

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

The Ramsey City Council conducted a City Council Special Work Session on Monday, November 18, 2019, at the Ramsey Municipal Center, 7550 Sunwood Drive NW, Ramsey, Minnesota.

Members Present: Mayor John LeTourneau
Councilmember Nadine Heinrich
Councilmember Mark Kuzma
Councilmember Jeff Menth
Councilmember Debra Musgrove
Councilmember Chris Riley

Also Present: City Administrator Kurtis Ulrich
Finance Director Diana Lund
Fire Chief Matt Kohner
Police Chief Jeff Katers
Parks and Assistant Public Works Superintendent Mark Riverblood
Public Works Superintendent Grant Riemer
Administrative Services Director Colleen Lasher
Community Development Director Timothy Gladhill
City Engineer Bruce Westby
Councilmember Elect Dan Specht

1. CALL TO ORDER

Mayor LeTourneau called the City Council Work Session to order at 6:42 p.m.

2. TOPICS FOR DISCUSSION

2.01: Continued Discussion of 2020-2029 Capital Improvement Plan (CIP)

Finance Director Lund reviewed the staff report.

Councilmember Riley referenced the Ramsey Boulevard rail separation project cost estimate projected over the next three years. He stated that it does not seem likely that element is going to move forward that quickly and suggested the project be moved to 2023.

City Engineer Westby agreed that it would make sense to modify the CIP to reflect the Highway 10 improvement projects as those rail project and frontage road improvements would occur in conjunction with the Highway 10 project. He recognized that some design work would be completed in advance and provided a more accurate time projection.

Councilmember Heinrich asked if the trail connections specify the part of the trails that would be completed.

Parks and Assistant Public Works Superintendent Riverblood confirmed that page 165 identifies the dollar amount with the specific trail project.

Councilmember Heinrich referenced an increase that occurs in 2021 and asked if that increase could be phased in.

Parks and Assistant Public Works Superintendent Riverblood provided additional details on the cost of a specific trail project. He noted that while that trail project could be completed incrementally, it would make more sense to complete that project as one in order to provide a connection rather than building in increments that would not connect to anywhere.

Councilmember Heinrich asked if that large trail project is a priority for 2021 or whether that should be reviewed.

Parks and Assistant Public Works Superintendent Riverblood provided additional details on the connection that would provide a link with a projected trail project from a developer. He explained that connection would be completed, as funding is determined and on the same period as the developer, which means that may not occur in 2021. He identified a higher priority trail connection that could be completed in 2021 and would have a much lower estimated cost for construction.

Councilmember Riley referenced an equipment purchase slated for 2027 and asked if that should be projected earlier as the equipment receives a lot of use for road patching.

Public Works Superintendent Riemer agreed that could be moved up a few years to 2024 or 2025 but would not suggest moving any earlier than that because there is a lack of storage space at this time.

Councilmember Heinrich commented that the priorities should be reflected as best as the City can because the community reviews the document to determine when ideas may become a reality.

Parks and Assistant Public Works Superintendent Riverblood reviewed upcoming proposed trail connection projects.

Councilmember Musgrove referenced the City Hall exterior lights and landscaping.

Public Works Superintendent Riemer explained that the landscaping is the hardscaping that will need to be relevelled.

Councilmember Musgrove referenced the City Hall roof repair and suggested that be moved up to a higher priority.

Public Works Superintendent Riemer stated that staff was simply putting the projects together, noting that this is the first year for projected City Hall improvements as the building is beginning to age.

Councilmember Musgrove asked for opinions on the priority of the City Hall items.

Public Works Superintendent Riemer confirmed that the roof could be listed as a higher priority.

Mayor LeTourneau asked for details on the process staff uses to assign dates for the projects.

Public Works Superintendent Riemer provided details on the input staff has received from contractors. He noted that both the landscaping and roof need to be repaired, but are not critical repairs and simply need to be included on the list to be done. He stated that if one had to go before the other, he would agree that the roof would be before the landscaping.

Councilmember Musgrove stated that she was simply asking for input on why one was given more priority than the other.

Mayor LeTourneau stated that he has faith that staff has the knowledge necessary to properly prioritize the items included on the CIP rather than approving the items included. He stated that if the Council feels that there should be a focus on prioritization of the CIP, perhaps a Committee should be put together to do that.

Councilmember Musgrove noted that the Council was elected to ask questions, give direction and provide feedback to staff.

Mayor LeTourneau stated that the direction the Council gave staff was to prioritize the CIP based on the highest anticipated needs, which is what was presented and now the discussion has focused on reprioritizing the list. He stated that this is a flexible document that will ebb, and flow based on the conditions that arise and encouraged the Council not to spend too much time in the weeds.

Councilmember Heinrich stated that she sent her questions to staff prior to this meeting and prior to the last meeting to provide her thoughts and questions. She noted that some items have still not been fully answered and therefore she would like those answers before the CIP is brought for formal adoption.

Mayor LeTourneau stated that he would like the document to remain a very high-level document that remains flexible in this dynamic atmosphere. He stated that he trusts the judgement of staff in prioritizing the needs based on the needed timing.

Councilmember Heinrich referenced the parks supplemental packet, noting three projects listed under 2021. She referenced the bridge crossing that is identified, and she believes to be a lower priority. She asked that items of that nature be moved to a later year to be kept as a placeholder.

Parks and Assistant Public Works Superintendent Riverblood agreed that the pedestrian bridge and waterfront item should be moved to 2025 and 2024 respectively. He stated that he is currently working on a phasing plan for the remaining downtown improvements, noting that a later element of that exercise will be to identify the funding. He explained that once completed, that will provide a better snapshot of the timing for those projects, noting that those projects would include large grants.

Councilmember Kuzma asked for details on the sunset time of the National Parks grant the City received.

Parks and Assistant Public Works Superintendent Riverblood confirmed that grant has already sunset and advised that with those grant funds the City received a complete set of plans and specifications to make that project shovel ready, which will make the City competitive for grant applications. He confirmed that staff would still attempt to obtain grant funds for those projects and moving the timing within the CIP would not impact that process.

Councilmember Heinrich referenced the future sealcoating fund and asked if staff could further review the fund to determine if refunds could be made from that fund for projects already completed through the maintenance fund. She asked if the projected projects in the CIP could be reviewed to determine if the sealcoat fund could be used to fund those projects.

Finance Director Lund provided background information on the sealcoat fund, how the fund was established, and how it can be used.

Councilmember Riley asked why the fund is necessary if the City is no longer funding in that manner.

Finance Director Lund explained that the funds are restricted because they were developer funds.

Councilmember Musgrove referenced page 16, specifically the Alpine Drive pedestrian crossing at 151st Avenue and asked for details on that location.

City Engineer Westby believed that to be the crossing from the Riverstone development to the north to Lake Itasca Park. He noted that this is an ongoing discussion with the developer that will occur when the northern portion of the property is developed. He noted that there would be funds from both the City and the developer for that improvement.

Parks and Assistant Public Works Superintendent Riverblood noted that additional details can be found on page 206.

Councilmember Musgrove asked if staff anticipates that occurring in 2021.

City Engineer Westby explained that project would be developer driven and therefore staff is not exactly sure on the timing as the developer is still finishing on the south half of the development. He believed it would be more likely to occur in 2022, but that would just be a guess.

Councilmember Heinrich asked if staff could highlight the changes made based on this discussion when the Council reviews the document again.

Finance Director Lund stated that she would not be able to highlight but could send a recap.

Councilmember Musgrove asked if there would be a request for a new truck for the Fire Chief.

Finance Director Lund stated that the \$20,000 aggregate fee has been met and therefore the cost for replacement through insurance would be \$1,000.

Councilmember Musgrove referenced page 105 and asked for an update on a piece of equipment that may not need to be replaced because there are only two or three dirt roads remaining in Ramsey.

Public Works Superintendent Riemer confirmed that piece of equipment is used for snow removal. He explained that there may be further discussion in the future whether the equipment would be replaced, or the roads would be paved. He estimated another three or four years before the grader would need to be considered for replacement.

City Administrator Ulrich stated that there is a policy for paving the remaining unpaved roads.

Public Works Superintendent Riemer confirmed there are 2.3 miles of unpaved roads remaining in the City and estimated that is between about five locations. He noted that some of those paving projects would have fairly large drainage projects that would need to be completed in conjunction.

City Administrator Ulrich noted that in the future a discussion could be had with Nowthen to determine if there could be some sharing of services before making an investment of purchasing a new grader.

Councilmember Heinrich asked if it has been helpful to move to the ten-year CIP rather than the five-year CIP.

City Administrator Ulrich explained that there are some large pieces of equipment that need to be replaced on a predictable schedule and therefore the longer-term planning can be helpful for those large purchases. He recognized that there are some smaller more discretionary items.

Councilmember Kuzma noted that the road discussion also spurred the desire for a longer-term CIP in order to help plan for that expense along with other City expenses. He stated that the community center is another longer-range item.

Finance Director Lund agreed that the change from a five-year cycle to ten-year cycle was mainly based on the road needs.

Councilmember Musgrove referenced wellhead construction and water tower improvements proposed for 2020 and 2021, noting that the construction for a new wellhead and pump seemed to be a lower cost than the planned improvements.

City Engineer Westby noted that the cost for well nine specified in 2020 would be the cost for the study to determine where the next well would be located and provided additional details on when that would be anticipated.

Finance Director Lund noted that the plan had been to bring a request forward to the next meeting to call for a public hearing on this item in December. She asked if staff should bring this information forward again for review with the changes discussed and a public hearing could then be scheduled for January.

It was the consensus of the Council that the request for public hearing could come forward at the next regular meeting.

Councilmember Kuzma stated that there was a process completed in the beginning of the year to identify the priorities of the Council, which staff used to develop the budget and CIP. He commended staff for the work they have completed, and the process followed to date. He stated that he trusts the work of staff and did not believe that the Council needs to scrutinize every little thing that is brought forward. He stated that this is a working document and the amount of time that was spent tonight moving items slightly did not seem necessary. He explained that the time spent earlier in the year identifying priorities provided staff with the necessary direction.

Councilmember Heinrich referenced the peace officer's fund balance and asked if the rifle replacement should occur in a timelier manner using that fund.

Police Chief Katers replied that he is cautious using that fund as there are multiple funds within that fund. He provided an example of the vest replacement fund, noting that sometimes the City receives reimbursement from that purchase and sometimes not, therefore the fund can run a negative balance. He stated that some of the funds can be used once accrued while other funds have a running balance and he would be cautious to use those. He stated that while he would love to have the rifles replaced now, he would rather agree to the three-year replacement plan rather than attempting to use the peace officer's fund. He explained that special police officer funds are not guaranteed and therefore it is hard to predict when some of those funds would receive contribution. He noted that when the balance accumulates to a certain level, he does use that for equipment purchases but would not want to use the available balance at this time.

Councilmember Heinrich asked if Police Chief Katers would want to use the drug forfeiture fund to offset the rifle replacement.

Police Chief Katers stated that while some funds could be put towards that purchase he noted that he was unsure of the desired level of reserves that should be kept in the funds. He noted that he is comfortable with the three-year replacement plan.

Councilmember Kuzma stated that when the first round of budgeting was completed direction was given to reduce and Police Chief Katers replied with the three-year replacement plan. He stated that he would support the three-year replacement plan as proposed. He commented that it would make more sense to leave the peace officer's fund balances as is, rather than attempting to use those funds to offset the operating budget.

2.02: 2020 Capital Equipment Requests

Finance Director Lund reviewed the staff report.

City Administrator Ulrich provided input on the distribution policy, which allocates funds to the capital maintenance fund.

Councilmember Riley referenced a seized vehicle and asked what that would be replaced with.

Police Chief Katers replied that he would purchase whatever is available on the State purchasing contract. He explained that there are restrictions on what a vehicle can be used for when they are obtained through seizure, therefore it may not meet the needs of the department.

Councilmember Musgrove referenced differences between 2020 and 2021 and noted that the difference seems to be based on the allocation of funds that is made through the distribution policy. She asked if a larger amount of the fire truck should be purchased in 2020 because the funds are available rather than having to bond in the future years.

Finance Director Lund explained that there are not additional funds that would be available in 2020 to use for the fire truck. She explained that a capital equipment certificate would be issued for the total amount of debt.

2.03: Discuss 2020 Personnel Requests

Administrative Services Director Lasher reviewed the staff report.

Councilmember Heinrich referenced a previous worksession discussion related to the Planning Technician noting that the intent was to keep that position budget neutral and asked for additional details.

Administrative Services Director Lasher explained that the Planning Technician would have 40 hours per week and the phased retirement position would have 16 hours per week. She explained that is necessary to handle the current workload in that department.

Community Development Director Gladhill explained the difference in pay rate between the employee entering phased retirement and the Planning Technician. He noted that the position would most likely be offset by permit revenue.

Councilmember Heinrich asked if it would be possible for the Planning Technician to have less than 40 hours per week.

Community Development Director Gladhill replied that he did not believe the City would obtain a quality candidate offering less than 40 hours per week. He highly recommended against that option given the need for a quality candidate and the workload for code enforcement and land use.

Councilmember Riley referenced the employee survey, noting that comments were provided that some employees feel overworked or that there is not sufficient staffing. He commented that he would believe that department heads would prioritize the workload and staffing needs.

City Administrator Ulrich stated that this feedback was provided to the department heads and Council for consideration. He stated that those comments will be used to identify department shortages that would then be addressed through additional prioritization and proposals for additional staffing needs that are brought to the Council.

Councilmember Kuzma commented that most employees would feel overworked most of the time. He stated that in his opinion there would be a problem when there is work that is not able to be completed.

City Administrator Ulrich stated that there is a police officer position currently in the process of being filled.

Councilmember Heinrich asked for input on the reclassification in the fire department and how that position would be impacted by the dissolution of the JPA.

Fire Chief Kohner replied that the reclassification would not be impacted by the dissolution of the JPA. He provided additional details on the duties that would be handled by the Assistant Chief position.

Councilmember Heinrich asked if there are any proposed positions that would be considered “wants” using the example of the Planning Technician.

City Administrator Ulrich stated that the Planning Technician is a high priority to replace the position moving to phased retirement and the hours lost. He stated that the highest priority would be to backfill any vacant positions or time lost. He stated that reclassifications would be characterized as important and would be valuable to the organization and critical to the mission of the City for the purposes of retention and compensation for the work completed.

Councilmember Riley referenced the Community Development position, which will partially be offset by permit revenue, and asked if that would reduce the hours of contract review.

Community Development Director Gladhill stated that there are other areas within Community Development where he could attempt to further offset the cost for that position if necessary. He stated that each year the activity level increases and he would want to ensure sufficient coverage in the department. He agreed that the addition of this position would hopefully reduce some utilization of consultants. He explained that there will be a learning curve for the new employee.

Councilmember Heinrich asked if staff is willing to present ideas for further offsetting the Planning Technician position prior to budget adoption.

Community Development Director Gladhill confirmed that could be done.

Councilmember Menth asked if the main responsibility of the Planning Technician would be code enforcement.

Community Development Director Gladhill confirmed that would be one element of the position but noted that the employee would also be responsible for managing the intake of land use applications.

Councilmember Menth stated as he understands it currently, rental properties do not have an annual or semi-annual inspection. He stated that he inspects rental properties in Coon Rapids, where an inspection is completed every three years. He noted that those inspections catch a lot of violations and forces code compliance without requiring neighbor complaints. He suggested that perhaps Ramsey also implement a similar process.

Community Development Director Gladhill noted that discussion could occur at a future worksession. He noted that Ramsey currently does not have sufficient staff to handle those types of inspections.

Councilmember Menth echoed the comments that code enforcement and inspections have a high turnover rate for employees.

Councilmember Kuzma referenced the comment from Councilmember Heinrich asking for additional budget cuts to offset the Planning Technician position. He stated that it would be difficult to predict the permit revenue and he would hate to see the budget made too tight and believed that would tie the hands of the Community Development department to some extent.

Councilmember Heinrich stated that she would like the departments to take some time to review the budgets again to determine if there are some items that fall into the “want” category and could be postponed.

Mayor LeTourneau stated that in an ongoing operational scenario the staff should always be sensitive to efficiencies that could be gained. He explained that the Planning Technician request is simply to create a more even playing field. He stated that he would not want to force staff to pinpoint the need for contract services for 2020, as it would be difficult to predict what those needs would be without seeing the applications and workload that comes forward.

Councilmember Heinrich stated that she would like to be presented with other possible budgetary cuts within each department and review that information in a worksession prior to budget adoption.

Mayor LeTourneau stated that the Council and staff have been going through that exact process since May and the Council is at the place where a decision will need to be made to move forward. He recognized that the budget may not be perfect, but it has to get to a point where the Council feels comfortable moving forward.

Councilmember Heinrich stated that while she is close to that point, she is still not comfortable. She asked staff to review the budget again to determine where “wants” could be cut. She stated that she is not asking call times or level of service to be impacted.

Mayor LeTourneau stated that there is a possibility that the 180-degree view of that is that the question of wants versus needs has already been asked and responded to.

Councilmember Kuzma stated that this is his seventh year on the Council. He stated that when he first joined the Council, the staff was in poor shape and overworked and it has taken time for the Council to receive honest feedback from the staff on their needs and have an honest working relationship. He stated that there is now a trust factor that has been built between the Council and staff. He noted that the Council asked for additional cuts and staff provided those cuts to equate to the directed amount of six percent. He explained that four percent of those increases were items that were already built into the budget and could not be cut. He stated that he is comfortable with the six percent levy and was unsure what else would be desired to cut. He commented that cutting a few thousand dollars on specific line items will not have a large impact on the overall budget.

City Administrator Ulrich stated that some final adjustments will be made to the budget based on the discussions. He agreed that there has been a lot of discussion on wants versus needs related to the personnel requests based on priorities. He stated that the budget is an estimate and will not be finite. He explained that they do not want to underestimate expenditures or overestimate revenues. He explained that staff must make their best guess at construction costs and the state of the economy and therefore some contingencies are built into the budget. He noted that any surplus budget at the end of the year is allocated into long-term capital funds.

Councilmember Musgrove referenced the employee survey and stated that it seemed that there were a lot of feelings involved in the responses. She asked if each department has a metric of the job tasks and duties that would determine if the department is short staffed.

City Administrator Ulrich confirmed that to be true to an extent. He used the example of Community Development and time for permit review as well as Public Safety and response time.

Councilmember Musgrove used the example of Public Works where certain elements are given priority over other tasks. She stated that there are instances where there is not enough time or manpower to accomplish tasks that are considered lowered priority. She referenced the Police Records Technician position that was removed from the 2020 budget and asked if that would reappear in the 2021 budget.

Police Chief Katers anticipated that he would include that request in 2021 as a part-time staffing request.

Councilmember Musgrove stated that there was previous discussion related to the Metro Cities membership and referenced the recently released legislative agenda from that organization. She stated that there are 93 cities included in the organization and therefore there could be potential conflicts of interest between the parties being represented by Metro Cities. She suggested that membership be removed from the budget as the City already pays its own lobbyist, Mr. Tinklenberg, to act on part of Ramsey. She stated that she is also concerned with the amount the City pays to Mr. Tinklenberg and what is provided in return for that monthly payment.

City Administrator Ulrich referenced the contract with Mr. Tinklenberg and noted that the suggestion from the Council was not to discontinue the contract but for an update to be provided prior to the December 10 meeting. He stated that the contract renewal will also be part of an upcoming agenda. He stated that the membership to Metro Cities was decided upon after a recent presentation from a representative from the organization. He commented that the membership is a valuable resource, although not critical. He confirmed that Metro Cities has a mixed audience in its membership, using the example of LGA. He stated that Ramsey has only belonged to that organization for the past two years when the City wanted more involvement on a regional playing field and with regional policies. He noted that there are more opportunities to get involved with Metro Cities, to the extent the City desires.

Councilmember Riley stated that he feels comfortable that Mr. Tinklenberg is working on the interests of the City. He stated that he does not have a strong opinion on the Metro Cities membership.

Councilmember Heinrich stated that she would be in support of not continuing the membership with Metro Cities. She stated that she has reached out to the legislative representatives about the issue of LGA and would be willing to reach out and speak about other issues that are important for Ramsey.

Councilmember Kuzma stated that he would defer to the opinion of City Administrator Ulrich as he himself does not have time to go down to the legislature. He stated that if staff feels there is a benefit from the Metro Cities membership, he would support that. He noted that if staff feels that membership could be cut, he would also support that.

Councilmember Mentsh asked why the City joined Metro Cities three years ago.

City Administrator Ulrich stated that the City was making a conscious decision to step up regionally. He stated that the willingness of members of the Council to step up and reach out to legislators has helped bridge the gap that was provided by the organization. He reviewed some of the other organizations that the City is involved with that he felt provide more benefit to the City. He stated that the membership to Metro Cities is not critical and if it is the decision of the Council, he would agree to end the membership.

Community Development Director Gladhill noted that Metro Cities also acts as a watchdog for the Metropolitan Council and advocates for the rights of cities in regional planning and regional

funding. He used the example of the Livable Cities grant the City recently received in the amount of \$900,000.

City Administrator Ulrich stated that the organization will continue to do its job whether the City chooses to be a member or not. He noted that cities come in and out of membership and explained that metro cities as a whole would not suffer if Ramsey was not part of their organization.

Mayor LeTourneau stated that he could support either option related to the Metro Cities membership. He noted that the membership does provide opportunity for another voice, explaining while the City is quickly growing it helps to have every voice possible advocate for the City. He stated that this is a critical time for Ramsey and there is value in the membership, it would be the job of the City to advocate for more help from organizations.

Councilmember Menth stated that advocating for the City against the Metropolitan Council or for Highway 10 would seem to provide sufficient benefit.

Councilmember Musgrove believed that the Council can be more influential speaking with legislators directly and by using Mr. Tinklenberg. She stated that there are 93 cities in Metro Cities and therefore they are advocating for funds for all those cities, rather than providing direct service to Ramsey. She recommended that the Metro Cities membership not be funded next year.

Councilmember Riley stated that he would recommend not including the membership in the budget.

Mayor LeTourneau stated that in the interest of moving forward he would also agree that the City could make it without the Metro Cities membership in order to reach consensus.

Councilmember Musgrove stated that she believes that there are two staff acknowledgements times during the year, along with the holiday party. She asked for feedback on removing one of the staff acknowledgement events.

City Administrator Ulrich provided background on the staff acknowledgement events, noting that there is a breakfast once per year where higher-level staff serves breakfast to staff and presents years of service awards. He noted that the second event is a picnic type event where higher-level staff serve the staff. He stated that there is a great turnout for the events, which serve as an important atmosphere for communication and morale. He noted that there is not a large expense for the events. He stated that cutting the informal recognition event and communication opportunity could send the wrong message to staff. He believed that the events are an important part of showing the employees how they are valued to the organization. He stated that years of service awards are only presented at one of the events.

Councilmember Menth stated that in his last 17 years in construction he worked for Egan Companies and did not think a price could be put on an event where employees are shown value. He commented when holiday parties were cut it was a devastating time for employees. He stated

that any time employees are shown appreciation and acknowledged for their years of service is unmeasurable.

Administrative Services Director Lasher provided background on the events and the recognition that is given at the Employee Appreciation Breakfast and the picnic lunch, which are coordinated and planned by the Labor Management Committee. She stated that the events help with employee morale and provides an opportunity for employees to interact with employees not involved in their direct line of work. She stated that the breakfast occurs prior to most employees clocking in and the lunch occurs during the employee lunchtime. She stated that it means a lot to employees when Councilmembers attend and participate in the events.

Councilmember Riley stated that employees are the most important asset and recognizing them twice a year does not feel excessive and therefore he would not be in favor of changing that.

Councilmember Musgrove stated that she was glad to have this discussion. She stated that her opinion was that similar activity and recognition does not happen in the private sector. She commented that these events are very generous and was glad the City is able to do that for the staff; she simply did not believe that was common practice.

Councilmember Heinrich stated that she would be interested in making a motion asking staff to review the budget further to identify areas in the budget where further reductions could be made.

City Administrator Ulrich clarified that this is a worksession and therefore formal motions cannot be made. He noted that there could be consensus to provide that direction to staff, if that is desired. He stated that some changes will be made based on the discussion tonight and some changes from the State funding amounts will be known. He stated that Youth First will be making a presentation to the Council at an upcoming meeting.

Administrative Services Director Lasher stated that she would like to know by consensus whether she can begin recruitment for the Planning Technician. She confirmed the consensus of the Council to move forward on that recruitment. She referenced the recruitment of the Patrol Officer and noted that staff has gone through the process and has a candidate that is nearly ready for hiring. She stated that she would like to bring that item to the Council for approval at the December 10 meeting with an anticipated start date on December 26. She confirmed the consensus of the Council with those details. She referenced the reclassifications and noted that if comfortable she would bring forward a request at the December 10 meeting for approval through resolution. She confirmed the consensus of the Council to move forward on that item as well.

3. TOPICS FOR FUTURE DISCUSSION

3.01: Review Future Topics/ Calendar

City Administrator Ulrich stated that both Representative Heinrich and Scott have RSVP'd for the December 10th meeting.

Councilmember Riley stated that the issue of road financing has been deferred in setting the budget up in this manner and therefore the Council has the anticipation of further discussing that topic in the near future. He suggested that the issue be tackled early in 2020.

Councilmember Kuzma stated that the funding for the public works facility will also have an impact on the future years budgets.

4. MAYOR / COUNCIL / STAFF INPUT

None.

5. ADJOURNMENT

The Special Work Session of the City Council was adjourned at 9:17 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kurtis G. Ulrich
City Administrator

ATTEST:

Katie M. Schmidt
Administrative Assistant

Drafted by Amanda Staple
TimeSaver Off Site Secretarial, Inc.