

Community technology advisory commission

The St. Louis Park Community Technology Advisory Commission is meeting in person in the Westwood Room on the third floor of St. Louis Park City Hall, 5005 Minnetonka Blvd. Members of the public may attend the meeting in person.

Agenda

1. Call to order – roll call
2. Approval of minutes: Feb. 18, 2026
3. Workplan items
4. Communications and announcements
5. Adjournment

Community technology advisory commission

Minutes

Members present: Reid Anderson, Shane Leverenz, Kayla Stautz, Benjamin Straus
Members absent: Rudyard Dyer, Konnor Slaats
Staff liaison: Jacque Smith, communications and technology director
School District liaison: Tom Marble, St. Louis Park Public Schools (non-voting member)

1. Call to order – roll call

The meeting was called to order. A roll call was conducted.

2. Approval of minutes – Jan. 21, 2026

There was no discussion regarding the approval of the minutes from Jan. 21, 2026.

3. Workplan review and next steps

Commission Member Leverenz provided an update from the application review team. The team discussed the current functionality of the app. The team will investigate what other municipalities have for apps and industry standards. The team will also start investigating what features on the app are also available on the website and begin compiling that into a documented analysis.

Commission Member Straus provided an update from the AI white paper group. The group shared some of the research they found on the topics they outlined at the last meeting. The group thought about whether they want to come up with a position for or against, or just present facts. The group thought about some format ideas for the white paper and decided on providing some high-level ideas related to St. Louis Park's strategic priorities.

Commission Member Straus continued that the group would see if their research fits those categories. They would give examples, warnings, cautions and things to consider within those. Their action will be to continue the research and to think about how they fit into those categories while being careful not to use AI to solve problems that don't exist.

4. Communications and announcements

Ms. Smith announced that Nat Johnson resigned from the commission. The position will stay open until May when the council makes appointments. Ms. Smith noted that Commission Member Leverenz and Commission Member Straus have terms expiring at the end of May. They will be getting communication from Pat Coleman at some point in the next couple months about the reappointment process.

5. Adjournment

It was moved by Commission Member Anderson, seconded by Commission Member Slaats, to adjourn the meeting at 7:23 p.m. The motion passed.

These minutes were created with the assistance of a generative AI transcript service, then edited and finalized by a city staff person.

2025 work plan | Communications and Technology Commission

1	Initiative name: Support citywide Vision 4.0 process		
	Initiative type: ☒ Staff support (review project, policy or program and provide feedback) ☐ Independent research project ☐ Gather community feedback ☐ Lead community event	Initiative origin: ☐ Applicant-initiated ☒ Staff-initiated ☐ Commission-initiated ☐ Council-initiated Legally required (e.g. response to Legislative changes or Judicial decisions)? ☐ Yes ☒ No	Commissioner lead(s) name(s): None, all will be involved. If joint commission initiative, list other board or commission: Is this an established work group? ☐ Yes ☒ No
	Initiative description: Support the citywide Vision 4.0 process by participating directly and/or encouraging others to participate, and by sharing information with other community members about the process.		
	Strategic Priority: ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☒ 5 ☐ N/A		
	Deliverable: ☐ Research report ☐ Summary of community input ☒ Other ☐ N/A		
	Target completion date: 3Q 2025		
	This section to be completed by staff:		
	Council request (if applicable): ☐ Review and comment or reply ☐ Review and decide ☒ Informational only – no response needed		
	Budget required: None		
	Staff support required: Communication from staff liaison about opportunities with Vision 4.0		
Liaison comments: Plan to keep the commission informed about opportunities to assist with the citywide Vision 4.0 process. Commission members received information from the community engagement coordinator throughout the Vision 4.0 process, including invites to participate in surveys and to host community meetings.			

- Commission member Benjamin Straus hosted a community meeting at his apartment complex.
- **Commission members reviewed the Dec. 8, 2025, Vision 4.0 council report presented to the city council, to inform CTAC additional workplan goals for 2026.**

2	Initiative name: Participate in city website redesign review process		
	Initiative type: ☒ Staff support (review project, policy or program and provide feedback) ☐ Independent research project ☐ Gather community feedback ☐ Lead community event	Initiative origin: ☐ Applicant-initiated ☒ Staff-initiated ☐ Commission-initiated ☐ Council-initiated Legally required (e.g. response to Legislative changes or Judicial decisions)? ☐ Yes ☒ No	Commissioner lead(s) name(s): None, all members or a small group will be involved. If joint commission initiative, list other board or commission: Is this an established work group? ☐ Yes ☒ No
	Initiative description: While the exact process for the redesign has yet to be determined, we plan to draw on the expertise of the CTAC by involving members, or a small group of members, in potential user group testing or other review of a draft redesign of the city website.		
	Strategic Priority: ☒ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☒ 5 ☐ N/A		
	Deliverable: ☐ Research report ☐ Summary of community input ☒ Other ☐ N/A		
	Target completion date: 3Q 2025		
	This section to be completed by staff:		
	Council request (if applicable): ☐ Review and comment or reply ☐ Review and decide ☒ Informational only – no response needed		
	Budget required: None		
	Staff support required: Staff liaison		
Liaison comments: The primary goals of the redesign are to ensure compliance with upcoming ADA requirements, ensure mobile accessibility and improve search function. CTAC will be asked to focus on these items in its review. • CTAC members Konnor Slaats and Kayla Stautz each participated in one of two user experience workshops Sept. 9 and 11, both two hours each. Both were provided with recordings of the workshop they didn't attend, and provided comments on user feedback, as well as suggested wireframe and design elements.			

--	--

3	Initiative name: Stay informed about pending legislation affecting cable and technology		
	Initiative type: ☒ Staff support (review project, policy or program and provide feedback) ☐ Independent research project ☐ Gather community feedback ☐ Lead community event	Initiative origin: ☐ Applicant-initiated ☒ Staff-initiated ☐ Commission-initiated ☐ Council-initiated Legally required (e.g. response to Legislative changes or Judicial decisions)? ☐ Yes ☒ No	Commissioner lead(s) name(s): None, all will be involved If joint commission initiative, list other board or commission: Is this an established work group? ☐ Yes ☒ No
	Initiative description: CTAC is asked to stay informed about pending legislation that may affect the city's cable franchise, or other technologies vital to the community such as broadband.		
	Strategic Priority: ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☒ 5 ☐ N/A		
	Deliverable: ☐ Research report ☒ Summary of community input ☐ Other ☒ N/A		
	Target completion date: Ongoing		
	<i>This section to be completed by staff:</i>		
	Council request (if applicable): ☐ Review and comment or reply ☐ Review and decide ☒ Informational only – no response needed		
	Budget required: None		
	Staff support required: Information and updates from staff liaison		
Liaison comments: Staff liaison will stay informed of pending legislation through contact with state and national advocacy organizations, as well as through the city's legislative staff and lobbyists. Information affecting cable and technology will be shared with CTAC members.			

--	--

4	Initiative name: Whitepaper – Future of Generative AI for Cities		
	Initiative type: ☐ Staff support (review project, policy or program and provide feedback) ☒ Independent research project ☐ Gather community feedback ☐ Lead community event	Initiative origin: ☐ Applicant-initiated ☐ Staff-initiated ☒ Commission-initiated ☐ Council-initiated Legally required (e.g. response to Legislative changes or Judicial decisions)? ☐ Yes ☒ No	Commissioner lead(s) name(s): Konnor Slaats, Kayla Stautz, Benjamin Straus If joint commission initiative, list other board or commission: Is this an established work group? ☐ Yes ☒ No
	Initiative description: This is a proposed whitepaper seeking to explore the question: how might cities need to adapt to be generative artificial intelligence (AI)-compatible in the future? The whitepaper will explore policy adaptations cities, including St. Louis Park, may need to make in a generative AI-enabled future. Peer cities and use cases for generative AI tech will be explored in areas such as public works, public-facing chatbots, planning and zoning, external resources and coalitions, and public engagement.		
	Strategic Priority: ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ N/A		
	Deliverable: ☒ Research report ☐ Summary of community input ☐ Other ☒ N/A		
	Target completion date: Q3 2026		
	<i>This section to be completed by staff:</i>		
	Council request (if applicable): ☐ Review and comment or reply ☐ Review and decide ☒ Informational only – no response needed		

	Budget required:
	Staff support required:
	Liaison comments: CTAC has reviewed the generative AI guidelines generated in November 2024 for city staff, and is aware of the data assessment project conducted in 2025 to move the city toward the goal of having reliable, organized data to “feed” any future generative AI project. Data cleanup will continue in 2026.

5	Initiative name: mystlouispark (city customer response management system) assessment		
	Initiative type: ☐ Staff support (review project, policy or program and provide feedback) ☒ Independent research project ☐ Gather community feedback ☐ Lead community event	Initiative origin: ☐ Applicant-initiated ☐ Staff-initiated ☒ Commission-initiated ☐ Council-initiated Legally required (e.g. response to Legislative changes or Judicial decisions)? ☐ Yes ☒ No	Commissioner lead(s) name(s): Rudyard Dyer, Shane Leverenz, Tom Marble (school district staff liaison) If joint commission initiative, list other board or commission: Is this an established work group? ☐ Yes ☒ No
	Initiative description: The commission team members will conduct an assessment and review of the current MySLP app. We will document the current feature set, capabilities, accessibility (language options), and integrations. Research will be conducted on industry best practices and peer municipality apps to determine if there are any opportunities to expand, further integrate, or modify the existing MySLP app in any way to provide more or better benefits to residents. We will also examine whether the MySLP app is even necessary. The end deliverable will be a report outlining the current condition and capabilities of MySLP with recommendations for any changes, enhancements, or modifications to the platform.		
	Strategic Priority: ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☒ 5 ☐ N/A		
	Deliverable: ☒ Research report ☐ Summary of community input ☐ Other ☒ N/A		
	Target completion date:		
	This section to be completed by staff:		
	Council request (if applicable): ☐ Review and comment or reply ☐ Review and decide ☒ Informational only – no response needed		

	Budget required:
	Staff support required:
	Liaison comments: City staff are currently evaluating this product for compatibility with other software being used in the city for tracking work requests internally, in an attempt to eliminate duplicate efforts.

Initiative Origin Definitions

- Applicant-initiated – Project initiated by 3rd party (statutory boards)
- Staff-initiated – Project initiated by staff liaison or other city staff
- Commission-initiated – Project initiated by the board or commission
- Council-initiated – Project tasked to a board or commission by the city council

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

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.

Future ideas

Initiatives that are being considered by the board or commission but not proposed in the annual work plan. Council approval is needed if the board or commission decides they would like to amend a work plan.

Initiative	Comments

Feedback from city council on workplan

From Jacque Smith <jsmith@stlouisparkmn.gov>

Date Tue 3/3/2026 9:56 AM

To Jacque Smith <jsmith@stlouisparkmn.gov>

Bcc Benjamin Straus <benctac@bstraus.com>; Thomas Marble <marble.thomas@slpschools.org>; Rudyard Dyer <rudyard.dyer@gmail.com>; Benjamin Straus <b.straus@icloud.com>; benjaminnstraus@gmail.com <benjaminnstraus@gmail.com>; k.slaats34@gmail.com <k.slaats34@gmail.com>; Kayla Stautz <kayla.dostal@gmail.com>; Reid Anderson <rbarryanderson@gmail.com>; Shane Leverenz <shaneleverenz@gmail.com>

Hello CTAC members:

The city council has approved CTAC's revised workplan. Please note the below feedback from Council Member Sue Budd:

- In considering resources for the white paper, I would suggest tapping into any research or position papers done by the League of MN Cities and the National League of Cities, as they may have good information specific to city governance.
- Initiative 5 will provide good insight to council. The 'current condition' analysis may already include this, but just to be sure, please include some analysis of the current myslp use — both in submissions from the app, and also clicks or views of info contained there, and anything we can learn about satisfaction from past users.

[@Shane Leverenz](#) [@Rudyard Dyer](#) [@Thomas Marble](#) If you would like specific data about mystlouispark prior to the March 18 CTAC meeting, please send those questions to me by Friday, March 6, to allow plenty of time for staff to compile the information.

Finally, if you are unable to attend the March 18 meeting, let me know. Thanks!

Jacque Smith, APR (*she/her/hers*)

Communications and technology director | City of St. Louis Park

5005 Minnetonka Blvd., St. Louis Park, MN 55416

Office: 952.924.2632

jsmith@stlouisparkmn.gov

www.stlouisparkmn.gov

Experience LIFE in the Park

**Accela/Public Stuff app information for the Community Technology Advisory Commission
March 2026**

1. Annual cost for the Accela app
 - \$28,930 for 2025-26 and 2026-2027
 - 2026-2027 renewal term is June 17, 2026 - June 16, 2027; requires 60-day cancellation notice
 - Implemented in 2014 by PublicStuff which was then purchased by Accela
2. How would canceling the app affect other subscriptions or services the city pays for or provides?
 - Replacements or solutions needed for:
 - Customer response management (CRM) including streets issues
 - Citywide push notifications such as snow emergencies
 - Sign up/cancellation for solid waste and utility billing services
 - Setting up/canceling utility billing – all done through Accela
3. Updates/changes/modifications made to the app in the last year
 - Added forms for residents to sign up for solid waste services; removed website form.
 - No app updates for four years
4. Any planned updates/changes/modifications to the app
 - Accela has been contacted to provide any updates
5. Estimated time staff spend supporting the application (*This shouldn't include the hours city staff spends responding to requests through the app.*)
 - Direct app support is minimal. Creating new signups for solid waste services was the biggest change in 2025. Most time spent on updating/adding new staff or changing workflows for which staff is notified when issues are submitted.
 - Lack of integration with key systems like utility billing, public works task tracking, and solid waste collection requires extra staff time for manual processes.
6. Number of subscribers/downloads
 - Total subscribers: 17,288
 - 6,033 users (excluding anonymous submissions) have submitted requests since the app was implemented in 2014.
 - iOS downloads
 - Dec. 14, 2024 – Jan. 7, 2026: 1088 downloads
 - 95% iPhone, followed by iPad and very small percentage of desktop
 - Android downloads: 1,000-plus

Guidelines for use of generative AI

Purpose

The purpose of this standard is to provide requirements and establish a framework for the responsible use of public web services enhanced by generative artificial intelligence (AI) tools for individual work tasks by City of St. Louis Park employees. The goal is to provide guidance on how to use publicly available generative AI services such as ChatGPT, OpenAI, Gemini, Claude or others responsibly in a manner that:

- Deliver value and benefit to St. Louis Park residents
- Meet legal and regulatory requirements
- Secure protected information and data

This document covers the use of generative AI tools for individual work tasks like writing, editing, researching, or other duties that improve employee productivity. It doesn't apply to AI-assisted tools such as those that help review documents for spelling errors or formatting or that provide predictive text in documents or emails.

Background

AI-assisted services have been used by organizations for many years. However, new generative AI services available online or embedded into existing tools create the need for new governance to use these tools responsibly. This standard refers primarily to these new services.

Publicly available generative AI services can be very helpful for a variety of tasks, but it's important to use these services responsibly and consider potential legal, practical, security and privacy issues. The content produced by available generative AI services should be consistently and skeptically reviewed by employees before they incorporate it into their work tasks.

People can input questions into publicly available generative AI services. The responses mimic humans but because the generative AI service is not a human subject matter expert, it may provide responses that are inaccurate or incomplete. Current generative AI services do not understand questions; instead, they generate answers to those questions in the form of word patterns that mimic content they have been trained to use.

Data ownership and risk assessment

When you submit data to a generative AI service, it leaves a copy of the submitted data with the service. This may pose security and privacy risks. These risks are magnified if the generative AI service automatically incorporates submitted data into responses shared with other users as part of the data they are trained to use. This standard will categorize data as low, moderate or high risk. They have the following definitions:

- Low risk: Data that is defined by Minnesota Statutes Chapter 13 as "public" and is intended to be available to the public.
- Moderate risk: Data that does not meet the definition of Low or High. This includes but is not limited to system security information, nonpublic names, nonpublic addresses, nonpublic phone numbers, and IP addresses.

- High risk: Data that is highly sensitive and/or protected by law or regulation. This includes but is not limited to:
 - Protected Health Information (PHI)
 - Social Security Administration (SSA) data
 - Criminal Justice Information (CJI)
 - Government-issued ID numbers such as Social Security, driver's license, state ID card, passport
 - Federal Tax Information (FTI)
 - Payment Card Industry (PCI) account data
 - Bank account numbers

Using moderate- or high-risk data with publicly available generative AI services could be considered a data breach. The prevention of improper access or dissemination of data is a critical concern because there are civil or criminal penalties for violations. City employees should assume any data used on generative AI services like ChatGPT, OpenAI, Gemini, Claude or others will be retained by the service.

Allowed AI services and tools

- At this time, publicly available generative AI services should only be used with low-risk data.
- If you are uncertain whether a service or tool incorporates generative AI services and/or whether you are allowed to use the service, contact the IT division. Generative AI services will be evaluated based on understanding the AI's training, ownership of data, and level of security.
- Any software or service where a third-party AI-enhanced service has access to City of St. Louis Park moderate- or high-risk data needs to be reviewed and approved by the IT division before use.

Prohibited information

- Don't use any data that is classified as moderate or high risk in generative AI services unless the generative AI service has been approved through the city's IT division.
- Treat the information used in generative AI services as if you were posting it on a public site.
- Use generative AI services as a starting point, as opposed to the final output, which poses fewer reputational, legal and other risks.

Sample use cases

At this time, commercially available generative AI services may only be used for individual tasks that improve the way you work.

Examples of **acceptable use cases** include:

- Summarizing long documents that only contain public information.
- Researching public topics where the resulting content can be verified by a subject matter expert.
- Generating draft documents that deal with public information.
- Embedded AI tools that check and provide suggestions for spelling, grammar, formatting, etc.

Examples of **unacceptable use cases for generative AI** include the following.

- Drafting responses to email messages and sending without first reviewing content for accuracy and appropriateness.

- Generating documents for public use without review or verification by a subject matter expert. For instance, using generative AI services to generate a request for proposal, but not asking subject matter experts to review the proposal before sending it.
- Entering moderate- or high-risk data in the generative AI tool to generate a report or document.
- Using generative AI tools to create misleading voice or video content.

Data security

- When considering the use of generative AI services in city operations, compliance with the Minnesota Government Data Practices Act is necessary. Government data is defined as all data collected, created, received, maintained, or disseminated regardless of physical form, storage media, or conditions of use. The City of St. Louis Park must be responsive to any data request pertaining to data created with the assistance of generative AI services.
- City employees must ensure adequate security measures to protect moderate- and high-risk data from unauthorized access, breaches, or misuse. This includes following city guidelines for technology use outlined in the personnel manual.
- City employees should recognize that publicly available generative AI services are for-profit tools designed to return shareholder value to the companies that create them. As such, they may provide value while simultaneously collecting data in a manner that benefits the generative AI service but exploits users. These tools often provide limited value as they attempt to collect and sell nonpublic, private, confidential, and restricted data.

Legal and ethical considerations

- Ensure that the output from generative AI services is checked by a subject matter expert for facts, legality, and other responsible use concerns.
- Because of human influence, current generative AI services have bias. When the data used to inform the AI system has preexisting prejudices or underrepresented data sets, the system cannot compensate for that. If using AI to help in decision making, consider if the results have a discriminatory effect on certain residents because the data used was flawed.
- Generative AI services should only be used to enhance human performance, not replace it. Do not use it as a substitute for your creativity, judgment, or expertise.
- If generative AI services are used to create formal, long-lasting documents, and a significant portion of the final document remains unchanged by a human, consider adding a note stating that generative AI was used. For example, "This document was created using a generative AI service, then reviewed by a subject matter expert and finalized by a city staff person."

Resources

- League of Minnesota Cities: <https://www.lmc.org/resources/cities-and-artificial-intelligence-ai-what-you-should-know/>
- Transparent Artificial Intelligence Governance Alliance (Minnesota IT Services): <https://mn.gov/mnit/taiga/>

Information in this document is based on content and guidelines created by Minnesota IT Services (MNIT) and the League of Minnesota Cities. Created 11.27.2024