

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: March. 18, 2026
3. Workplan items
4. Communications and announcements
5. Adjournment

Community technology advisory commission

Minutes

Members present: Reid Anderson, Rudyard Dyer, Shane Leverenz, Konnor Slaats
Members absent: Kayla Stautz, Benjamin Straus, Tom Marble (school district liaison)
Staff liaison: Jacque Smith, communications and technology director

1. Call to order – roll call

The meeting was called to order at 6:05. A roll call was conducted.

2. Approval of minutes – Feb. 18, 2026

It was moved by Commission Member Slaats, seconded by Commission Member Leverenz, to approve the Feb. 18, 2026, minutes with one change. The motion passed.

3. Workplan Items

Chair Slaats provided updates on the AI workplan item, noting that Commission Member Straus and Commission Member Stautz were absent but had been working on the project for an extended time. He indicated he would send notes to fill in team members on current progress and suggested comparing notes on everyone's contributions at the next meeting.

Commission Member Leverenz reported that he had not made progress on their project but had reviewed helpful information provided by city staff about the mystlouispark app. He planned to use this information to document the current status of the city app including its features, management structure, and costs as a baseline for future work.

Vice Chair Dyer acknowledged he had not made significant progress either but had examined other city websites. He found the St Louis Park website significantly better than comparable cities. He expressed difficulty in identifying needed improvements without being an active app user and suggested conducting a public opinion poll to gather resident feedback on desired features rather than brainstorming changes internally.

Commission Member Leverenz noted that during the previous meeting he and another member had documented all app features by going through the application systematically. He found it interesting that the communications team provided download statistics showing approximately 17,000 app downloads, with 6,000 users submitting requests since the app's 2014 implementation.

Chair Slaats questioned whether the download figure represented cumulative downloads since 2014. Commissioner Anderson stated that in the last two years there had been 1,000 iOS downloads and approximately 1,000 Android downloads.

Commission Member Leverenz suggested a resident survey could be valuable for gathering feedback on desired features. Ms. Smith noted that website redesign research might already include relevant information since the new design will provide a better mobile experience that functions similarly to an app. She emphasized the importance of understanding that the app serves as customer response management beyond just providing general city information.

Chair Slaats observed that an assessment review could incorporate multiple elements including capabilities evaluation, expansion opportunities, integration possibilities, modifications, and comparisons with other cities. He suggested these components could be combined with a potential survey as a comprehensive approach.

Commissioner Anderson discussed integration opportunities, noting his professional background in system integration. He identified the lack of integration with key systems like utility billing, task tracking, and solid waste collection as areas for improvement. He proposed that recommendations could focus on automating app submissions directly into relevant city systems to reduce staff workload and improve resident responsiveness.

Commission Member Leverenz supported this approach as it would create efficiency gains for staff members who currently manually transfer information from the app to other systems.

Chair Slaats emphasized the importance of maintaining policy-level focus rather than getting too detailed in technical functionality. He stressed the need to consider how recommendations might influence future policy decisions.

Commission Member Leverenz clarified their goal is educating city council members about the app's current functionality, costs, and considerations while providing information about other cities' approaches. He suggested recommendations could include directing staff to conduct a citywide survey for more detailed app usage information.

Ms. Smith explained that policy recommendations would be valuable for budget requests, which become policy questions affecting city levy decisions. She noted that external assessments help support budget proposals.

Commissioner Leverenz proposed that integration recommendations should focus on creating a closed loop where user submissions go directly to appropriate staff and completion notifications return to users automatically. Chair Slaats agreed this represents a policy question about whether the city wants to achieve best-in-class status and suggested benchmarking against other cities' spending and available products.

Commission Member Leverenz acknowledged making no substantial progress on the work plan and hoped for updates at the next meeting.

Chair Slaats reported extensive research on AI applications across various cities including South Africa, Cincinnati, and Ann Arbor. He noted having approximately 40 different use cases covering multiple municipal divisions. The team's approach involves examining use cases across different city departments rather than focusing on specific implementations.

Chair Slaats outlined their research framework covering internal city operations, chatbots for internal and external use, public works applications including traffic cameras and automated pothole detection, facilities and utilities management, public safety, planning and zoning, public engagement, external resources including AI coalitions, and agentic AI applications.

Commission Member Leverenz mentioned Albania's appointment of an AI government minister to oversee public procurement and combat corruption, representing the first country to have an actual AI employee. He noted this as an interesting use case for AI in checks and balances.

Ms. Smith suggested considering the potential negative implications of AI tools beyond its beneficial applications, such as how data is collected and aggregated on individuals.

Chair Slaats welcomed this perspective as a timely addition to their considerations section, noting the importance of examining both positive applications and negative risks.

Commission Member Leverenz supported including awareness of negative consequences and potential pitfalls alongside optimistic outlooks. He described the "nightmare scenario" method used in strategic planning to identify worst-case outcomes and potential risk mitigation strategies.

Chair Slaats shared an example of enterprise AI model concerns where extensive use could result in companies owning employee thought processes and work products, though he noted this may be less relevant for municipal applications.

Ms. Smith confirmed that city employees are likely using various AI tools since access is not blocked, though Microsoft Copilot access is limited due to government cloud restrictions and cost considerations.

Vice Chair Dyer inquired about potential collaboration with other commissions, specifically regarding data center development concerns raised in communities like Rosemount. He noted environmental and community impact issues that might warrant joint discussion with the environmental commission.

Vice Chair Dyer suggested cross-collaboration with the environmental commission could provide educational value about data center benefits and concerns including job creation and development opportunities versus environmental impacts.

Commission Member Leverenz expressed interest in learning more about data center issues, acknowledging that while he has technology understanding he was unclear about specific community concerns regarding power and water consumption.

Ms. Smith indicated this could be added as an additional work plan item pending planning department consultation about zoning processes for existing and potential data centers.

Chair Slaats confirmed he could communicate individually with team members working on AI projects while maintaining compliance with open meeting requirements. He planned to share compiled research notes with team members for the next meeting's collaborative discussion.

Commission Member Leverenz clarified open meeting law restrictions regarding email communications, confirming that one-way information sharing is permissible but back-and-forth email discussions among multiple members are prohibited.

4. Communications and announcements

Ms. Smith announced that terms for Commission Member Leverenz and Commission Member Straus end in May and they should have received reappointment materials from Pat Coleman.

Ms. Smith noted that the annual council meeting will occur in September rather than April this year. The chair and vice chair will attend with other members welcome to participate.

Ms. Smith reported that a work group of council members and city staff is reviewing 2025 updates to boards and commissions to assess improvements in communication and advisory body effectiveness. The review focuses on implementation results, challenges, and needed

adjustments for 2026 including commission check-ins, communication tools, work plans, information resources, and bylaws. The group will reconvene with a full recap to follow.

5. Adjournment

It was moved by Vice Chair Dyer to adjourn the meeting. The motion passed; meeting adjourned at 6:43 p.m.

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

ACCELA · SERVICE REQUEST MANAGEMENT

SRM Customer FAQ

Everything you need to know about upgrading to SRM and getting the most out of Accela's civic operations platform.



Your account team is your guide.

Every question in this FAQ can be explored further with your dedicated Accela account team. Don't hesitate to reach out at any stage of the process.



Upgrading to SRM

Is there a cost to upgrade?

No. The upgrade to the SRM Mobile App is included at no additional cost. Your new SRM contract will be priced in line with your current agreement, and your account team will walk you through any details before you sign.

What do I need to do to prepare?

Your account team will guide you through every step. To get started:

- Schedule a discovery call with your account team
- Choose a preferred upgrade timeframe
- Access the sandbox environment when available to explore the platform before go-live

How long will the migration take?

Migrations typically take **2–4 months** depending on your configuration. Your account team will confirm a timeline during your discovery call.

Who will support us during the upgrade?

You'll have a dedicated account team and a Professional Services team with you throughout — from planning through go-live.

Will both systems run at the same time?

No. The migration is designed as a **clean cutover**, so you won't need to manage two systems simultaneously.

Will our URL change?

Yes, but Accela can redirect traffic from your existing URL to the new platform so residents experience a seamless transition.

What gets migrated automatically?

Your existing data, configurations, and integrations move to SRM Mobile. The result is a fully configured environment, a public-facing portal, and a branded mobile app — all ready at launch. Specific details are confirmed during discovery.

Will our residents need to create new accounts?

No. Resident accounts — including usernames and passwords — are migrated automatically. Residents pick up right where they left off.

How will residents know to download the new app?

Accela provides **communication templates** to help you notify residents. Your account team will review your specific outreach needs during discovery.

Will our SSO setup carry over?

SSO requirements are reviewed during discovery and addressed with a plan specific to your agency.

Will pricing increase at renewal?

Your new contract pricing will not exceed typical step-ups from your current agreement. Optional add-ons are available but never required.

What training and documentation will be provided?

Accela will provide user guides, documentation, and training aligned with the full product suite. Your account team will share a training plan as part of your onboarding.

**About SRM****What is SRM?**

SRM is Accela's citizen request management platform — not just a standalone 311 tool, but part of a full civic operations platform. It includes:

- **SRM Mobile App** — iOS and Android app for resident requests
- **SRM Civic Apps** — staff-facing tools for managing requests
- **Public Portal** — web-based intake for residents
- **Civic Platform integration** — connects requests to permits, code enforcement, and asset management
- **AI capabilities** — text classification and image recognition (available by tier)

iOS & Android

WCAG 2.1 AA

ArcGIS Maps

AI-Ready

What can residents do in the SRM Mobile App?

- Submit service requests from iOS or Android
- Search by keyword or browse by category
- Submit anonymously (for eligible request types)
- Receive push notifications and email confirmations
- View ESRI ArcGIS maps for location-based requests
- Log in with a unified account that also works on the Public Portal

What about accessibility?

SRM Mobile is **WCAG 2.1 AA compliant**, ensuring it's accessible to residents of all abilities.

What languages are supported?

The mobile app displays in the resident's device language. Additional language packs are available by plan tier using customer-provided translations.

What third-party integrations are supported?

SRM supports integrations including **iWorq** and **Tyler EP & L Enforcement** via open APIs. Your account team can confirm compatibility.

What if we're not ready for Public Portal yet?

No problem. Service requests are also available through **ACA (Accela Citizens Access)**, which works as an interim web solution.

What features from PublicStuff are not in SRM?

SRM was redesigned for streamlined, modern workflows. A small number of PublicStuff features were intentionally not carried forward, including public request feeds, social-style commenting, satisfaction ratings, Facebook login, and per-request privacy toggles. Your account team can discuss your specific use cases during discovery.