

Maple Grove Citizens Advisory Committee

Meeting Minutes

July 13, 2016

Call to Order	The meeting was called to order by CAC member Bob Joiner at 7:02 p.m.		
Members Present	Nkechi Anyamele Leslie Bender Stephen Gill Harry Kennedy Karen Nickolauson Stephanie Walvatne	John Beacham John Burgard Lorraine Gresser Joan Masberg Joe Picket	Adam Bedard Katie Cohen Bob Joiner Meg Miller Don Skoglund
Members Absent	Tim Klevar, Steven Maas, Kevin Rebman		
Others Present	Councilmember Erik Johnson and CAC Staff Liaison Mike Opatz		
Minutes	Motion made and seconded to approve the minutes from the June 8, 2016, meeting of the Citizens Advisory Committee. Motion passed.		
Area Reports	<p>Water meter repair (Lorraine Gresser): Repair representative hired by the City showed up at the house with no advanced notice, which would have been appreciated. Said that if no one had been home, he would have left a card to set a time to return.</p> <p>Lack of lighting in tunnel that runs under Weaver Lake Road connecting Central Park area to south and residential area to north. Mike Opatz stated this had been addressed previously and he would look back to see what the response was at that time.</p>		
Review Resident Survey Questions	<p>The meeting will include a conference call with a representative from National Research Center (NRC) to review the draft survey questions and the changes that were incorporated from question review and revisions made at the June CAC meeting.</p> <p>Prior to that call, the committee started their review question by question.</p> <p>Questions 1, 2 and 3 were fine and would stay as is.</p> <p>Question 4: With regard to the item regarding “Visited the Basketball Gyms at Maple Grove Junior High School,” the suggestion was made to change the word “Visited” to “Used” which would follow the wording for the Sports Dome item in this section. Also, change the word “Junior” to “Middle”.</p> <p>Questions 5 and 6 were fine and would stay as is.</p>		

Question 7: It was said that City Administrator Nelson had concerns about removing the four “Job” questions. Discussion ensued about the wording and use of the term “Maple Grove government” as well as keeping the section of Council responding to citizen concerns. NRC will be asked their thoughts on removing these four items, particularly as it relates to benchmark purposes.

Question 8: Removed at June CAC meeting.

Questions 9, 10, 11 were fine and would stay as is.

Questions 12, 13, 14: Removed at June CAC meeting.

Question 15: Discussion took place on the wording, and it was decided to review with NRC on the conference call.

Mike Opatz provided a handout regarding NRC’s survey methodology. He stated the different colors for the survey represents the mailing wave, i.e., first mailing, second mailing. NRC said they can divide the City into four quadrants.

He stated that City Administrator Nelson is interested in an open web survey. NRC said they can break out the results from the standard mail survey as well as those obtained from the open web survey. NRC feels that achieving 400 responses would still be a valid survey.

The conference call with NRC representative Morgan was initiated with brief introductions made.

Morgan invited input and stated that in general changing wording can affect benchmarking as well as comparisons made to other cities.

Question 1: Brief review about adding the wording “As a place to live”. Morgan stated there is benchmarking for place to live in comparison to other cities.

Question 2: Regarding the employment opportunities. More specifics could be added and Morgan was asked to make suggestions for breaking down by entry level to career level. She suggested that thought be given to how the information that is gathered will be used. The question was asked about changing employment opportunities to career opportunities. Mike Opatz will work with NRC who will send suggestions for creating a more detailed employment question.

Question 2: NRC agreed to the changes suggested for addressing bus travel.

Question 2: When asked, NRC recommended to leave in the word “Availability” for four questions which CAC had discussed removing at its June question review. All were in agreement to keep as is.

Question 4: NRC will change the wording of the question to allow for the removal of the introductory phrases for each statement, for example, removing the word used, watched, visited.

Question 5: Break out sports fields to availability rather than quality. The question was asked of NRC if an “other” category can be added, and the answer was yes. Add qualifier to “Senior” to Sports Dome at Maple Grove High School

Question 6: Fine as is.

Question 7: Asked NRC about “government” questions and the wording as well as suggested removal. NRC stated these type of questions tell how engaged, responsive, and happy people are. Morgan said they are great to leave in and good for benchmarking.

She stated that NRC has a benchmark for interaction with City departments/staff member and that addresses knowledge and responsiveness of the staff.

The question was asked if the Police Department staff still does a survey with citizens with whom they have had interactions. It was not known, but an inquiry would be made to Police.

Questions 12, 13 and 14 are obsolete and will be removed.

Question 15: The suggestion was made to make this a possible two part question: 1) Do the citizens want an arts center? 2) Do they want to pay for it? Discussion ensued about how to word the question about taxpayer dollars/support.

The NRC rep stated that if there is no dollar amount, which there isn't at this time, then it is difficult to ask about funding. She stated the question could be asked in general to get the temperature of the respondents.

A suggestion was made of “Do you feel the City is lacking for arts programming?” Discussion took place and clarified that it would be City property tax dollars that would support an arts center.

NRC will craft appropriate wording to ask about an arts center/programming.

Question 20: The NRC rep stated that as it is currently worded, this question is too much of a catch all and answers received will be random—anything and everything. Suggestions were “What is single most top priority for City?” and “What is single most important change or improvement in next two to three years? NRC will fine tune the question.

With regard to an online/web survey, NRC rep Morgan explained the process and stated open participation is usually done after the scientific survey results are received. Providing this opportunity allows residents to feel they have a voice. NRC would provide the results to the open survey separately.

The question was asked about having kiosks in select locations to help control the open/web responses. NRC does not have this capability. There would also be a definite cost factor to doing so.

Discussion took place about non-residents taking the survey. The question was asked about survey respondents providing their address as an option. It appeared that NRC could have specific links for different areas. The idea was presented to possibly have paper copies of the survey at the Government Center and Community Center.

The Committee thanked Morgan for her time, assistance and guidance.

It is planned that the final form of the community survey will be presented to the City Council at its August 1st meeting to stay on track with survey schedule recommended by NRC. The next survey draft will be emailed to CAC members.

**Youth Sports
Subcommittee
Final Report
Review**

Draft of the final report was distributed to CAC and reviewed by subcommittee chair Harry Kennedy. He stated that it is in fairly final format but kept in draft mode so that CAC can bring up any concerns.

It was stated that it seems the report is more of a call to action for the Park Board rather than the City Council. The question was asked about how the report will get acted on. Input will be received from CAC and then make recommendations the Council can act on. The statement was made about how the associations may react upon receiving the report. Councilmember Johnson suggested that CAC give Council direction to act on.

Discussion took place about presenting this information at a future City Council meeting. It was felt appropriate that CAC provide a five-minute overview of the findings at a Council meeting, but a PowerPoint presentation will not be made. CAC Chair Joiner and the Youth Sports Subcommittee members would attend the Council meeting.

CAC members should send any comments on the Youth Sports Final Report to Mike Opatz.

Other Matters

The suggestion was made for CAC members to think about future department presentations they would like to have. Next CAC meeting will be September 14th.

Adjournment

Motion made and seconded to adjourn the July 13, 2016, Citizens Advisory Committee. The meeting adjourned at 9:09 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Carol Morris
Minute Secretary