Forget PEG "Stations"...Community Media Centers are the Future" Washington Association of Telecommunication Officers and Advisors. (Spring 2012)

"300 Words for the Next 30 Years." Community Media Review. (Spring 2006)

"The Future of PEG Funding and Renewals in the Face of the Changes in the Cable Industry." Journal of Municipal Telecommunications Policy, NATOA. (Summer 2005)


"Successfully Negotiating a Franchise Renewal -- 2004 Revised Edition." Published by Alliance for Community Media. (2 chapters)


"A Paella Called Access." Community Media Review. (Summer 2001)


Video User Magazine. Associate Editor.


American Cities in the 80's. "Cable Communications." Conference on Alternative State and Local Policy. (May 1983)


Cable TV Franchising Primer. NFLCP. Co-author. (1980)
OTHER: Alliance for Communications Democracy - Board of Directors - Secretary (2011-2015); Chair (2016-2019)

Alliance for Community Media (formerly National Federation of Local Cable Programmers) – Former Member of the Board of Directors


Adjunct Faculty: Montgomery College, Rockville, MD. Instructor. (1982-83)

Adjunct Faculty: Antioch College, Yellow Springs, OH. (1979-1980)

AWARDS AND HONORS


2012. Recipient of the Joseph Sakey Award from Cambridge Community Television, Cambridge, MA.

2000. Recipient of the Distinguished Alumnus Award from the University of Wisconsin at Platteville.

1987. Recipient of the Buske Leadership Award from the NFLCP.

1980. Recipient of the George Stoney Award for Humanistic Communication from the NFLCP.

1979-83. Selected for inclusion in Who’s Who in Cable Television.

1972-76. Cable Fellowship. New York University School of the Arts, Alternate Media Center.
RANDY VAN DALSEN
The Buske Group
4808 T Street
Sacramento, CA 95819
(916) 441-6277
randy@thebuskegroup.com

QUALIFICATIONS
Over 45 years of professional experience in cable television local programming management, systems analysis and consulting services. Responsibilities have included:

- Performance Evaluation
- Survey Research
- Data Analysis
- Management Plan Development
- Executive Director Search
- Budget Preparation and Review
- Community Media Facility System Design
- Video Production and Post-Production

EMPLOYMENT HISTORY

1991 - Present
Vice President, The Buske Group; Sacramento, California

1985 - 1991
Executive Director, Access Sacramento; Sacramento, California

1983 - 1985
Director of Membership Services and Finance, Alliance for Community Media; Washington, D. C.

1981 - 1983
Corporate Director of Community Programming, United Cable Television Corporation; Denver, Colorado

1980 - 1981
Eastern Region Director of Community Programming, United Cable Television Corporation; Denver, Colorado

1975 - 1980
Public Access Coordinator, United Cable of Mid-Michigan; East Lansing, Michigan

1974 - 1975
Director, Local Origination Dept., United Cable of Mid-Michigan; East Lansing, Michigan

1973 - 1974
Cable TV Coordinator, Michigan State University Housing; East Lansing, Michigan
RELATED EXPERIENCE

1977 - Present
Life member of the Alliance for Community Media (ACM).
Current Chief Financial Officer of the ACM Western Region Board of Directors; former member of the ACM national Board of Directors (3 years) and Treasurer (1 year); Central States Regional Coordinator (1 year); founder and chair of the Colorado Front Range Chapter in 1982; Coordinator of the 1980 ACM National Convention and two regional conferences (Central States in 1979, Mountain in 1982); member of the original ACM By-Laws Committee (1978). Selected as a speaker at many ACM national conventions and regional conferences of the Central States, Midwest, Mountain, Mid-Atlantic, Western, and Northwest Regions of the ACM.

1977 - 1979
Founder/Steering Committee member, Michigan Assn. for Community Cable Development.

1972 - 1974
Founder and Director of the Michigan State University "Video Workshop."

AWARDS AND HONORS

2009
"Dirk Koning - George Stoney Award for Humanistic Communication." Alliance for Community Media.

2005
"Brian Wilson Memorial Award for Outstanding PEG Access Mentorship." Alliance for Community Media -- Western Region.

1985 - 1991
During my tenure as Executive Director, Access Sacramento received 23 First Place awards in national and regional competitions, including "Overall Excellence in Public Access" from the Alliance's "Hometown Video Festival" in 1989 and 1991.

1983
Selected for inclusion in Who's Who in Local Origination Programming.

1980
Selected for inclusion in Who's Who in Cable Television.

1977
"ACE Award" as executive producer of sports special, "Bull Bowl `76." National Cable Television Association.

1975

1974
"Outstanding Student Award." TV/Radio Department, Michigan State University.

EDUCATION

1980
M. A. degree in Telecommunication, Michigan State University.

1974
B. A. degree in TV/Radio (with high honors), Michigan State University.
Todd Thayer
2528 Woodpecker Ave (805) 407-8940
Ventura, Ca  93003 e-mail toddpthayer@yahoo.com

Summary of Qualifications:
Strong executive management background with specific expertise in startup and relocation of media operations, broadcast / cablecast, studio production, post-production and other media technologies. Extensive experience with all facets of technical facility and staff development, including facility design & build-out, systems design, integration, installation & training. Strong project management & problem solving skills with heavy emphasis on partnership development, customer service and sales support.

Professional Experience:

Coastal Media Group
Broadcast Engineer 9/2014 - Present
Responsible for operation and diagnostic / maintenance support of mobile satellite vehicles and associated video production. Experience with analog and digital C/Ku band up/downlink operations including encoding, compression, modulation and format parameters. Strong background in HD video production, post-production and digital media.

Community Access Partners of San Buenaventura
Executive Director 2/2003 – 5/2014
Responsible all aspects of management of a community not-for-profit media center, including stakeholder and partnership relations, revenue development and strategic planning. Responsible for the design, construction and operation of 6,800 sq/ft facility ground-up build, including civil, site/core & shell through equipment acquisition and systems integration. Successfully developed and implemented earned income revenue strategies to offset changes in funding. Reported to Board of Directors.

Liberty Livewire Interactive Services Group
Responsible for design, installation and operation of startup interactive television facility. Provided facilities for the integration of enhanced content (web, MSO network, etc) with traditional broadcast programming. Unique understanding of the process of integrating broadcast and enhanced content. Responsibilities also included IT / network & telecomm administration. Reported to Vice President - Operations.

NDTC-LA
Director of Production 8/98 – 7/2000
Responsible for all aspects of television production in four studio, 80,000 sq/ft facility. Responsible for oversight of design and installation of studio facilities. Coordinated relocation and expansion into new facility. Developed and maintained expense & revenue (>$6M/year) budgets for studio operations. Recruited, trained and maintained staff more than 60 for various client networks, including TVG network launch. Reported to General Manager.

International Channel
Production Manager 11/97 - 8/98
Managed all operational issues in production and post-production. Supervised staff of 15, 2 studios and 2 edit bays. Reported to Executive Vice President.

IS Manager 7/95 - 11/97
Managed all aspects of hardware and software acquisition, design, installation and support. Experience with Windows system administration, TCP/IP configuration, LAN / WAN design - installation, application deployment and support etc. Reported to Executive Vice President.
Production Engineer 7/94 - 7/95
Provided end to end support for master control, studio and post-production design installation and operation.
Reported to Chief Engineer.

Contract Television Engineer 10/88 - 7/94
Television Systems Engineer: KSCI Los Angeles, CA / KHSC Ontario, CA / KLCS Los Angeles, CA
Provide design and installation consultation and technical support for television studios and technical facilities.
Transmission Engineer: Conus - Los Angeles, CA. Operate and maintain Ku band satellite uplink truck.
Freelance Video / Ultimatte Operator: Various studios and production companies.

Staff Engineer 12/80 - 10/88
Performed various operational and supervisory duties in master control and studio environments.
KADY TV-63 Oxnard, CA / KDOC TV-56 Anaheim, CA / Trinity Broadcasting Network Tustin, CA
March 5, 2018

Ms. Karly Werner  
Sr. Director, Government & Regulatory Affairs  
Comcast Twin Cities  
10 River Park Plaza  
St. Paul, MN 55107

Re: Cable Television Franchise Renewal – St. Louis Park, Minnesota

Dear Ms. Werner:

I received your letter dated January 18, 2018, to Mr. Reg Dunlap, wherein Comcast gives notice of its desire to renew its cable television franchise in the City of St. Louis Park, Minnesota (“City”), and requests commencement of renewal proceedings. Per your request and pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 546, the city has initiated proceedings within the city to: 1) assess Comcast’s past performance under the existing franchise; and 2) assess the future cable-related community needs and interests of the city.

In the letter Comcast indicates its desire to conduct renewal proceedings informally. The city is open to informal renewal negotiations with Comcast and looks forward to working with the company during this process. If Comcast objects to proceeding in an informal manner and would rather pursue a formal renewal process, please respond in writing, within thirty (30) days of the date of receipt of this letter. If the city does not receive a written objection, we will conclude Comcast’s silence indicates agreement to proceed in an informal manner at this time.

Based upon our review of federal law, if at any time in the process either the city or Comcast believes that renewal cannot be achieved through informal negotiations, either party has the right to move forward in the formal process pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 546 (a-g).

If you have any questions please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

Jacqueline A. Larson, APR  
Communications and Marketing Manager
January 18, 2018

CERTIFIED MAIL

Mr. Reg Dunlap
Community Television
City of St. Louis Park
5005 Minnetonka Blvd
St. Louis Park, MN 55416

Subject: FRANCHISE RENEWAL

Dear Mr. Dunlap:

We at Comcast appreciate the opportunity to serve the citizens of St. Louis Park. It is our credo that we will deliver a superior experience to our customers every day. Our products will be the best and we will offer the most customer-friendly and reliable services in the market. In living our credo, we look forward to providing broadband services to our customers in St. Louis Park for many years to come. Therefore, we are taking this step to ensure the renewal of our franchise with you.

The Cable Communications Policy Act of 1984 ("the 1984 Cable Act") encourages franchisors and cable operators to reach renewal agreements at any time through an informal process of discussion. However, Section 626 of the 1984 Cable Act also provides for commencement of a formal renewal procedure. To preserve our statutory rights to this formal procedure, this letter is our official notice to you invoking that provision.

This letter is not intended to introduce a new formality into our discussions, nor is that the intention of the 1984 Cable Act. In fact, we prefer to reach a mutually satisfactory agreement through informal negotiations, thus making many of the 1984 Cable Act’s formal procedures unnecessary.

I will be happy to discuss this matter with you, or provide any additional information that you may require. I look forward to meeting with you in the near future and to continuing a relationship that, we believe, benefits both the community and the residents of St. Louis Park.

Sincerely,
Karly Werner
Sr. Director, Government & Regulatory Affairs

cc: Steve White, West Division President
    Chris McDonald, West Division Vice President of Government Affairs
    Michael Ruger, Senior Director of Government Affairs

10 River Park Plaza St. Paul, MN 55107  www.comcastcorporation.com
Executive summary

**Title:** Update - PLACE Via Sol and Via Luna projects

**Recommended action:** No action required at this time.

**Policy consideration:** Not applicable. Please inform staff of any questions you might have.

**Summary:** Required remediation activities have been completed on both 5909 Highway 7 (the parcel at the southeast corner of Highway 7 and Wooddale Ave) and 5855 Highway 7 (former McGarvey property). Both North parcels have been appropriately backfilled, graded and are now construction-ready. According to PLACE, precast concrete walls for the Via Sol foundation were manufactured off-site and are awaiting transport to the site. Excavation for pouring footings and placement of pre-cast walls was expected to begin immediately after remediation activities were completed. Recently, PLACE informed us it is transitioning its architect/engineer of record from Stantec to a new team led by Minnesota-based MSR. Pursuant to copyright laws and the MN Board of Registration, Stantec must agree to transfer its previously approved architectural, structural, and civil plans to MSR. PLACE maintains that the parties are working through the plan transfer as expeditiously as possible. Once received, MSR must review the plans, make any necessary revisions, then sign and resubmit all plan sheets to the Buildings and Energy Department for final review and approval. In the event Stantec does not release its plans, they will become null and void and MSR must prepare and submit new plans for city review and approval. The reason being, that once construction commences there must be an approved plan set on file by the project’s current architect/engineer of record for the building contractor to follow and the city to reference. Until either of these actions are satisfactorily completed, no construction activity can begin on the North Parcels.

Meanwhile, PLACE submitted its planned unit development amendment application for Via Luna on the South Parcels. However, they were deemed incomplete as the civil drawings were not updated. The most notable changes are that the hotel and apartment building have switched places on the site and that most of the parking is underground versus in a structured ramp. Also, both buildings would be constructed of concrete and steel which will be higher quality building material than previously proposed. Programmatically, the two buildings would function similarly to the previously approved plan.

**Financial or budget considerations:** None at this point.

**Strategic priority consideration:** St. Louis Park is committed to providing a broad range of housing and neighborhood oriented development.

**Supporting documents:** PLACE Via update memo

**Prepared by:** Greg Hunt, economic development coordinator  
**Reviewed by:** Brian Hoffman, building and energy director  
**Approved by:** Tom Harmening, executive director and city manager
MEMORANDUM

DATE: August 12, 2019

TO: St. Louis Park City Council

FROM: Chris Velasco

RE: Update on Via

Dear Councilmembers:

The purpose of this memo is to update you on our Via project.

Via Sol (Phase I)

The first phase of Via, Via Sol, is still on schedule to be completed by the deadline in our agreement.

Much off-site construction work has been completed, including over $1 million in precast foundations.

Recently, an environmental finding forced us to delay the installation of our footings. Discarded railroad ties were discovered during excavation. These ties had not appeared on any previous environmental assessment. The project paused construction while we underwent a full review by the MPCA to make sure we were handling the new conditions properly.

The team continues to move energy modeling and commissioning forward to produce a LEED-certified, high-performance building. In addition, Civil Engineering is preparing the project to be the first Envision® certified project in Minnesota, and the first affordable housing in the country to receive Envision certification.

New project team members who have been added include MSR, taking over all architectural services, ISS structural and and Barr Civil Engineering. Project documents, which were maintained in proprietary format, are being translated into new formats for the new team members.

Due to these new local team members, the project is being reviewed again by City Building Inspections. No work can proceed during that review, which is expected to take several weeks.

The Via project team expects to complete Via Sol by the completion date in our amended Purchase and Redevelopment Contract, December 31, 2020.
Phase II

Phase II is currently on track to close on financing by November 25.

Phase II of the Via project includes Via Luna, and the Fairfield Inn & Suites, which are connected as one building, but have separate financing and ownership structures.

Via Luna will use previously-awarded tax-exempt bonds and 4% tax credits as its primary funding sources. In addition to R4 out of New York, who have already provided a financing term sheet, PLACE is now talking to St. Louis Park bank, Old National about keeping the bonds and purchasing tax credits.

Phase II architects, LHB, submitted a PUD amendment on August 5, updating the previously approved designs.

Hotel/PACE financing team from Twain, who previously submitted financing term sheet for the hotel, made a site visit on August 14.

PLACE held hotel design teleconference with LHB Architects and hotel operator Aimbridge on August 15.

We receive preliminary construction pricing for Via Luna and Fairfield from General Contractor, TGE, on August 23.

We expect 80% design approval from Marriott on September 27.

We expect financing commitment for Via Luna by October 18.

We expect financing commitment for Fairfield by October 25.

We expect final design approval from Marriott on October 25.

We currently expect Phase II to close on financing by November 25.

PLACE is a nonprofit with a mission to create places that foster a sustainable, just, and inspiring world.
Executive summary

Title: Telecommunication advisory commission transition update

Recommended action: City council is asked to review this update and provide any feedback before presentation for official approval at a future city council meeting.

Policy consideration: Will the proposed changes to the bylaws and city code to transition the telecommunications advisory commission to the community technology advisory commission, and the proposed 2019 work plan, support the city council and the city in achieving progress in the city’s five strategic priorities?

Summary: At the June 24, 2019, city council study session, commission members and city staff presented a proposed change to the commission name and mission, along with tentative work plan items. The city council expressed its support for these items. At an August 7, 2019, meeting, commission members reviewed the existing bylaws and city code and approved proposed changes to allow for the new community technology advisory commission. They also approved a work plan to be submitted to city council.

Financial or budget considerations: Costs may be associated with outreach and education initiatives suggested by the commission. It’s expected that the city’s cable TV fund can support those incidental costs. Any future major initiatives recommended by the commission may result in more significant budget implications.

Strategic priority consideration: Not applicable. This commission believes changes to its bylaws and to the city code supporting the transition to the community technology advisory commission will result in support and advancement of all the city’s strategic priorities.

Supporting documents:
- Discussion
- Proposed changes to bylaws
- Proposed changes to city code
- Proposed work plan for 2019
- August 7, 2019, unofficial meeting minutes

Prepared by: Jacque Smith, communications and marketing manager
Reviewed by: Clint Pires, chief information officer
Melissa Kennedy, city clerk
Maria Carrillo-Perez, senior management assistant
Approved by: Tom Harmening, city manager
Discussion

**Background:** At the June 24, 2019, city council study session, telecommunications advisory commission members and city staff presented a proposed change to the commission name and mission, along with tentative work plan items. The city council expressed its support for these items. At an August 7, 2019, meeting, commission members reviewed the existing bylaws and city code and approved proposed changes to allow for the new commission. They also approved a work plan to be submitted to city council.

**Present considerations:** The commission is interested in any feedback from council on the proposed bylaw and city code changes and to the proposed workplan, prior to official approval at a future city council meeting.

**Next steps:** If the council agrees with the proposed changes and the work plan, these are the next steps for the commission:

- Include the proposed bylaw and city code changes as a consent agenda item at a September regular city council meeting, along with the proposed work plan.
- At its next meeting, Tuesday, Sept. 10, 2019, 6 p.m., begin discussion on how to conduct community engagement efforts. The results of community engagement will help determine topics and formation of committees.
TELECOMMUNICATIONS COMMUNITY TECHNOLOGY

ADVISORY COMMISSION BYLAWS ARTICLE I

– THE COMMISSION

1.1 Name of the Commission. The Commission was officially created as the Cable Television Advisory Commission by Ordinance 1783-89 on April 17, 1989, and reestablished and renamed the Telecommunications Advisory Commission (“The Commission” by Ordinance 2216-01 effective January 1, 2002. Commission members voted August 7, 2019, to change the name of the commission to the Community Technology Advisory Commission.

1.2 Powers. The powers of the Commission shall be as stated in section 2-184 of the St. Louis Park City Code.

1.3 Relation to the Ordinance. These bylaws supplement the Ordinance, and in the case of conflict, are subordinate to the Ordinance.

ARTICLE II – OFFICERS, MEMBERS & STAFF

2.1 Officers and Members. The officers of the Commission shall be the Chair and Vice-Chair. There shall be at least seven commission members, one of whom is appointed by the St. Louis Park school board and one of whom is a youth member.

Chair. The chair shall preside at all meetings of the Commission and is eligible to vote on all matters coming before the Commission. The chair shall appoint all committees. The chair shall have the responsibility for calling special meetings of the Commission and for conducting all meetings in an orderly manner.

2.2 Vice-Chair. The Vice-Chair shall perform the duties of the chair in the absence or incapacity of the Chair.

2.3 Staff Liaison. A staff liaison to the Commission shall be appointed by the city manager and shall be subject to the administrative rules and regulations of the city. The staff liaison may facilitate or assist in the meetings and shall be responsible for recording attendance of commission members and for preparation of minutes. The staff liaison is responsible for keeping the city manager informed regarding the business of the commission and shall communicate to the city manager any problems or issues that may arise. The staff liaison shall also be responsible for assisting the commission in considering their financial needs and, if deemed necessary by the commission, shall request appropriate the annual budget process.

ARTICLE III - ELECTIONS
3.1 **Elections.** A regular election shall be held at the annual first meeting each year following city council boards and commissions appointments in May. Officers shall be nominated from the floor by any voting member of the commission.

3.2 **Term of Office.** Officers will assume office at the first meeting following an election. The term for officers shall be one year and the chair may only serve for up to two consecutive years as chair.

3.3 **Succession of Office.** The Vice-Chair shall succeed to the office of Chair in the event the Chair is vacant by virtue of any inability to fulfill the duties of the office. Should the Vice-Chair thus move to the Chair, a special election shall be held to fill the unexpired term of the Vice-Chair.

**ARTICLE IV – CONDUCT OF BUSINESS**

4.1 **Voting.** Each regular member of the Commission including the Commissioner appointed by the School Board and any Youth Member appointed by the City Council shall be entitled to one vote on all matters brought to a vote.

4.2 **Quorum.** A majority of commissioners shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of transacting its business. A smaller number may adjourn from time to time until a quorum is obtained.

4.3 **Majority Vote Required.** A simple majority vote of the members present and voting is required for passage of all matters before the Commission.

**ARTICLE V – MEETINGS**

5.1 **Meetings.** All meetings of the commission will be conducted in accordance with the Minnesota Open Meeting Law. Proceedings of the Commission will be conducted as outlined in the Standard Code of Parliamentary Procedure.

5.2 **Annual Meeting.** The annual meeting of the Commission shall be the last meeting held each year at which time elections will be held and a summary of progress made, worked accomplished and a proposed work program for the coming year shall be prepared for delivery to the City Council.

5.3 **Regular Meetings.** The Commission will hold at least four regular meetings each year. Regular meeting dates shall be set during the final meeting of each year for the upcoming year and shall not be held on any of the holidays recognized by the St. Louis Park City Council. These holidays include: Ash Wednesday, Chanukah, Christmas, Independence Day, Labor Day, Martin Luther King Day, Memorial Day, Passover (first two nights), President’s Day, New Year's Day, Rosh Hashanah, Thanksgiving Day and the Friday after Thanksgiving Day, Veterans Day and Yom Kippur. (For Chanukah, Christmas, Passover, Rosh Hashanah and Yom Kippur, the holiday includes the evening before the holiday.)

The meeting time shall be 7:00 p.m. promptly. Meeting dates shall be posted in advance in the city offices. The commission may change the regular meeting time or date as
5.45.3 **Special Meetings.** Special meetings of the Commission may be called by the chair or three commissioners for the purpose of transacting any business designated in the call. The call for special meeting shall be delivered in compliance with state law. At least one day prior to the meeting, a notice must be delivered to the Commissioners of the date, time, place and purpose of the special meeting. Notice of the date, time, place and purpose of a special meeting must also be posted on the principal bulletin board of the city at least three days prior to the date of the meeting. Commissioners should be notified of the special meeting before or at the same time the meeting is officially posted.

5.55.4 **Emergency Meetings.** An emergency meeting may be called by the chair due to circumstances which require immediate consideration. Notice must be made to commissioners by any means available. A good faith effort shall be made to provide notice of the meeting to any news medium that has filed a written request for notice of meetings. The notice shall include the purpose of the meeting.

5.65.5 **Record of Proceedings.** All minutes and resolutions shall be in writing and shall be recorded in the journal of the proceedings of the commission. Records shall be kept in accordance with MN Statute and rules regarding preservation of public records and the MN Government Data Practices Act.

**ARTICLE VI – ATTENDANCE**

6.1 **Absences.** If a Commissioner is unable to attend a regularly scheduled or special meeting of the Commission, that member shall notify the city staff liaison of this fact no later than 4 p.m. the day of the meeting.

6.2 **Attendance.** Commission members are expected to attend regular and special commission meetings and assigned committee meetings. A roster of attendance shall be maintained. Repeated absences shall result in the chair contacting the member to ascertain his/her intentions as to about continuing involvement on this Commission.

6.3 **Request for Council Action.** Should the member not wish to continue to serve on the Commission, or should the member have continuing absences, the chair shall inform the City Council of this fact, recommending the Council appoint a replacement.

**ARTICLE VII – AMENDMENTS**

7.1 **Amendments.** Amendments to these bylaws may be proposed by any voting member. All proposed amendments shall be submitted in writing to each member of the Commission at least fifteen (15) days prior to the regular meeting of the Commission at which that amendment is to be considered. A statement explaining the purpose and effect of the proposed amendment shall be attached to the proposed amendment. Amendments shall be considered only at regular meetings of the Commission.
City code CURRENT VERSION

Sec. 2-184. Powers and duties.

The telecommunications advisory commission shall have the following powers and duties to:

(1) Provide a public forum for the expression of cable television concerns of franchise subscribers and public and private cable television users;

(2) Promote and encourage the widest range of use of the city's public access channels;

(3) Encourage a diversity of programs and services to cable subscribers through a working relationship with the cable television company that fosters an examination of new programs and services and of changing community needs;

(4) Oversee future interconnections with metropolitan communities;

(5) Monitor the day-to-day operations of the cable television system as well as any experimentation that is done with new and specialized cable services;

(6) Assist in any evaluation of the cable television system that are conducted during the term of the franchise or in anticipation of refranchising;

(7) Submit to the city council by April 1 of each year an annual report of the activities of the commission during the previous year; and

(8) Perform other functions as needed to carry out these duties and responsibilities as directed by the city council and to act in an advisory capacity to the city council.

(Code 1976, § 1-323)

SUGGESTED REVISION

Sec. 2-184. Powers and duties.

The community technology advisory commission shall have the following powers and duties to:

(1) Advise and collaborate with the city council and boards and commissions on the application and use of technology for the purpose of improving city services and quality of life for St. Louis Park’s citizens, businesses and visitors.

(2) Submit to the city council by April 1 of each year an annual report of the activities of the commission during the previous year; and

(3) Perform other functions as needed to carry out these duties and responsibilities as directed by the city council and to act in an advisory capacity to the city council.

(Code 1976, § 1-323)
### Work Plan Template | telecommunications advisory commission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Initiative</th>
<th>Strategic Priorities</th>
<th>Purpose (see page 2 for definitions)</th>
<th>Outcome (fill in after completed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4Q 2019</td>
<td>□ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5 □ N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3Q-4Q 2019</td>
<td>Attend meetings of other city boards and commissions to learn how technology might help their activities and related city services</td>
<td>☑ New Initiative  ☑ Continued Initiative  ☑ Ongoing Responsibility</td>
<td>☑ Commission Initiated Project  ☐ Council Initiated Project  ☐ Report Findings (council requested)  ☐ Formal Recommendation (council requested)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☑ 1 ☐ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5 ☑ N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3Q-4Q 2019</td>
<td>Connect with similar commissions from other agencies</td>
<td>☑ New Initiative  ☑ Continued Initiative  ☑ Ongoing Responsibility</td>
<td>☑ Commission Initiated Project  ☐ Council Initiated Project  ☐ Report Findings (council requested)  ☐ Formal Recommendation (council requested)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☑ 1 ☐ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5 ☑ N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☑ 1 ☐ 2 □ 3 □ 4 ☑ 5 □ N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### City of St. Louis Park Strategic Priorities
1. St. Louis Park is committed to being a leader in racial equity and inclusion in order to create a more just and inclusive community for all.
2. St. Louis Park is committed to continue to lead in environmental stewardship.
3. St. Louis Park is committed to providing a broad range of housing and neighborhood oriented development.
4. St. Louis Park is committed to providing a variety of options for people to make their way around the city comfortably, safely and reliably.
5. St. Louis Park is committed to creating opportunities to build social capital through community engagement.
   OR Other
### Purpose: definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commission Initiated Project</td>
<td>- Project initiated by the board or commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Initiated Project</td>
<td>- Project tasked to a board or commission by the city council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Findings</td>
<td>- Initiated by the city council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Board and commission will study a specific issue or topic and report its</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>findings or comments to the city council in writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- No direct action is taken by the board/commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Recommendation</td>
<td>- Initiated by the city council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Board and commission will study a specific issue or topic and makes a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>formal recommendation to the city council on what action to take</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- A recommendation requires a majority of the commissioners' support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Modifications:

Work plans may be modified, to add or delete items, in one of three ways:

- Work plans can be modified by mutual agreement during a joint work session.
- If immediate approval is important, the board or commission can work with their staff liaison to present a modified work plan for city council approval at a council meeting.
- The city council can direct a change to the work plan at their discretion.
Parking Lot

Items that are being considered by the board/commission but not proposed in the annual work plan. Council approval is needed if the board/commission decides they would like to move forward with an initiative.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative</th>
<th>Comments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Produce a quarterly report for the city council of relevant technology activities and advances.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Produce final reports on completed commission activities, with recommendations for consideration by other commissions or by the city council.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance the commission’s presence on the city website.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide analysis of proposed or considered technology for the community and city operations and provide recommendations and feedback to staff, the city council and other commissions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. **Call to order**
Chair Abe Levine called the meeting to order at 6:05 p.m.

Present: Maren Anderson, Cindy Hoffman, Abe Levine, David Dyer, Yonah Davis, Mohamud Mohamed
Absent: Bruce Browning, Rolf Peterson
Staff: Jermaine Wheeler, Jacque Smith, John McHugh, Clint Pires

2. **Adoption of agenda**
No changes to the agenda. Motion by David Dyer, second by Cindy Hoffman to approve agenda; all voted in favor of approval.

3. **Approval of minutes: March 13, 2019**
No changes. Motion by Mohamud Mohamed, second by Cindy Hoffman; all voted in favor of approval.

4. **Unofficial minutes for information only (no vote required). There were no changes to the minutes.**
   a. May 7, 2019
   b. June 11, 2019

5. **Public comment:** none

6. **A brief history of fiber and futures in St. Louis Park (Clint Pires)**
Pires suggested this be deferred to next meeting in the interest of time. The commission members agreed.

7. **Communications from the chair/commissioners**
   a. May 7 workshop
      Members present agreed they were familiar with the information from May 7.
   b. June 11 subcommittee meeting
      No comments on this; notes in the packet from this non-official meeting (less than a quorum present).
   c. Outcome of June 24 meeting with city council
      Levine shared that he, Browning and Pires were present at the meeting. He said the only point of discussion was related to having a council member at the commission meetings. The directive was to go forward as the commission had decided on June 11. Abe stated the council was satisfied with the direction of the commission. Pires noted several council members liked the committee structure and to come back to the council quarterly or so; or whenever there was something to discuss/report.

8. **Election of chair/vice chair for remainder of 2019**
Smith shared an email from Browning related to allowing Chair Levine to be considered as chair for a second one-year term. Levine said the role of the chair is to set up meetings and to run the meetings. There will be more work to do with committee work and coordinating information as well
as communicating with council. Chair should work with Pires and Smith on what will be said to
council and how to present it. Pires said that’s a great approach, but staff will let the chair know
what’s needed on the agenda from an official business standpoint. From there staff will provide a
skeleton agenda and let the chair fill in the rest. Levine thought we could agree on a framework for
each meeting, then items from staff could be added in.

Levine asked for volunteers who would like to be chair; Levine offered to serve as chair. Pires
suggested that as we go forward with additional changes, let the council know who is serving as
chair.

Dyer motion to have Levine continue as chair until the December 2019 meeting; Mohamed
seconded. All voted in favor.

Commission members asked who was vice chair. Smith said the most recent vice chair was Nathan
Munson who is no longer with the commission. Dyer motioned that Cindy Hoffman be vice chair;
second by Maren Anderson, all voted in favor.

9. Presentation from election staff on ranked-choice voting
Michael Sund from city elections staff gave a presentation about ranked-choice voting. He asked the
commission members about how results and tabulation should be presented. Dyer suggested use of
social media the day after polls close. Sund said that Minneapolis announced on Twitter, then posts
on website. McHugh suggested a sign at polling places that counting would take place at 8 a.m. the
following day. Hoffman said Carver County did the counting the night of the election. Sund
explained the initial machine count will be posted that night; but if no one receives 50% there will
be a manual count the next day. Sund invited the commission to attend the Sept. 17 mock election.

10. Review proposed changes to bylaws
Smith suggested 1.1 should read “Commission members voted Aug. 7, 2019, to reorganize as the
Community Technology Advisory Commission.”

Dyer suggested 2.1 should read “There shall be at least seven members...” Pires pointed out that the
commission can have non-commission members on committees, etc.

Hoffman mentioned that in 2.2 commission should be small C.

Dyer suggested that in 3.1 the language be changed to read “A regular election shall be held at the
first meeting following city council boards and commissions appointments in May.”

Pires pointed out 3.2 and asked if the commission would like to change. Levine suggested a caveat,
...“unless otherwise voted on by the commission.” There was discussion of what “consecutive”
means. The language will read, “The term for officers shall be one year and the chair may serve for
up to two consecutive years.”

Levine noted that 4.2 should be changed to “A majority of commissioners shall constitute a
quorum...”

The commission agreed with striking 4.3 as simple majorities aren’t required.
The commission agreed with the change to 5.3.

5.2 can be removed as there’s no reason for an annual meeting.

Levine asked about meeting time and if that needs to be specified. Pires said there is language to allow for changes.

5.4 there was discussion about why only one day’s notice for commissioners for special meetings. Pires recalled it was from a time when postal mail was the way to notify people officially. Staff will check in with the city clerk on language for this item to see if it can or should be changed; if it can preference would be notice is given at the same time meeting is posted officially.

Motion to approve the slate of changes for the bylaws by Dyer; Hoffman seconded. All voted in favor.

11. Changes to code
Smith explained that city code language has been simplified so that commission can be nimble and make changes as needed to their work.

Dyer moved to permit staff to amend the code section 2 per direction by city clerk’s office. Mohamed seconded. All approved.

Anderson moved to approve the revisions to city code as presented. Davis seconded. All approved.

12. Review/approve work plan for 2019
Levine asked if the commission wanted to decide committees at another meeting; the commission agreed. Hoffman moved to approve the work plan as presented. Davis seconded. All voted in favor.

13. Staff items
Staff will check on any applications for a new youth member, which was due August 1.

Pires asked who would attend the August 14, 2:30 p.m. Verizon meeting; Browning, Levine and Mohamed plan to attend. Since there is not a quorum expected no official notice has to be posted of the meeting.

Levine proposed a meeting on September 10, 6 p.m. to tackle the commission’s next item on establishing subcommittees. He asked if commission members would be willing to be part of more than one committee; there was general agreement to this. Levine suggested that not much can be done on committees until community engagement is done and he wants to do exploration on how they can learn more from the community. Pires recapped by saying the commission wants to do some exploration, which will at the same time serve other items on the workplan.

Levine didn’t think the commission was ready to form committees. Pires explained the change of a city department from inspections to building and energy to encompass climate action plan and sustainability.

Levine asked that everyone think about main components of community to which the commission should do outreach. Next meeting is Sept. 10 to review that input. Commission members should
send their ideas to jsmith@stlouispark.org by Tuesday, Sept. 3. Idea is to figure out what it means to get input from the community. Other homework is to review a list from Browning that has ideas for several committees; commission members weren’t familiar with this list so Levine said he would email it to Smith, who will then send it to the commission. Dyer reminded commission members to be careful emailing, and that “replying all” or having conversation by email about official commission business could violate open meeting laws. Smith and Pires agreed and thanked Dyer for providing that reminder to the commission.

Pires said he wanted to bring up one item regarding fiber. Since 2005 the city has installed fiber conduit whenever a street is reconstructed; that has contributed to the 50 miles of fiber in the community. In 2012, a study by CTC consultants helped determine what to do with excess fiber and how to lease the fiber. For the first time, in 2020 the city is considering not putting fiber conduit into the ground during these projects. The reason is primarily financial as the city looks to manage the property tax levy amount. Pires said the city manager and city council will be interested in how the commission would react to that.

Dyer stated this seems to be against everything the commission is trying to accomplish. Pires pointed out that conduit laid in the Sorensen neighborhood was recently leased back to US Internet to provide service in that area. Anderson asked if enough money was recouped to cover the cost of installation of the conduit. Pires said they do a trade, it’s not monetary. Hoffman asked about the demographic of the neighborhood and raised concerns about perceptions of inequities if this practice is discontinued going forward.

Dyer said it’s difficult to know how to respond to this proposed change without understanding the entire picture and what pressures are on the finances.

Pires understands the commission direction is to look for more opportunities with outside vendors to expand in St. Louis Park and to look at alternative ways to provide same infrastructure but with private vendors.

Levine made a motion that the commission believes high speed data communication is important to the future of the city, and where costs are prohibitive to provide fiber, the city will look at alternative business models and technologies that can or will provide equivalent capabilities to fiber. Hoffman seconded the motion. All voted in favor.

14. Adjournment
Hoffman moved to adjourn the meeting, Dyer seconded. All voted in favor. Meeting adjourned at 8:05 p.m.
Executive summary

Title: Environment and Sustainability Commission (ESC) Quarterly Report

Recommended action: This is a quarterly report from the ESC to provide information to the council to highlight and focus on environmental and sustainability activities and opportunities for the city.

Policy consideration: None currently. Attached is a memo from the ESC members to the city council. The ESC would like to foster a regular communication with the city council and will submit memos 4-6 times throughout the year.

Summary: There are three categories in the attached memo discussing positive steps, concerns and awareness items. The positive steps include being supportive of the city department reorganization with additional resources being put toward climate action and sustainability, particularly the Efficient Building ordinance (also known as Benchmarking). Concerns include focusing on businesses. The commission also recommends three key areas of focus including business engagement, residential engagement and measurement for the Climate Action Plan (CAP). Awareness concerns include the declaration of a climate emergency by many governments and organizations; focusing actions not just words, but actions to address the urgency of climate change; needing more than just individual actions from city departments in an emergency; and catalyzing response by joining with the county and state level to declare a climate emergency.

Financial or budget considerations: Not applicable.

Strategic priority consideration: St. Louis Park is committed to continue to lead in environmental stewardship.

Supporting documents: ESC memo to city council

Prepared by: Meg J. McMonigal, principal planner
Reviewed by: Brian Hoffman, building and energy director
Approved by: Tom Harmening, city manager
MEMO

From: Environment & Sustainability Commission
To: St. Louis Park City Council
Approved: August 7, 2019

Re: ESC report to Council, August 2019

As discussed in our April 22 meeting with City Council, we would like to foster a better, more regular connection between Council and the Environment & Sustainability Commission (ESC) to advance sustainability and environmental stewardship throughout the city. The ESC plans to regularly (every 2-3 months) submit memos to the Council to keep them apprised of progress and possible opportunities for improvement. We would be open to discussing the topics with City Council members individually or at an upcoming meeting, as these memos are meant to encourage dialogue and collaboration to advance our collective goal.

Below, we have outlined some areas of work where we see positive steps being made, where we have some concerns, and what we would like to bring to the attention of the Council.

Positive steps:
- We’re supportive of the reorganization Tom Harmening recently announced creating a Division of Sustainability within the Department of Building and Energy (formerly Inspection). While we’re happy to see additional resources on climate action, we’re especially encouraged to see climate action being woven into the fabric of existing departments, and we urge staff to continue to look for ways to do this. It’s our belief that climate work should not just require additional resources, but should primarily entail a re-examination of how existing departments function and integrate sustainability into their work (as opposed to a reliance on the new staff members).
- We’re excited to see progress on the building benchmarking ordinance, called the Efficient Building Program. It seems to be on track for approval by the end of the year or perhaps January.

Concerns:
- The ESC and Roots ’n Shoots started developing a business engagement program in 2018 with the goal of making connections with businesses in St. Louis Park and starting a conversation with them about the Climate Action Plan. The development, strategy, and implementation of a business engagement program has stalled, and we believe it should be a key focus of the city’s consultant and new Department of Building and Energy.
- We recommend staff revisit the consultant’s work plan and explore the focus and goals, as we have questions about the strategy and therefore the tactics being employed. With new sustainability staff coming on board, this is a great opportunity to rethink and elevate our work with the consultant. We recommend three key areas for focus: business engagement program, residential engagement program, and Climate Action Plan measurement.
Awareness:

● There is a global transition occurring, changing the way cities and countries talk about and respond to climate change. In fact, a “climate emergency” has been declared in 850 jurisdictions in 18 countries, covering 160 million people worldwide. In addition to formal declarations of emergency, many organizations are simply choosing to use words more in line with the seriousness of the threat, such as “climate crisis” and “existential threat.”

● Our focus should be on actions, not just words, but we feel that even with the Climate Action Plan in place, we are not responding with the urgency needed, and we are not operating the city like it’s an emergency.

● In an emergency, we can not rely on promoting individual actions when systems change is the only truly effective option. In an emergency, we would be mobilizing resources at a much faster rate and we would be calling ‘all hands on deck’ from every city department.

● We understand that we cannot address this alone, but there is power in a city like ours catalyzing a response at the local, county, or state level. Could we convince Hennepin County or other cities to join us in a declaration of climate emergency?