

**CITY COUNCIL WORK SESSION
CITY OF RAMSEY
ANOKA COUNTY
STATE OF MINNESOTA**

The Ramsey City Council conducted a City Council Work Session on Tuesday, April 10, 2012, at the Ramsey Municipal Center, 7550 Sunwood Drive NW, Ramsey, Minnesota.

Members Present: Mayor Bob Ramsey
Councilmember Randy Backous
Councilmember David Elvig (arrived at 5:24 p.m.)
Councilmember Colin McGlone
Councilmember Sarah Strommen (arrived at 5:56 p.m.)
Councilmember Jason Tossey
Councilmember Jeffrey Wise (arrived at 5:16 p.m.)

Also Present: City Administrator Kurtis Ulrich
Deputy City Administrator Heidi A. Nelson
Public Works Director Brian Olson
Fire Chief Dean Kapler
Police Chief James Way
Finance Officer Diana Lund
Parks Supervisor Mark Riverblood
Human Resources Representative Lasher
Senior Planner Tim Gladhill
Planning Intern Patrick Brama
City Attorney William Goodrich
Development Manager Darren Lazan

1. CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Ramsey called the City Council Work Session to order at 5:05 p.m.

2. TOPICS FOR DISCUSSION

2.01: Continued Discussion of 2013 Budget

Finance Officer Lund reviewed the staff report and presented the proposal of Councilmember Elvig that the total levy not exceed \$7,150,000 with road reconstruction funded by implementing a \$7/month/franchise fee, generating approximately \$1.5 million. She indicated the net affect on the City's tax rate would be about 38.70% and create a positive cash flow of \$144,988. In addition, \$275,000 related to TIF 4 could be attributed to road reconstruction, resulting in \$1,750,000 for road reconstruction if including a franchise fee.

City Administrator Ulrich noted staff had previously estimated the need for \$3 million per year for full reconstruction if there are no assessments so this proposal is still short in terms of a full reconstruction effort.

Mayor Ramsey asked about the monthly franchise fee.

Finance Officer Lund clarified it is actually \$7 per month per utility, for a total of \$14/month.

City Administrator Ulrich stated this concept puts into place the proposed staff reductions, lowers the levy by taking off \$1.5 million, and then replaces it with the franchise fee implementation.

Mayor Ramsey noted it seems that adding the franchise fee on top will result in a tax capacity rate of 52%.

City Administrator Ulrich stated the publicized tax capacity rate would be 38.7%.

Councilmember Backous stated he thinks the franchise fee is a tax when it comes down to it, but it shows the public there are two pieces, the road reconstruction budget and the levy. He noted the taxpayer would be paying the same dollar amount but the franchise fee brings in more payers. The idea was to present it properly and he supported the franchise fee.

Mayor Ramsey stated it has been indicated that the advantage of the franchise fee is to bring in more entities but that portion only equals about \$40,000, which he considers a minute amount. Mayor Ramsey stated he does not support “pulling wool over resident’s eyes,” thinks it gives the wrong perception, and supports putting all road costs in the general fund budget.

Councilmember Wise arrived at 5:16 p.m.

Mayor Ramsey noted this proposal puts \$1.5 million into the general fund budget with a 52% tax capacity rate, which is 10% more than the current rate so it does not accomplish what needs to be accomplished.

Councilmember Tossey stated he knows the goal is to rid the City of assessments but if the City can pay down assessments and avoid a franchise fee with savings in the budget, it may lower the assessment amount to where residents would reconsider counter petitioning a project.

Mayor Ramsey doubted that would occur. He felt the odds were slim that a project will get done if assessed at 100% because it will be counter petitioned. In addition, the City is getting push back on reconstruction projects that are 50% assessed. Mayor Ramsey felt roads are a core function as well as police and fire and, unfortunately, the City has neglected that responsibility for years. He did not support adding another 30% tax on residents and suggested the Council reassess core functions and adjust accordingly. Mayor Ramsey stated he would not vote to increase taxes or institute a franchise fee. Rather, he supported reassessing services provided to residents, even if that results in cutting back the core services of police and fire.

Councilmember Backous stated he has nothing against the franchise fee concept but would not support \$14/month. He indicated it was his impression that the intention was \$7/month and asked if a lower franchise fee could be considered.

Mayor Ramsey stated he would not support a franchise fee but was not opposed to having a portion of the road project assessed, especially road reconstruction.

Public Works Director Olson stated that has been the challenge with this issue, some feel assessments should be phased out and others support assessments. He noted there are benefits to a franchise fee beyond collecting from non-taxable because it also creates equity between residential units. However, an inequity is with residents not connected to natural gas since they would pay only one-half the franchise fee. Ultimately, it is the City Council's decision in how to come up with \$3 million and whether with or without assessments. Public Works Director Olson stated the franchise fee was presented at \$14/month and noted it could be phased out over five years with a 25% assessment for reconstruction.

Councilmember Backous asked if reconstruction projects can be scaled back and/or put off another year or two. Public Works Director Olson stated he understands it is a difficult situation and decision to make, and projects could be scaled back but the Council still needs to solve the issue of additional funding sources. He pointed out that a 40-year design life capitalizes on the Anoka sand plain and maintenance of the roadway system in sealcoats and overlays will extend the pavement life. Public Works Olson noted staff had presented a conservative approach and spread cost over a 40-year time frame. However, 50% of the City's roads were built between 1975 and 1985 so delaying projects further will result in the reconstruction effort falling behind.

Councilmember Elvig arrived at 5:24 p.m.

Mayor Ramsey stated he would support a 40% tax capacity rate but when you add in the franchise fee, it is back up to about 52%.

Councilmember Elvig noted the first goal was to pull down taxes to get a leaner environment by cutting back costs. Staff's recommended cuts reduce the budget by \$1.4 million and the franchise fee would offset that reduction by raising \$1.5 million, resulting in a zero net increase to taxes. Councilmember Elvig noted the franchise fee would allow the creation of a \$1.5 million dedicated road fund supported by all utility users including non-profits.

Finance Officer Lund corrected that adding the franchise fee would increase the tax capacity to 44%, not 52%.

Mayor Ramsey stated he wants the tax capacity to be at 40%, noting the tax capacity was 44% last year and 39% the previous year.

Councilmember Backous stated if the franchise fee is cut to \$7/month, it brings the net tax capacity to 41%. He indicated he would support a franchise fee under \$10/month.

Finance Officer Lund advised that a \$7/month franchise fee would generate \$825,000.

Councilmember Tossey noted the City cannot bond for a project unless it is 20% assessed. He expressed concern that funding road projects only from franchise fees would limit the City because it would not have the ability to bond should there be a critical road project.

Councilmember McGlone stated what the counter petition process costs the City.

Public Works Director Olson estimated \$150,000 for Andrie Street.

Councilmember McGlone noted residents that are selling their house would not want their property assessed.

Mayor Ramsey advised that staff has made some progress on the counter petition process.

City Administrator Ulrich reported staff had conversation with the Charter Commission and Commissioners indicated they were open to setting a higher percentage requirement, from 35% to 50% or greater, for residents to be able to overturn a project.

Councilmember Backous stated the assessment for Andrie Street was to be \$1,500.

Public Works Director Olson explained that Andrie Street was originally proposed as an overlay but members of the association that came forward said they wanted a reconstruct. Since it is an MSA road, it had to be built larger so that was done and an overlay assessment considered. The City went forward with project design with anticipation that assessment rates would be about \$1,800 to \$2,000 with the rest funded with MSA. He estimated that assessment may have equaled 20% of the total project cost.

Councilmember McGlone noted the residents would not support paying it.

Public Works Director Olson agreed the vast majority of residents were opposed at that time, not because of the assessment, but because of the sidewalk.

Councilmember Wise stated he believes strongly in the franchise fee because of the equity it brings; a person living in an apartment generates the same wear and tear on the roads as someone on a 20-acre parcel. He stated he understands the suggestion to reduce the franchise fee but noted it would be a “band aid” and not fix the problem of funding road projects. Councilmember Wise stated Councilmember Tossey makes a good point about not being able to bond for a project, which may involve a considerable project to overcome.

Public Works Director Olson noted that in January the Council had discussed a 50% assessment and scaled it back to 25% with a franchise fee. He indicated if there are no assessments or franchise fees, internal borrowing or a reserve would need to be built so the City can afford larger projects.

Mayor Ramsey stated the City had not put away funds for streets for years and he would not support asking for a “raise” from residents to meet that need.

Councilmember Wise stated the Council needs to do something and while it might not fix everything, the City needs to start by dedicating some level of funding. He agreed the solution may not be perfect and some problems may be found in the future, but the City needs to start something.

Councilmember Backous agreed that a reduced franchise fee may not take care of the entire problem, but it would at least be a start. He noted that residents will pay for the roads one way or another and the Council is only talking about the mechanism to take the money from the residents. Councilmember Backous felt the assessment process was an inefficient and costly system but a franchise fee would start accumulating funds. He agreed that bonding is an important point that the Council needs to keep in mind and may be a reason to consider a compromise of franchise fee and some low percentage of assessment that allows the option to bond, if needed. In addition, a lower assessment may lessen the likelihood of a counter petition.

Councilmember Tossey stated he cannot support a franchise fee if in addition to assessments. He would rather keep the assessment low and raise additional funds through taxes as opposed to hiding it as a franchise fee. Councilmember Tossey noted residents will be told they are paying a franchise fee to fund roads and then later will ask why they are also being assessed to fund a road project. He supported keeping the assessment process in case the City needs to bond for a critical road project.

Councilmember Backous asked whether the City had that “phantom critical project” in its road system.

Public Works Director Olson stated staff could provide a map identifying the age of roads and dates for reconstruction. He stated he had mentioned earlier that half of the roads were built within a ten-year timeframe so there will come a point when the City will need a glut of funding.

Councilmember Backous stated he thinks the City has a “broken system” of assessing and counter petitioning that is too costly and wastes the City’s money. He noted staff has researched road conditions, knows when the roads were built, and the amount of funding needed per year to tackle that problem. In the past, the City has borrowed from TIF districts and used internal loan funds so he was not afraid there may be such a “phantom critical project” in the future because mechanisms are in place and can be used, if needed. Councilmember Backous stated his support to come up with a funding mechanism and then going with it.

Councilmember Elvig stated he agrees with the comments of Councilmembers Backous and Tossey and is not excited about a mix of franchise fee and assessments. He offered a compromise of a \$20/month franchise fee for five years to address the need of a start up fund, and then reduce the franchise fee over the years.

Finance Officer Lund explained that most TIF Districts are coming off line in the next few years. She advised when TIF Districts will be decertified and noted the project has to be within the District to use those funds.

Councilmember Elvig noted part of the consideration is to reduce government, the City needs to raise funds and create a pool of money for roads, and it will come from the taxpayers. He stated residents can be shown the City is reducing taxes that will be offset when adding a franchise fee to fund roads, but he believed a later assessment would send the wrong message. Councilmember Elvig asked if there is another mechanism available if the City cannot bond for roads.

Public Works Director Olson stated if the Council decides it wants to eventually get rid of assessments, then staff will tailor the message to residents who ask why they have to pay for the franchise fee in addition to a lower assessment by explaining the City is no longer assessing for sealcoating and overlays and will eventually do away with assessments all together. He indicated staff will follow the Council's policy and correctly portray it to residents.

Councilmember Elvig expressed concern that property owners will counter petition road projects until the funding is figured out.

Public Works Director Olson stated that would not be a problem because the City is already behind in maintenance activities, which will take several years to complete.

Councilmember Tossey stated after further thought he supports no franchise fee because taxpayers want their City to hire police to keep them safe, fire protection for their property, and roads to get those services to their property. He thought a franchise fee would create another "finger" to take taxes and in a representative form of government, residents need to know what they are voting for.

Mayor Ramsey asked why police and fire are more important than roads and suggested adjusting levels of funding for each piece because, in his mind, all are equally important. He indicated that if it comes down to it, he supports telling the City Administrator to present levels of funding for police and fire so the Council can find money to fund the roads.

City Administrator Ulrich advised the general model, if taking from the general fund, is with an assessment of 25% to 40% with the City paying the balance of the project cost.

Councilmember Backous noted the Council is talking about, cutting the budget in one area and taxing through a franchise fee to take care of the roads. He stated he supports a franchise fee that brings in all the road users, noting it may only raise an additional \$40,000 with these numbers but it will grow in the future. Councilmember Backous stated he does not understand the debate because all funds come from resident's pockets.

Mayor Ramsey stated he still believes the levy is above where it should be.

Councilmember Strommen arrived at 5:56 p.m.

Councilmember Wise stated he also likes the equity that franchise fees bring and does not support a policy that will "handcuff" a future Council. He stated he has no problem with moving forward, to Councilmember McGlone's point, and tell residents this problem has been here for a

long time and needs to be addressed through a road policy. Councilmember Wise stated it is his goal to have a road policy in place by year end. He supported reducing the general levy by the same amount as taxing from another method, such as a franchise fee.

Councilmember Elvig noted the Council has already made dramatic budget cuts. He stated the Council previously decided to tack on a storm water fee when it realized the problem with poor drainage and that fund has built so those drainage problems can be addressed. The same thing occurred with priority lighting and he believed funding roads was no different. Councilmember Elvig stated it would be prudent to lower the general budget but that cannot be done in addition to rebuilding 40 years of roads and end up at a net deduct. Councilmember Elvig stated when property values go up, then maybe the City can absorb more internally but the road funding problem has to be solved today.

Councilmember McGlone asked what the tax capacity rate would need to be to solve the \$3 million road funding problem in 2013.

Finance Officer Lund stated it would go to a 53% tax capacity.

Councilmember McGlone stated the City cannot address all of the roads today and he hates the idea of assessments because of the problems it causes. He agreed with Councilmember Tossey that residents expect a police officer and fire fighter but the City does not have franchise fees for those services. Councilmember McGlone stated the Council needs to decide and come to a consensus on what level the City can fund for road projects. He agreed the problem is so big that some level of assessments may need to be considered.

Mayor Ramsey stated his plan was 30% for roads, 40% for the tax capacity rate, and 50% for staffing. He stated it seemed plausible to solve some of the issues. Mayor Ramsey stated if the Council ever gets to the point of talking about raising taxes, it better include all funds including spending the Land Trust Fund long before considering raising taxes.

City Administrator Ulrich stated one of the strategies could be to solve \$1.5 million of funding or target money for 2013. He believed there was still a need to have an assessment process as cumbersome as it is. City Administrator Ulrich suggested a property owner should pay a portion of a project that benefits its property and the rest would be paid by the City as a community benefit. If the Council supports a 40% tax capacity bench mark, then services need to be cut to get there. City Administrator Ulrich stated the Council may need to look at additional general fund reductions to stay at a 40% tax capacity rate, noting police and fire budgets have had cuts but not to the extent of other operations.

Mayor Ramsey stated he would like to see more information on the 30/40/50 formula.

Councilmember Strommen stated she liked the plan presented by Public Works Director Olson and City Engineer Himmer for a franchise fee combined with assessment for reconstruction because funding cannot be solved without some level of assessment. She also supported getting assessments out of sealcoat and overlay projects. Councilmember Strommen noted residents said assessments are not an expense people can plan for but if paying a little each month

(franchise fee), residents do not feel as much “pain.” She stated she has talked with a few people about these ideas and found it was fairly well received. Councilmember Strommen noted the City did a formal study and franchise fees were well received because people can plan for it, a small amount each month. She noted that reconstruction projects don’t come along very often but residents can’t plan for them. In addition, franchise fees would start to bring in and build funds today and can be reconsidered in the future if the Council desires. She also felt staff’s plan presented a balanced approach. In terms of cuts to the general fund budget, Councilmember Strommen stated she needed to understand the context and how the service level may change, noting residents want to know the level of service they are getting for what they pay.

Mayor Ramsey stated he would also like to see that information. He agreed the Council studied assessments but he felt the question was not asked correctly.

Councilmember Backous asked on average, what is the assessment.

Public Works Olson answered that it varies dramatically on each project and the highest was Garnet Street with \$22,000 principal, \$27,000 with interest added, and a ten-year payoff. He explained that a residential urban lot with less frontage would equal \$9-10,000 if 100% assessed.

Councilmember Backous noted that would equal about \$75/month for ten years. He asked if residents would rather pay \$75/month for ten years or \$14/month forever, thinking residents would probably support the assessment.

Councilmember Tossey noted the Council is talking about an assessment plus a franchise fee, and he does not support using both.

Councilmember McGlone asked about raising taxes on all \$14/month instead of considering a \$14/month franchise fee.

Finance Officer Lund stated it would be about a 46% tax capacity.

Councilmember McGlone noted property taxes are deductible but franchise fees are not.

Mayor Ramsey asked staff to address the 30/40/50 plan he had proposed because as more development happens, more funds are collected and the road funding also increases.

Finance Officer Lund asked if the percentages include debt service.

Mayor Ramsey stated he was addressing the amount of money the City spends every year and he does not want taxes to go up.

Finance Officer Lund asked if the percentages are calculated on the total budget or the total levy, noting the budget will be \$10 million and the levy has debt service added to it. In addition, staffing is only a general fund number so there are many variables.

Mayor Ramsey supported 30% for roads because it is 30% of the City's job to care for the roads and the other 70% responsibility is for police, fire, and the rest.

Councilmember McGlone stated the Council previously decided to base trunk numbers on a growth of 260 units per year. He stated while that is not reasonable today, it is probably not unreasonable for the future. Councilmember McGlone asked what would be the City's increased tax base if using a similar formula; how much will the City's taxes grow. He noted staff's estimates had not addressed projected growth, which may show more funds will be raised so the assessments can be dropped.

Public Works Director Olson cautioned that growth results in the need for more infrastructure and funding to pay for those improvements when due.

Councilmember Tossey added that along with infrastructure growth comes inflation and the City's biggest possible tax base is TIF from The COR, which cannot be used unless the City decertifies. He believed the City needed to stop spending TIF funds it does not have.

Mayor Ramsey indicated there may be future projects not included within a TIF District.

Councilmember Strommen noted the City has gone through periods of significant growth and if that was the solution to road funding, it would have been solved. She indicated this is why she is concerned about not having an economic development staff person in place, to grow and create a robust tax base since it will not happen in a competitive economy without dedicated staff working on it.

Mayor Ramsey agreed the City had experienced growth but believed the funds were spent instead of being put away for road projects.

Councilmember Elvig stated this and the last Council did not have the foresight because TIF dollars were spent elsewhere. He stated he can get on board with the 30/40/50 formula, having a sliding scale, and a policy of establishing spending ratios; however, the Council needs to address how to raise money. He noted the Mayor does not support raising it through taxes so he would ask how the budget and expenses can be cut and money still put aside for on-going maintenance with reconstructs in three to four years.

Mayor Ramsey indicated there may be unrestricted funds that can be reallocated.

Councilmember McGlone stated he would not consider in any way the idea of basing all on projected growth because that is what happened in the past with constructing and paying for the municipal center. He just wants a basis to start a discussion.

City Administrator Ulrich indicated staff will calculate the 30/40/50 formula, additional reductions to get to \$1.5 million, determine the point of additional growth that would drive down the tax base, and land proceeds that will be gained from The COR. This information will be presented to the Council for additional discussion.

2.03: Consider the Sale of Peltzer Park (Lot 1, Block 5, Peltzer Addition)

Parks Supervisor Riverblood reviewed the staff report and presented a draft policy for the disposition of surplus City-owned lands. He estimated there were 20 distinct groups of people using Peltzer Park, an average of three persons in each group, equating to about 20 hours of playground use, at a minimum, in one March weekend.

Mayor Ramsey stated he favors selling underutilized properties but it is now clear that Peltzer Park is being used so he supports keeping and maintaining the property.

Councilmember Strommen concurred, noting the maintenance of Peltzer Park is not that much, and park use will probably increase during warmer summer months.

Councilmember McGlone suggested consideration whether to sell should not have labeled only “utilization” but, rather, what the City can sell. He stated he is not considering the number of people using the property. Councilmember McGlone noted this is one of 36 parcels with potential for sale and while \$1,000 in maintenance may not be a lot, it may not factor staff traveling to and from the park for the maintenance. He stated the idea was to take money from selling properties and put it into the park fund to pay for the system and create a better value to residents for what they pay for parks in general.

Mayor Ramsey stated his preference to start with considering properties that are not utilized prior to considering parcels that are being utilized.

Councilmember Backous indicated that tough decisions will need to be made to weed out the quantity of parks but he believed there were easier properties the Council can consider than Peltzer Park.

Councilmember Wise stated if this decision is delayed, he wants to make sure it remains on the list of potential properties for sale so it is not forgotten.

Parks Supervisor Riverblood presented pictures taken in Peltzer Park at ten-minute increments.

Councilmember Elvig stated he is concerned with the policy because selling parkland that was dedicated by someone for that purpose should not be taken lightly and requires foresight. He stated he is struggling with this decision, understands the budget consideration, but felt it may be almost impossible to buy park land in the future so he wants to be cautious and assure a good thought process.

Councilmember McGlone asked how large is Peltzer Park.

Planning Intern Brama estimated close to 10 acres.

Parks Supervisor Riverblood added it is primarily low land.

Councilmember McGlone noted this open space will remain, the City has a park that was never dedicated, and that was the criteria used to determine where to start. He stated Peltzer Park was considered to be “low hanging fruit” in what the City can sell in park inventory and that is how Peltzer Park rose to be considered first. Councilmember McGlone stated the play equipment is scheduled to be relocated to a nearby park, not taken out of the area. He believed it was never going to get easier down the road to make a decision to sell park land.

Mayor Ramsey stated that is the case but the Council had the understanding that Peltzer Park was under utilized; however, it appears now that is not the case. He believed the City had other parcels that were not being utilized and supported considering them before considering parcels that impact residents.

Councilmember McGlone pointed out this park equipment was to be moved to another location where it will be utilized even greater.

Councilmember Strommen stated Councilmember McGlone is right but there is a difference in what the City “can” sell and what it “should” sell. She supported discussion on a policy that is clear and defines what is “underutilized” to provide guidance when making a decision on what to sell. She stated the Council needs to be clear on the direction. In terms of moving the play structure, Councilmember Strommen stated she had reviewed comments from residents who live near the new park and liked it because their children would not have to cross the street. She asked how the Council makes the decision to move a play structure and create that same issue (children crossing a street) in this neighborhood. Councilmember Strommen commented on the value for children to get to and from a park, have that level of independence, and be safe in playing. She noted people look for that in a community so she thinks this is not a big investment to keep/maintain Peltzer Park and noted it can be evaluated again later.

Mayor Ramsey asked if any Councilmembers are adamant in selling Peltzer Park.

Councilmember Tossey stated Park Supervisor Riverblood had first thought Peltzer Park was an under utilized park and asked if he still holds that opinion. He stated he does not want to pit two neighborhoods against each other for the play equipment.

Parks Supervisor Riverblood stated staff knew this would be a difficult decision, as has been proven, and it was hard to see this number of children using Peltzer Park and say it is not utilized or is under utilized. He noted that when compared to Central or Elmcrest Parks, all are underutilized but to this neighborhood it appears to be a good utilization given the low maintenance costs and he would recommend not taking action and looking at in the future.

Planning Intern Brama stated there are an additional two parcels not currently being marketed and the remainder of the parcels were dedicated.

Mayor Ramsey supported looking at the two remaining parcels that have not been dedicated.

Planning Intern Brama asked if the Council would like to adopt a policy prior to making these decisions.

Mayor Ramsey stated if no one is using the property and there is no play structure, he thinks sale can be considered prior to policy adoption.

Councilmember Elvig indicated it would be beneficial to bring those properties forward so they can be debated, which may drive the policy.

Councilmember Tossey stated he often hears people change their mind if residents are in attendance, and at the next meeting North Commons residents may be in attendance. However, he has met with them and does not think North Commons' residents would support taking a park away from another neighborhood.

Councilmember McGlone stated he wants to do the right thing for all of Ramsey's residents. He stated his frustration that the Council debates issues and then backpedals when a resident walks in the door. Councilmember McGlone stated \$1,100 per year to mow the park is something to consider and supported streamlining the City to make it more efficient by selling unutilized properties.

The majority consensus of the Council was to not sell Peltzer Park at this time and continue annual maintenance expenditures for the park, approximately \$1,000/year.

2.02: Policy for the Disposition of Surplus City Owned Land

Planning Intern Brama reviewed the staff report, presented the draft policy, and suggested adding criteria staff used to identify surplus properties.

Mayor Ramsey asked who makes the decision relating to future City functions.

Planning Intern Brama explained that would be addressed in the criteria to determine what is needed. He stated when this process first began, a meeting was held with department heads to review the Comprehensive Plan and addressed each parcel to make that determination.

Mayor Ramsey stated that will be difficult to qualify, such as whether the parcel has to be identified in the Comprehensive Plan for future use.

Councilmember Elvig noted the Council has not considered criteria to determine how the City should acquire property, noting if the Council cannot find determination for acquisition, it would then not be needed. He suggested the language also include acquisition findings of facts.

Planning Intern Brama stated staff will bring forward that language so the Council can consider two side-by-side policies, one for acquisition and one for disposition. He explained that when a property is identified, staff would prepare a list of criteria including findings of fact for Council consideration prior to making that decision. In addition, there would be different criteria for properties that were dedicated.

The consensus of the Council was to direct staff to present additional information, as discussed, for consideration at a future Work Session.

3. FUTURE TOPICS FOR DISCUSSION

Noted.

4. MAYOR / COUNCIL / STAFF INPUT

None.

5. ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Councilmember Wise, seconded by Mayor Ramsey, to adjourn the Work Session meeting.

The Work Session of the City Council was adjourned at 6:56 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kurtis G. Ulrich
City Administrator

ATTEST:

Jo Ann M. Thieling
City Clerk

Drafted by Carla Wirth
TimeSaver Off Site Secretarial, Inc.