Whether real or perceived, incidents of incivility in local governments in Minnesota and across the nation seem to be on the rise. The reasons may vary but clearly mayors, city councilmembers, county commissioners, city and county staff, and even citizens make decisions every day that influence whether our city halls and county courthouses are places for dialogue, deliberation, and collaborative decision making, or whether they are combat zones where politics is practiced with a win-at-all-costs ferocity.

**A story to illustrate…**

*In preparing for a strategic plan related to redevelopment, the staff of a suburban city concluded the community currently had too much parkland to be maintained for the size of the population. Several individuals with complaints against the city and city staff decided to run for office, mobilizing concerned citizens around a message that the city wanted to give away their parks and that city hall couldn’t be trusted. Neither the staff nor the sitting councilmembers saw the firestorm coming and didn’t have a counter message ready. It being an off-year election with voter turnout at less than 20 percent, the new members took over a majority of the council seats.*

A tumultuous period followed the election. The council was divided with every issue a major debate and tug-of-war between the new and old factions. There was little, if any, trust between staff and council. The city manager was fired and 47 other employees left in a two-year period including 70 percent of management level staff. Numerous personnel-related lawsuits were filed, costing the League of Minnesota Cities Insurance Trust over $3 million in defense and damages costs. The city almost lost LMCIT coverage and did have its deductibles raised substantially.

A few years later a new council majority took office with the goal of restoring order and civility to city operations. But costs and impacts of that period of incivility continue even seven years after these events. Several years later developers, bond rating agencies, government grantors, and even state legislators still inquire about the city’s political stability when deciding whether to grant its requests.

Cities throughout Minnesota and the country have experienced periods of incivility or at least conditions that suggest incivility is brewing. They stem from a variety of actions by elected officials, city staff, and residents. Some recent examples include:

- A developing city experienced political and organizational turbulence after a large and controversial redevelopment project went into foreclosure, putting the city and its taxpayers at significant financial risk. The newly elected council came with a strong ideological bend that government is inherently bad but found that it was ultimately unable to resolve community issues or govern effectively.

- The credibility of the city and city officials was put in serious jeopardy by indictment of a city elected official for shoplifting and the misuse of a city credit card by a senior member of the administrative staff.
An individual, who had previous code enforcement issues with the city, was elected to office in part by citizens who felt it was just “time for a change.” The new mayor subsequently took control by using what can best be described as bullying tactics to demean and intimidate other members of the city council and city staff.

Meetings in a small rural city became so contentious that the council was unable to even approve the minutes of the previous meeting.

A county commission had no turnover in membership for over 10 years. When a new commissioner with a different philosophy and policy agenda was successful in being elected she was “welcomed” in private with sexist and otherwise highly inappropriate remarks and, in public, with ridicule for her uninformed ideas.

The city administrator of a small community was told by the new mayor that the administrator’s role would be reduced to only overseeing recreational grants while he (the mayor) would be taking over daily supervision of all other city functions.

A new medical campus promised a sorely needed boost for an economically distressed metropolitan area in another Midwestern state, but approval for the supporting infrastructure was delayed for over a year when personal attacks and vulgar language at public meetings were so overwhelming that meetings had to be stopped.

The long-term city clerk of a small town informed a new city councilmember that she had no right of access to any city records.

After assertively expressing her own opinions at a council meeting, an elected official proceeded to “tune out” the comments of her council colleagues while she visibly checked e-mails and text messages on her smart phone.

All of these real life stories are but a few examples of the incidences of “incivility” happening in the local governments across Minnesota and the nation on a seemingly more frequent basis.

**Introduction**

Lively debate on the issues has always been a hallmark of democratic government. And it’s healthy. But when disagreements deteriorate into personal attacks, leading to government that is unable to deal with pressing issues, a boundary has been crossed. Many would label this phenomenon as incivility, even if the term can be difficult to pin down.

To avoid being alarmist it must be acknowledged that, at any given time, the vast majority of Minnesota cities and counties are doing just fine. Most governing bodies are functioning effectively; outstanding services are being delivered to citizens. And those citizens are largely satisfied. Recent polling data from the Minnesota firm Decision Resources found that local government continues to win far more confidence from its citizens than does the federal or state governments. Citizens rated local government higher on professional conduct, as being more accessible for meaningful citizen input, notable for representing people “like me,” and having a
higher trust level to do “what’s right.” A nationwide poll by the Pew Research Center from March 2013 showed a similar trend, with 63 percent of respondents holding a favorable view of their local governments. By comparison, only nine percent gave leaders in Washington a favorable rating according to a recent Gallup poll, the lowest rating ever.

But it is also true that, at any given time, there seems to be an increasing number of cities and counties in the news where things have deteriorated to the point where relationships and interactions between people have become toxic. Whether this seeming increase is real or just a perception driven by the 24 hour news cycle and the expanding use of social media, local officials are increasingly alarmed. Gather with public officials anywhere these days and civility, or the lack thereof, is on everyone’s minds. Most government conferences now include sessions, if not entire tracks, on the topic. The League of Minnesota Cities’ 2013 Annual Conference included a two-part session entitled, “Civility: Where Did it Go, How Do You Recapture it, and Why is Having it so Important to Your Success?” Extra seating had to be brought in to accommodate the standing-room-only crowd. Further, many attendees continued the conversation after the session concluded and throughout the rest of the conference, there was a tangible buzz about the topic.

The term “incivility” is itself broad, referring to a wide variety of behaviors, and probably subject to a lot of individual interpretation. Incivility can be hard to define but is one of those things that most people say they recognize when they see it or feel it. More practically, when local officials talk about incivility they seem to be referring to everything from how members of the governing body interact with and treat each other, to deteriorating relationships, insensitivity and downright abusive behavior between the elected officials and city staff, to even how community residents treat their elected officials and too often each other in public settings.

Conversely civility is marked by individuals that understand their roles and respect the process. One can be very effective even when working among differences. Incivility is not equal to conflict, dissent or disagreement. It’s about how conflict, dissent, or disagreement is handled. It matters because civility provides an important foundation on which to work through differences of opinion and still accomplish things. Civility is a tool for working with strongly held different views, not a way to silence or ignore them. Leaders that espouse civility can have robust debate, and make better decisions. A divided government body or a divided community that uses the tactics of incivility will face significant difficulties in governing and reaching its goals.

**Background on Task Force**

In considering the emerging needs of Minnesota cities, in 2012 the League of Minnesota Cities (LMC) Board of Directors identified “improved civility” as one its highest three priorities. At about the same time, the Board of Directors of the Minnesota City/County Management Association (MCMA), the professional association of the appointed chief executive officers and top assistants working in Minnesota’s cities and counties, independently identified the same priority. Consequently, LMC and MCMA formed a joint Civility Task Force, to study and make recommendations to both organizations on ways to pursue this sometimes elusive goal. While the focus has been on cities and counties, it is the Task Force’s impression that civility issues are of concern in counties, school districts, townships and other units of local government as well.
Members of the Task Force were chosen to represent a wide range of perspectives from local elected officials, staff, and the staff of local government associations who have personally dealt with specific, pronounced, and sometimes prolonged instances where incivility has essentially immobilized, or at least seriously compromised, the ability of a local government to act with confidence. A roster of Task Force members is available in the Appendix.

Over a series of six meetings the Task Force heard stories from several specific jurisdictions and met with a variety of individuals with different perspectives on civility.

- Doug Anderson, former mayor, city of Dayton
- Dave Bartholomay, Mediation Services for Anoka County
- Stacy Doepner-Hove, president, League of Women Voters Minnesota
- Troy Gilchrist, local government attorney, Kennedy and Graven
- Dan Greensweig, assistant director, League of Minnesota Cities Insurance Trust
- Grace Keliher, Minnesota School Boards Association
- Sharon Klumpp, Springsted Associates
- Bill Morris, Decision Resources
- Heidi Nelson, city administrator, City of Wayzata
- Kathy Quick, assistant professor, Humphrey School of Public Affairs
- Rhonda Sivarajah, Anoka County Board chair
- Lindsay Strand, Lindsay Strand Associates, Inc.
- Bill Thornton, deputy executive director, Georgia Municipal League (via phone)

**What contributes to incivility?**

Any plan to address incivility has to begin with a much firmer understanding of what can lead to it in the first place. As the Task Force listened to stories from individual cities and counties and reviewed research findings on the topic, frequent patterns in the indicators of incivility or pending incivility began to emerge:

- *Lack of Community Vision or Conflict Among Visions*: a tension arises in the community, either because there is no coherent vision for the community or there are competing visions of the future, and then erupts in the political arena in very personal and vitriolic ways. This seems to be especially common in developing areas around metropolitan edges where development pressures begin to clash with the existing rural lifestyle. It is important to note that conflict itself is not always problematic. Rather, how conflicting viewpoints are expressed can mean the difference between civil and uncivil exchanges.

- *Specific Development or Redevelopment Issue*: the planned or proposed sale of parkland, construction of an affordable housing project or community center, or special assessments for an infrastructure project ignites the passions of a particular neighborhood, or community segment, but then turns into a broader referendum on the confidence citizens have in the responsiveness of their local government.

- *Financial Crisis*: the city or county experiences a financial or infrastructure crisis that leads to fears of rapid tax or rate increases. A common example is the need to replace...
failing water or sanitary sewer systems in small communities. Another issue during the Great Recession has been paying for infrastructure that was built in anticipation of new development that didn’t happen. Financial crises frequently can be catalysts for blame shifting – “who caused this and how can we punish them” rather than “how can we work together to fix this.”

- **Hidden Agendas:** an individual or group that has a “bone to pick” with the local government – perhaps code enforcement or a personnel decision affecting them or a family member – latches onto to some other issue to try to prove how inept or ineffective the city or county is run and to seek retribution by strengthening their own political power base.

- **Role Confusion and Power Conflicts between Mayors (or County Board Chairs), Other Governing Body Members, and Staff:** new mayors may be elected thinking and behaving as if they are operating in a “strong mayor” system with more significant executive authority than they actually possess. New council members and county commissioners may not understand that the council/board is “one boss with five or seven members” and not a “group of five or seven individual bosses”. Staff may have similar thoughts of controlling the agenda from their respective positions. Either way, role confusion, unawareness of the differing perspectives of elected officials and staff, and lack of appreciation for the unique contributions of each can hamper effective operations and even break out into a tug of war.

- **Lack of Respect for the Breath of Responsibilities of the Office:** newly elected officials may see their election certificate as a license to pursue their own agenda with little restraint, not recognizing that with their election comes responsibility to uphold the integrity of their new office as a representative of all citizens. Elected officials have an obligation to balance competing interests objectively with the ultimate goal of deciding what is in the interest of the entire community and not only in their own interest or that of a small group.

- **Lack of Mutual Support between Elected Officials and Staff:** a majority group with a specific agenda on the governing body may decide it is their responsibility to “run” the city or county undermining staff authority. Or conversely, staff may be seen as trying to manipulate the governing body by withholding or selectively providing important information or failing to implement council or board directives. Governing body members and staff stop working as a team of “we” and begin to behave like competing factions of “us” versus “them.”

- **Personal Power and Individual Aggrandizement:** political activists and some elected officials who approach local politics and issues as a matter of personal affirmation and power. Televised meetings can further encourage this type of behavior from individuals. Bullying behavior is sometimes employed as a political tool. Some behaviors may even include acting out of clinical personality disorders like narcissism. One presenter reflected on a particularly contentious councilmember who once remarked, “I’ve never made a mistake in my life.” For some individuals who have never had power or a voice
once they get it they become overly aggressive and can’t let things go. All of these behaviors can discourage others from becoming involved in local government.

- **Ideological Commitment and Partisan Politics:** community members or elected officials who are so committed to their ideological beliefs (usually from the ends of the political spectrum, both left and right) that they feel justified in using a win-at-all-costs approach and are always wanting to be right. Some local governments, which historically operate on a non-partisan basis, have begun to experience involvement by the political parties in local elections for the purpose of creating a “farm team” of future candidates for higher level office. Those so elected may spend more time asserting an ideology or playing to a constituent base than they do in working constructively on local issues.

- **Illegal or Unethical Behavior by City Officials:** bad behavior by public officials, whether in their private or public lives, leaves citizens with a lack of confidence in their local officials and government. This can leave local officials especially vulnerable to character attacks for unrelated reasons.

- **Politics and Media:** the more partisan and acrimonious politics at the federal and state levels, which have been further amplified by social media and more ideological media outlets, is increasingly making its way to the local level. Additionally, the media, which is driven by ratings, tends to focus on controversial aspects of stories and less frequently reports on positive stories of city or county accomplishment.

- **Odd Year Elections:** can be a double-edged sword. With the usual low turnout of voters a small, but highly determined, community or political minority can more easily take control of the governing body to assert its narrow agenda. Conversely, odd year elections may enable such overreach to be more easily corrected at the next election.

- **Smaller Catalysts:** and, of course, there are a multitude of smaller behaviors, both personal and organizational, that can help set the stage for incivility. These include a lack of good interpersonal and communications skills to downright rudeness. Examples are city officials, both elected and staff, visibly not paying attention when others are speaking. More recently, the intrusion of personal mobile devices into the council or board meeting setting has not only led to general distraction, but may inappropriately be used to allow outside and “hidden” parties to inject themselves into the discussion by sending e-mails and text messages to individual members.

Other factors found to contribute to a culture of incivility include differences in generational values, diminishing resources that require increasingly difficult tradeoffs in service or program delivery, a lack of transparency and timely communication between the city and residents, and the ripple effects from personal and organizational devastation caused by the Great Recession.

Of course, in any given situation there may be an interaction of several of these drivers going on at once. While the presence of any of these factors does not automatically mean the city is headed towards uncivil territory, they are leading indicators that can point to possible problems ahead.
**Costs of Incivility**
Incivility carries with it significant costs in ways both tangible and intangible\(^8\).

- Cities and counties are unable to function effectively and efficiently in dealing with routine business, much less new and important community priorities.

- Incivility at city hall or the county courthouse can spill over into the community itself creating a toxic political environment that makes it even more difficult to find the consensus necessary to address urgent priorities.

- Local governments do not approach each other for collaboration because of loss of trust.

- Lack of citizen and media trust and confidence in their own local government or local governments in general\(^9\).

- Lack of citizen willingness in running for and serving on a local governing body – the “who needs that?” factor.

- Loss of talented staff that are fired or just resign in frustration. Subsequent difficulties in recruiting replacement staff that have the necessary skills and competencies.

- Lack of interest by talented young people in working for the particular city or county, or even in pursuing a career in local government at all\(^10\).

- Action by the legislature or even Congress to mandate or limit future local government actions based on the misfeasance of a few.

- Loss of private investment, new business locations, grant opportunities, and lowered bond ratings in a locality that is perceived as potentially hostile or politically unstable or where people are uncertain that the usual norms for fair decision-making are operating because investors perceive there will be too much work and time required to navigate the issues.

- Neglect of infrastructure investment and maintenance or a loss of time to address important issues when the behavior of certain individuals prevents the governing body from proceeding.

- Issues of personal health and well-being for city and county officials, staff and others caused by the stresses of incivility\(^11\).

- Actual monetary losses when the League of Minnesota Cities Insurance Trust (LMCIT), or the Minnesota Counties Intergovernmental Trust incur losses when one of their members is suffering from excessive conflict. According to LMCIT, cities in this situation consume a disproportionate share of staff time, including underwriting and
claims support, but also research, human resources, and other services for which LMCIT bears a share of the cost.

Although it’s not always possible to delineate exactly when a claim is related to incivility, as opposed to legitimate policy differences, there are clearly potential costs that can arise from a breakdown in city operations. For example, one relatively small city incurred losses of more than $800,000 during five years of conflict and eventually saw its LMCIT coverage severely restricted. Another, larger community incurred well over $2 million in losses while in turmoil during the same period, far more than that experienced by other cities of roughly the same size. It too found itself with coverage restrictions.

More generally, employment claims, which are often, although not always, an indicator of conflict within a city, comprised 17% of LMCIT liability costs from 2009-12, up from 13% in 2005-08. That works out to an average of $2.1 million per year from 2009-12, and $1.8 million from 2005-08. These costs do not include the funds invested by LMC and LMCIT in providing general human resources and research assistance designed to solve problems before they become full-blown claims.

- In determining whether to take or consider special underwriting action against a city, LMCIT considers whether the city “is repeatedly unable to adequately perform one or more of the critical, ongoing functions of city government.” These functions include conducting meetings in a professional manner, making decisions in a timely and reasonable way, providing essential public services, managing employment relationships, interacting with the public, and working with third parties. Of course, all cities hit a bump in the road from time to time. It is when a variety of bad things keep happening that a more systemic problem is suspected that may require LMCIT intervention.

**Addressing Incivility -Steps for Local Governments**

Addressing incivility is not a simple matter given that factors such as dealing with human personalities and intentions, complex interpersonal dynamics, and, of course, deeply held political values and public policy preferences are involved. So there is no panacea with guaranteed success.

However, based on the background research, the Task Force believes that by adopting the following goals and specific practices, local governments and local government officials can increase the likelihood of maintaining or restoring civilized discourse in their city or county:

1. **Make sure the elected officials, and city or county staff clearly understand their respective roles, responsibilities, and authorities**
   - Support city and county officials’ (both elected and staff) participation in training in those roles, responsibilities, and authorities
   - Include civility conversation in new council training sessions
   - Periodically review and talk locally about those roles and individual understanding
   - If there are conflicts or just differing expectations about roles, talk about those and negotiate agreement; consult, as necessary with the city attorney, LMC, and AMC for
better legal understanding, as well as outside organizations (e.g., the National Civic League) that study and provide guidance on best government structures and practices.

- Consider adopting an aspirational statement of values; see the *LMC Model Statement of Values* as an example.

2. **Support, don’t undermine, the role of the chief presiding officer (mayor or county board chair) at meetings of the governance body**
   All members of the city team, including other elected officials and staff, should take responsibility for the effectiveness of this role by:
   - Ensuring that the chief presiding officer fully understands that role and gets proper training in how to do it well
   - Insisting that proper protocol regarding the chair be observed at all meetings – i.e., comments and requests to speak are directed through the chair during formal sessions
   - Exhibit personal behavior and demeanor that reflects respect for the office and role of the presiding officer, regardless of whether or not one supports him or her on a political or personal basis

3. **Set an expectation of civility for all who participate in governing body meetings**
   - Consider adopting and make available “rules of conduct” for meetings – i.e., when is it appropriate to speak, how is the chair and governing body to be addressed, how do items get placed on the agenda for discussion, what role does the public play in participating in discussions
   - Make copies of rules available at the council or board meeting for all to see
   - Regularly review expectations for mayor, councilmembers/commissioners and staff behavior and assess how well the group is doing
   - Consider adding a statement about civility and expectations to each meeting agenda, public comment cards, etc.

4. **Build the City Team**
   - Schedule informal work sessions that allow everyone, elected and appointed officials alike, to contribute their ideas and perspectives to city issues. Build support for the idea of “we’re in this together”
   - Consider ways elected officials and staff can meet socially without violating the Open Meeting Law such as by holding an employee recognition/service award banquet or neighborhood picnics where the city displays equipment and other resource materials to promote and improve city services. Always consult the city attorney regarding the Open Meeting Law and any planned events

5. **Continually bring community attention to the issue of incivility**
   - Consider implementing a program focused on fostering civility and productive dialogue that reaches and involves the broader community in the issues of civic civility; set an expectation (e.g., the Albert Lea “Choose Civility” initiative)

6. **Get better at telling the city story, and in talking publicly and early about both accomplishments and potentially controversial projects**
   - Never surprise citizens or key stakeholder groups in the community
Use newsletters, websites, social media, and community meetings to aggressively inform residents about what’s going on in the city. Invite their early and frequent feedback.

Talk often and through multiple media about significant city accomplishments.

Enlist the help of local reporters to talk about the importance of civility in your community and how it’s been fostered by the city; convince them civility initiatives are newsworthy.

7. **Adopt effective citizen engagement strategies and take time to build a broad base of support for city projects**
   - Make effective use of citizen commissions and project task forces as a way to identify and address community needs.
   - Start community conversations about challenges and problems early before jumping to proposed solutions; invite everyone to contribute their ideas of how to address issues, then be prepared to demonstrate what you did with their input. Be sure to carefully identify all groups that have a stake in the outcome of decisions and make sure you reach out to solicit their input; don’t just wait for them to come to you.
   - Consider using citizen and stakeholder engagement techniques and technologies that have proven to be effective in eliciting citizen input.
   - Don’t just hold meetings in city hall; consider getting out to other locations in the community where people already gather. Hold meetings in the places where those who will be disproportionately impacted by the decision you’ll be making are getting together already – i.e. neighborhood groups in affected areas.
   - Consider taking the ICMA Civic Engagement Self Assessment to identify ways to strengthen your community’s civic engagement work.

8. **Consider adopting a code of ethics and/or a statement of aspirational values for the city or county**
   - LMC has a model statement of values and a template code of conduct posted on its website.

9. **See that the chief executive officer has understanding and training in the role that he or she can play to prevent incivility or, equally important, how to help resolve it once it happens.**

**Recommendations to the League of Minnesota Cities and Minnesota City/County Management Boards of Directors**

The following recommendations offer specific actions that the League of Minnesota Cities and the Minnesota City/County Management Association, the co-conveners of the Task Force, can take to support their local governments in putting the previous list of goals and practices in place to increase civility into practice.

LMC and MCMA should:

1. **Provide (and develop as necessary) training for elected and appointed officials in order to build their skills in anticipating, preventing, and coping with incivility.**
   - Incorporate training into programs of existing LMC and MCMA events, as well as create new opportunities for training, such as webinars.
Specific skill areas should include:
- Recognizing leading indicators of potential incivility
- Developing strategies to pre-empt incivility before it starts
- Confronting and defusing incivility once it happens
- Dealing with disrespectful behaviors
- Dealing with bullying behaviors
- Building the city team
- Expanding skills in civic engagement and stakeholder analysis, particularly around controversial public policy issues (see Lance Decker, LL Decker and Associates, Phoenix)
- Working with the media to share positive stories
- Ensuring a respectful workplace
- MCMA should particularly provide training on the role of the Chief Executive Officer in pre-empting or addressing incivility

2. Create a dedicated space on the LMC website that serves as a compendium of resources for city officials on civility and citizen engagement
   Resources featured on this website should include:
   - Sections in the LMC Handbook and/or revised material from Minnesota Mayor’s Association Handbook to apply to a broader audience – i.e. councilmembers, staff
   - A list of conflict resolution services available, such as those offered by the State Bureau of Mediation Services (BMS) and the Anoka County Dispute Resolution Center
   - Detailed information on training and other services offered as they become available
   - Citizen engagement self-assessment models and other resources on fostering citizen engagement

3. Create a peer-to-peer network for city officials
   - Promote network in partnership with LMC ambassadors, MCMA, and Minnesota Mayor’s Association

4. Open conversations and build relationships with other organizations interested in public promotion of civility such as League of Women Voters, InCommons, Citizens League, Minnesota Women in City Government, the business community, and area foundations to approach issue of incivility. Leverage their resources and support as appropriate

5. Reach out to key media about their coverage of and interest in the topic of civility. Specifically explore partnership with TPT for program on civility

6. Work with LMCIT and potentially AMC Insurance Trust to create a financial incentive program to encourage actions to prevent and deal with incivility
   Specific action steps should include:
   - Explore LMCIT premium discount or deductible incentive for adopting and implementing a multi-pronged and effective civility program
• Design incentive program that addresses key requirements. Possible minimal requirements might include things like basic levels of training for all, or at least a majority, of city officials, adoption of codes of conduct and/or rules of procedure.

7. In the future, consider supporting mandated Newly Elected style training for elected officials
• The Task Force was intrigued by a model from the State of Georgia, which legally requires newly elected officials to undertake a certain amount of training. The group concluded that there should not be a push at this time to seek legislative action to create such a mandate until local voluntary efforts are tried. The idea should be revisited in the future if such efforts prove inadequate. This would be a suitable topic for discussion at joint legislative conference events.

Note: This recommendation was not supported by the LMC Board

All resources listed in the End Notes are available in the Appendix

1 Public approval of state and local government rises, federal rating tumbles. Mike Maciag, Governing, April 19, 2013.
5 See Appendix for list of Task Force members.
7 For some discussion on the portrayal of local government by bloggers and the media see Everyday Ethics for Local Officials: Dealing with Emotional Audiences, Institute for Local Government, October 2009.
9 Albert Lea 2012 citizen survey (contact Chad Adams, City Manager for details)
12 See City Council Meeting FAQ from the City of Moorhead for an example.
13 See www.choosecivilityfc.org for more information.
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Shauna Johnson, city administrator, Waite Park (Chair)
Chad Adams, city manager, Albert Lea
Chuck Ahl, city manager, Maplewood
Sara Carlson, mayor, Alexandria
Phil Gartner, councilmember, Lake City
Troy Gilchrist, city attorney, Kennedy and Graven
Craig Klausing, former councilmember and mayor, Roseville
Rhonda Pownell, councilmember, Northfield
Kathy Quick, assistant professor, Humphrey School
Bob Thistle, LMC ambassador/MCMA range rider
Dan Vogt, city administrator, Little Falls and consulting city administrator, Crosslake
Mark Voxland, mayor, Moorhead


9 Albert Lea 2012 citizen survey (Contact Chad Adams, city manager, for details)


12 See City Council Meeting FAQ from the City of Moorhead for an example.

13 See www.choosecivilityfc.org for more information.