

CITY OF LAUDERDALE, MINNESOTA

TARGET SETTING SESSION

AUGUST 8, 1992

FACILITATOR: JAMES F. MILLER

COMMITMENTS FOR EFFECTIVE GOAL SETTING

- **PARTICIPATE**
- **BE CANDID**
- **BE CONSTRUCTIVE**
- **BE IMPERSONAL**
- **ACCEPT OWNERSHIP**

IF A CITY TEAM IS GOING TO BE SUCCESSFUL, GOALS ARE CRITICAL

GOALS SHOULD:

- **PROVIDE COMMUNITY DIRECTION FOR THE FUTURE**
 - **REDUCE CRISIS MANAGEMENT**
 - **REDUCE PERSONAL CONFLICT**
 - **INCREASE OWNERSHIP OF DECISIONS**
 - **INCREASE PROBLEM RECOGNITION**
 - **ENSURE CONTINUITY OF ACTION**

- **INCREASE PERFORMANCE**
 - **DIFFERENTIATE BETWEEN WHAT IS DOABLE AND WHAT ISN'T**
 - **PRIORITIZE WORKLOAD**
 - **EVALUATE ESSENTIAL PERFORMANCE**

GOALS SHOULD:

● **BUILD A CITY TEAM**

- ENHANCES UNDERSTANDING OF ROLES
- BUILDS TRUST AND OPENNESS
- CONCENTRATES ON PROBLEM SOLVING
- CLARIFIES ACCOUNTABILITY

● **INCREASE PRIDE AND CONFIDENCE**

- PERMITS AND ENCOURAGES COUNCIL TO LEAD
- IMPROVES CONFIDENCE IN GOVERNMENT
- ENHANCES COMMUNITY SUPPORT AND RESOURCES

**GOALS:
A FOUNDATION FOR EFFECTIVENESS**

GOALS CAN BE DIVIDED INTO THREE ELEMENTS:

- **VISION** **STRATEGIC PLAN FOR THE COMMUNITY'S
FUTURE**

- **TARGETS** **SPECIFIC ACTIONS TO BE ADDRESSED
WITHIN THE LIFE CYCLE OF THIS COUNCIL**

- **ACTION PLANS** **STRATEGY OF WHAT IS DESIRED,
WHAT WILL BE DONE,
WHO WILL DO IT,
AND WHEN.**

ISSUES HANDLED EFFECTIVELY

<u>ISSUE</u>	<u>COUNCIL</u>	<u>STAFF</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
HIRING FULL-TIME ADMINISTRATOR	4	2	6
ROAD TURN BACK	4		4
TIF REFINANCING	1	1	2
ROSEVILLE CIRCULATOR	1	1	2
COUNCIL TEAMWORK		2	2
NEW TRACTOR	1		1
AUDIT	1		1
COUNCIL MEETING EFFECTIVENESS	1		1
	13	6	

ISSUES MOST FEEL GOOD ABOUT

- **CITY ADMINISTRATOR - CREATING POSITION AND HIRING**
 - **TOOK COURAGE**
 - **RESPONDED QUICKLY**
 - + **ADEQUATE INFORMATION**
 - + **OPTIONS**
 - **RESULTED IN COST SAVINGS**
 - + **MORE FOCUSED STAFF**

(COUNCIL IMPRESSED BY PROCESS - STAFF BY IMPACT)

ISSUES MOST FEEL GOOD ABOUT

- **ROAD TURNBACK**

- **A REAL EXAMPLE OF TEAMWORK - COUNCIL, STAFF, COMMUNITY**
- **"LITTLE ENGINE THAT COULD" SYNDROME**

(IDENTIFIED BY COUNCIL, NOT STAFF)

ISSUES HANDLED INEFFECTIVELY

<u>ISSUE</u>	<u>COUNCIL</u>	<u>STAFF</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
PARKING ORDINANCE	2	1	3
BRIMHALL SCHOOL REQUEST	2	1	3
ROSEHILL POND	1		1
CODE REVISION	1		1
INFRASTRUCTURE	1		1
BUDGET	1		1
TRUSBILT	1		1
1858 WALNUT STREET		1	1
COUNCIL REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION		1	1
COUNCIL PLAYING FAVORITES		1	1
COUNCIL INVOLVEMENT IN OPERATIONS		1	1
STAFF REORGANIZATION		1	1

**ISSUES NOT EVERYONE
FEELS GOOD ABOUT**

● **PARKING ORDINANCE**

- **REASONS CITED:**

- + **HISTORY OF BEING INEFFECTIVE**
- + **ALWAYS BEEN A DIFFICULT ISSUE - LACK OF GOOD OPTIONS**
- + **FEAR OF PUBLIC REACTION**
- + **PERSONAL BIAS**
- + **UNWILLINGNESS OF COUNCIL TO STAND BEHIND**
- + **NOT AS IMPORTANT AS OTHER ISSUES**
- + **EMPLOYEE CONFLICTS**
- + **LACK OF CLEAR GOAL**

**ISSUES NOT EVERYONE
FEELS GOOD ABOUT**

- **PARKING ORDINANCE**
- **RAISES THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS:**
 - + **HAVE YOU ADEQUATELY IDENTIFIED THE ISSUE?**
 - + **HAVE YOU ACHIEVED CONSENSUS ON THE ISSUE?**
 - + **DO YOU HAVE THE ABILITY TO SOLVE THE PROBLEM?**
 - + **DO YOU HAVE THE WILLINGNESS TO SOLVE THE PROBLEM?**
 - + **IS THE TIMING APPROPRIATE OR SHOULD YOU WAIT UNTIL EFFECTIVENESS OF COUNCIL TEAM IMPROVES?**

**ISSUES THAT NOT EVERYONE
FEELS GOOD ABOUT**

- **REQUEST FOR FUNDING - BRIMHALL SCHOOL**
 - **REASONS CITED:**
 - **NOT ENOUGH TIME TO MAKE GOOD DECISION**
 - **MISSED OPPORTUNITY TO COOPERATE WITH ROSEVILLE/FALCON HEIGHTS**
 - **CREATED A NEGATIVE IMPRESSION**
 - **LACK OF DECISION OWNERSHIP**

**ISSUES THAT NOT EVERYONE
FEELS GOOD ABOUT**

- **REQUEST FOR FUNDING - BRIMHALL SCHOOL**
 - **RAISES THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS:**
 - **DID YOU ANALYZE THE IMPLICATIONS OF THE OPTIONS?**
 - **DOES THE STRUCTURE OF COUNCIL MEETINGS AFFORD EFFICIENT AND ORDERLY DEBATE OF ISSUES?**
 - **ARE ISSUES GENERALLY PRESENTED IN A TIMELY FASHION?**
 - **SHOULD THERE BE MORE ATTENTION TO DEFINING UPCOMING AGENDAS?**

**ISSUES HANDLED WITH
MIXED PERCEPTIONS**

<u>ISSUE</u>	COUNCIL		STAFF	
	<u>EFFECTIVELY</u>	<u>INEFFECTIVELY</u>	<u>EFFECTIVELY</u>	<u>INEFFECTIVELY</u>
EMPLOYEE TERMINATION	3	2	2	
ALLEYS	1			1

ISSUES HANDLED WITH MIXED PERCEPTIONS

- **TERMINATION OF EMPLOYEE**
 - **EFFECTIVE REASONS:**
 - + **COUNCIL, STAFF, ATTORNEY WORKED TOGETHER**
 - + **TOOK ADEQUATE TIME**
 - + **IDENTIFIED AND CAREFULLY EXAMINED OPTIONS**
 - + **REMAINED UNIFIED**
 - + **HANDLED PROFESSIONALLY**

ISSUES HANDLED WITH MIXED PERCEPTIONS

- **TERMINATION OF EMPLOYEE**
 - **INEFFECTIVE REASONS:**
 - + **CHAIN OF COMMAND WAS AMBIGUOUS**
 - + **INADEQUATE PERSONNEL POLICIES**
 - + **INFORMATION NOT PRESENTED BEFORE THERE WAS
NO RECOURSE**
 - **RAISES THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS:**
 - + **ARE REPORTING RESPONSIBILITIES CLEAR?**
 - + **ARE JOB DESCRIPTIONS AND, THEREFORE, EXPECTATIONS
CLEAR AND PRECISE?**
 - + **ARE PERSONNEL POLICIES ADEQUATE?**

ISSUES HANDLED WITH MIXED PERCEPTIONS:

- **ALLEYS**
 - **EFFECTIVE REASONS:**
 - + **ACTED AS A TEAM**
 - + **NOT CONSTRAINED BY PAST COUNCIL DECISIONS**
 - **INEFFECTIVE REASON:**
 - + **PROCRASTINATION**
 - **RAISES THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS:**
 - + **WHAT ARE IMPLICATIONS IF YOU ADDRESS INFRASTRUCTURE AND/OR CODE ISSUES?**
 - + **HOW IMPORTANT IS THIS ISSUE?**
 - + **IS IT SOLVABLE?**

**ISSUES REQUIRING
ADDITIONAL ATTENTION**

- **COUNCIL STAFF RELATIONS**
 - **CLARIFYING ROLES**
 - **CLARIFYING EXPECTATIONS**
 - **DEVELOPING "TEAM CONCEPT"**

- **STRATEGIC PLAN**
 - **DO WE WANT TO BE/CAN WE BE A SEPARATE COMMUNITY?**
 - **IF SO, HOW WOULD IT BE DIFFERENT THAN TODAY?**
 - **WHAT ACHIEVABLE ACTIONS DO WE TAKE TO GET THERE?**

**ISSUES REQUIRING
ADDITIONAL ATTENTION**

- **COMMUNITY RELATIONS**
 - **MORE INVOLVEMENT IN FORMAL PROCESSES**

(PUBLIC HEARINGS, ETC.)
 - **USE OF CITIZEN TASK FORCES**
 - **ENHANCING COMMUNITY SPIRIT AND IDENTITY**

PRIORITIES

<u>ISSUE</u>	<u>COUNCIL</u>	<u>STAFF</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
1. BUDGET	3	4	7
2. INFRASTRUCTURE PLANS	2	3	5
3. ORDINANCES	3	1	4
4. STAFFING	1	2	3
5. COUNCIL/STAFF RELATIONS	1	2	3
6. COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT	2		2
7. PUBLIC SAFETY	2		2
8. HIRING NEW ATTORNEY	1		1
9. ROSEHILL POND	1		1

PRIORITIES

<u>ISSUE</u>	<u>COUNCIL</u>	<u>STAFF</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
10. PARKING ORDINANCE	1		1
11. PARK BOARD	1		1
12. PERSONNEL POLICIES	1		1
13. HOUSING DETERIORATION	1		1
14. INDEPENDENCE OF LAUDERDALE	1		1
15. RELATIONS WITH OTHER COMMUNITIES		1	1
16. ALLEYS		1	1

PRIORITY ISSUES

BUDGET

- **PREPARATION**
- **CONTENT/FORM**
- **POLICY ISSUES (TAX LEVY, ETC.)**
- **SERVICE DELIVERY EFFICIENCY**

PRIORITY ISSUES

INFRASTRUCTURE PLANS

- **ASSESSMENT OF CURRENT CONDITION**
- **IDENTIFICATION OF NEEDS**
- **REALISTIC FINANCING PLAN**
 - **PROPERTY TAXES**
 - **MSA**
 - **UTILITY CHARGES**
- **SOMEWHAT DEPENDENT ON STRATEGIC PLAN**

PRIORITY ISSUES

ORDINANCES

- **PRIORITIZE CONCERNS**
- **REVIEW AND UPDATE ON A REASONABLE SCHEDULE**
- **ENFORCEABLE**
- **LINKED TO STRATEGIC PLAN OR SPECIFIC ISSUES
(HOUSING, ETC.)**

PRIORITY ISSUES

STAFFING

- **TIMING**
 - **LOSS OF STAFF MEANS DECLINE IN OUTPUT**
 - **MAY NEED TIME TO ASSESS NEEDS**
- **LOSS OF ORGANIZATION'S MEMORY**
 - **NEED FOR SYSTEMS TO PROVIDE ONGOING CONTINUITY**
 - **OPPORTUNITY TO FIND NEW WAYS OF OPERATING**
- **MORALE**
- **IMPACT ON COUNCIL/STAFF RELATIONSHIP**
- **DEVELOPMENT**

PRIORITY ISSUES

COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

- **POSITIVE EXAMPLES:**
 - **ROSEVILLE CIRCULATOR**
 - **NEWSLETTER**
 - **DAY IN PARK**
- **UNTAPPED RESOURCE**
- **HOW DO YOU DEVELOP AN INTEREST**

PRIORITY ISSUES

PUBLIC SAFETY

- **INCREASING COST/% OF BUDGET**
- **SERVICE EXPECTATIONS**
- **OPTIONS**

PRIORITY ISSUES

COUNCIL/STAFF RELATIONS

- **IMPACT OF PERSONNEL TRANSITION**
- **OWNERSHIP OF DECISIONS**
- **OPPORTUNITIES FOR INCREASED CONTACT
AND COMMUNICATION**

MUNICIPAL ACTION PLAN

MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL
CITY OF MINNETONKA
MARCH, 1985

Investment Policy

I. DESIRED OUTCOMES

- A. Definition of investment policy for Minnetonka
- B. Reconstitute Financial Advisory Group to assist in development of investment policy

II. ACTION STEPS

- Step 1: Staff to develop a charge to Financial Advisory Group
- Step 2: Create Financial Advisory Group to assist in developing investment policy
- Step 3: Council review of recommended investment policy
- Step 4: Council decision on investment policy
- Step 5: Staff implementation of policy

TARGET ISSUE NO 90-2

CIVIC CENTER

I. Target

To complete a review of the Civic Center Master Plan to include a traffic analysis which will examine the need for alternate access to the Civic Center site. To make decisions regarding the City Hall/Ice Arena parking lot reconstruction project, and acquisition of the Minneapolis Junior Academy and identify and prioritize other improvements/facilities for the Civic Center.

II. Desired Outcomes

- A. Complete review of the Park Board's recommendation regarding the Civic Center Master Plan.
- B. Review traffic analysis and reach decision regarding need for alternate access to the site.
- C. Decide whether to proceed with the construction of an expanded and improved City Hall/Ice Arena parking lot.
- D. Negotiate for the acquisition or option to purchase the Minneapolis Junior Academy.
- E. Determine whether to construct other improvements/facilities (swimming pool, nature center) at the Civic Center and include them in the Capital Improvements Program.

III. Evaluation Criteria

- A. Adoption of a revised Civic Center Master Plan and determination regarding the need for an alternate access to the Civic Center.
- B. Decision regarding the construction of the City Hall/Ice Arena parking area.
- C. Development of a strategy regarding the acquisition of the Minneapolis Junior Academy.
- D. Preparation of an implementation plan and financing strategy for various Civic Center improvements/facilities for inclusion in the City's Capital Improvements Program.

IV. Discussion

Development of the Civic Center has been a Target Issue for the City Council during the past several years. In 1988 the Target consisted of a decision regarding the replacement of the "Bubble" and conducting a review of the Civic Center Master Plan. During 1989, the Council decided to replace the "Bubble" with a permanent auxiliary Ice Arena. This facility was constructed between May and October and was completed on schedule and within budget.

The Council also asked the Park Board to review the Civic Center Master Plan to determine whether various improvements/facilities included in the plan are still appropriate after five years. The Park Board completed its review and presented it to the City Council at the 1989 Work Session. The Park Board recommended several modifications to the original Master Plan including:

1. Acquisition of the Minneapolis Junior Academy to serve as the City's recreation facility,
2. Construction of a family-oriented outdoor swimming complex,
3. Completion of the City Hall/Ice Arena parking lot reconstruction project, and
4. Possibly incorporating a Nature Center into the Civic Center area.

The Park Board also recommended the amphitheater and large group picnic areas be deleted from the original Master Plan design.

After receiving the Park Board's report regarding the Master Plan, the City Council requested that Martin & Pitz review their recommendations to determine whether the suggested modifications could be accommodated on the site. In addition, Council also expressed concern about the traffic level from the Civic Center area and asked that the need for an alternate access into the Civic Center be reviewed. Martin & Pitz is nearing completion of its review of the Park Board's recommendations regarding the Master Plan. The City also retained Benschhoff & Associates to perform an independent traffic analysis and review alternate access options for the Civic Center area.

Once the City Council receives the results of Martin & Pitz' review and the independent traffic analysis, it will be important for the City to identify and prioritize the improvements/facilities that they would like included within the revised Master Plan. Once these are determined, the City Council can adopt a revised Master Plan. While some of the projects are presently included in the City's Five Year Capital Improvement Program, the Council may wish to establish different priorities for these projects. Presently, the parking lot reconstruction is planned for 1990, and other projects such as the acquisition of the Junior Academy or construction of a recreation center and an outdoor swimming pool are scheduled for future years.

Interestingly, based on a Community Survey, there appears to be support for all of the facilities at the Civic Center that were recommended by the Park Board. Construction of a recreation center, nature center, and both indoor and outdoor swimming pools were supported by the majority of citizens responding to the Survey. The support for these facilities is even stronger if they could be built without tax increases.

V. Policy Decisions and Actions

- Action No. 1: December 13, 1989 Work Session - Council reviews report from Martin & Pitz regarding the Park Board's recommendations for the Civic Center Master Plan and the independent traffic analysis of the Civic Center by Benschhoff & Associates.
- Action No. 2: January, 1990 - Adoption of the revised Civic Center Master Plan,
- Action No. 3: February, 1990 - Adoption of the 1990-1994 Capital Improvements Program which includes a prioritization of various facilities/improvements for the Civic Center area.
- Action No. 4: March, 1990 - Authorization to hire a firm to prepare design plans for the construction of the City Hall/Ice Arena parking lot reconstruction.

Target Issue No. 90-2
Page Four

Action No. 5: June, 1990 - Approval of bids for the
City Hall/Ice Arena parking lot
construction project.