

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

The Ramsey City Council conducted a City Council Work Session on Tuesday, September 14, 2021, at the Ramsey Municipal Center, 7550 Sunwood Drive NW, Ramsey, Minnesota.

Members Present: Mayor Mark Kuzma
Councilmember Ryan Heineman
Councilmember Chelsea Howell
Councilmember Debra Musgrove
Councilmember Chris Riley
Councilmember Dan Specht
Councilmember Matt Woestehoff

Also Present: City Administrator Kurtis Ulrich
Finance Director Diana Lund
Administrative Services Director Colleen Lasher
City Engineer Bruce Westby
Fire Chief Matt Kohner
Police Captain Tim Frankfurth
Public Works Superintendent Grant Riemer
Senior Planner Chloe McGuire Brigl
Economic Development Manager Sean Sullivan
Building Official Jesse Szykulski
Planning Technician Brian McCann
Legislative Consultant El Tinklenberg

1. CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Kuzma called the City Council Work Session to order at 5:12 p.m.

2. TOPICS FOR DISCUSSION

2.01: Discuss Finalists for the Deputy City Administrator/Community Development Director Position

City Administrator Ulrich stated the City Council has chosen two finalists for the Deputy City Administrator/Community Development Director; Mr. Brian Hagen and Ms. Hanna Klimmek. Candidates participated in a testing process and met the criteria for hire, and both candidates are acceptable to City Staff. He asked whether there is consensus on a candidate to whom City Staff can extend a job offer. He noted wages and start date can be discussed at a later date.

Councilmember Riley stated he did not look at the test results, but he remembers that Ms. Klimmek scored low on a question regarding her own weaknesses. He added she answered a question poorly.

Councilmember Heineman agreed, adding it was two questions in a row and both of them were answered poorly.

Councilmember Riley asked whether that issue has been addressed by the testing.

Administrative Services Director Colleen Lasher stated this issue was addressed in the testing process and it was determined that the candidate fully accepts and acknowledges when they have made a mistake. She added they do not feel that they are perfect, and they were able to produce a good example of a time when they made a mistake or an error in judgment in the past and how they rectified it.

City Administrator Ulrich stated the consultant reviewed this issue at length and did not believe it to be a problem.

Councilmember Howell asked about City Staff's opinions about the two differing backgrounds of the candidates. She added they have both worn a lot of hats and come from smaller cities; Mr. Hagen is a city administrator, and Ms. Klimmek has a different role, but they are both great candidates.

Councilmember Riley stated he feels it is a detriment that Mr. Hagen has only worked for one small city. He added, considering overall experience, he does not think as highly of him as he did. He noted Ms. Klimmek has more diverse experience

Councilmember Woestehoff stated Ms. Klimmek's experience with the business community is invaluable and more in line with the day-to-day duties.

Councilmember Woestehoff stated Mr. Hagen's experience dealing with contractors would come in handy, but Ms. Klimmek has more experience with a bigger team in Big Lake. He added, overall, he puts a lot of weight on City Staff's opinion, and staff have made their points fairly clear across the board that Ms. Klimmek's experience is preferable.

Councilmember Heineman asked whether City Staff is still leaning toward Ms. Klimmek.

City Administrator Ulrich confirmed this.

Councilmember Heineman stated he found both to be great candidates. He added he was hoping the evaluation process would produce something to make the selection process easier.

Mayor Kuzma stated he is in favor of Ms. Klimmek, as her development experience will help grow the community.

Councilmember Specht stated he is leaning toward Mr. Hagen, although both candidates have great experience and will be able to grow into their position.

Councilmember Musgrove stated these are two very qualified, eager candidates, who anticipate developing their career. She added she believes Mr. Hagen is a stronger candidate and seems willing to lead.

The consensus of the City Council was to move forward with Brian Hagen for the position of Deputy City Administrator/Community Development Director.

Councilmember Specht stated he would recommend authorizing City Staff to offer the job to Ms. Klimmek if Mr. Hagen turns it down. The City Council agreed.

City Administrator Ulrich stated City Staff will extend the offer, and the City Council can review the offer, start date and salary at a formal City Council meeting.

2.02: Discuss Civil Legal Services Contract Finalists

City Administrator Ulrich stated the City Council conducted interviews with five law firms during a work session on August 23, 2021, and subsequent inquiry was done on two firms. He added one point of clarification was whether the attorneys have access to a backup attorney to handle City's contract and work. He noted the firms indicated that they do.

City Administrator Ulrich stated Hoff & Barry did not have a retainer number, but they have responded with an amount of \$7,000 per month. He added Mr. Knaak's firm reduced the retainer by a couple hundred dollars per month, from \$4,200 to \$4,000 per month.

City Administrator Ulrich stated the retainer from Hoff & Barry, which is documented in their proposal, seems high. He added Mr. Knaak's proposal includes 3rd party billing and other slight differences. He noted the limiting factor was that Mr. Knaak's contract specified 10 hours per month on one file, to be billed hourly, so there is potential for additional expenses.

City Administrator Ulrich stated both candidates provided references that were positive and checked out appropriately. He added there is nothing that disqualifies either candidate. He noted Mr. Knaak indicated more experience with elected officials, but both candidates have represented a number of different jurisdictions.

City Administrator Ulrich stated land use zoning and real estate is a strong point for Hoff & Barry. He added Mr. Knaak appears able to deal with issues on the spot and he would be good at council meetings and impromptu responses.

City Administrator Ulrich stated the City Council could decide to bring the candidates back for another interview. He added the existing law firm is still on retainer.

Councilmember Heineman asked whether City Staff received clarification from Mr. Knaak regarding who will fill in for him.

City Administrator Ulrich stated Mr. Knaak clarified that issue in his response letter.

Councilmember Specht stated he was impressed with Mr. Knaak's experience and knowledge, and he would be able to utilize his experience.

Councilmember Woestehoff stated the City Council indicated a few weeks ago in their comments that Mr. Knaak would not be moved forward, and he felt that was a strong recommendation from the City Council, and he would defer to the City Staff in this matter.

Councilmember Woestehoff stated it seemed like Mr. Knaak is great in meetings. He added the City Council should decide whether they want someone who gets the legal work done, or someone who wants to be on tv.

Commissioner Heineman asked Commissioner Woestehoff whether that is an assumption. He added he does not remember Mr. Knaak making those comments.

Councilmember Woestehoff stated Mr. Knaak served as legal counsel for Norm Coleman's recount attempt. He added he would strongly support Hoff & Barry as the better choice for the City.

Councilmember Howell asked where Councilmember Woestehoff found his information on Mr. Knaak.

Councilmember Woestehoff stated he did some research in the local paper.

Councilmember Howell stated she did research into Mr. Knaak's legislative background, which interested her quite a bit. She added he understands the legislative process, which will be a benefit if the City wants to pursue LGA dollars. She noted she is not interested in an attorney who gives policy preferences. She expressed her support for Mr. Knaak.

Councilmember Musgrove asked what is the average time spent on a case. She asked if 10 hours is reasonable, or if a total of 15 hours could be pursued, and then billable after that. She asked whether there would be a consensus to request 15 hours per case.

City Administrator Ulrich stated the majority of cases could be completed in 10 hours with a few exceptions. He added 10 hours is Mr. Knaak's proposal, but the City could counter with something else. He noted Mr. Knaak's offer is pretty low already, and he is offering 3rd party billing reimbursement.

Mayor Kuzma asked about the current monthly retainer.

City Administrator Ulrich stated the current retainer is \$3,200 per month with an additional \$500 per meeting upon request. He added he would need to clarify but he believes Mr. Knaak's retainer does not include meetings.

Councilmember Riley stated Mr. Knaak's letter says, "litigation matters that do not exceed 10 hours."

Councilmember Riley stated he thinks both parties are qualified, and that is his number one criteria. He added his second criteria is price, and Mr. Knaak is substantially cheaper.

Mayor Kuzma stated the current City attorney has done a good job for the City.

Councilmember Woestehoff stated, from a financial standpoint, he agrees Mr. Knaak is the better choice.

The consensus of the City Council was to move forward with Mr. Knaak's proposal.

2.03: Update from Legislative Consultant El Tinklenberg

El Tinklenberg, legislative consultant, gave an update on what has been going on in the State legislature. He added the Senate voted on the bill that included the City's application, just as the City Council were discussing interest in withdrawing the application. He added the bill is tied to other legislation, and it is not a foregone conclusion that it will be approved. He noted Senator Klobuchar is optimistic that it will pass, as there is much interest driving the consideration of an infrastructure bill.

Mr. Tinklenberg stated the City Council had discussed the possibility of designating Covid relief funds for the potential third lane project. He added what he learned from the Commissioner is that MnDOT has indicated that when they are ready to move forward with the third lane project, after Fair Oak and Ramsey Gateway are completed, funding will be available. He noted that would be better for traffic management for the third lane project in any case.

Mr. Tinklenberg stated, with regard to the river crossing that the City Council has discussed, that potential project could represent a terrific opportunity for the City in terms of the economic development that it could support, as well as providing relief to traffic on Highway 10. He noted that is an opportunity that will require a significant degree of City involvement.

Mr. Tinklenberg stated he spoke with Representative Stephenson, who has sponsored legislation that would provide funding for the river crossing, and he feels interest level is at a point where there is an opportunity to make progress. He noted there will be a lot of infrastructure money moving around in the next 3-5 years.

Councilmember Musgrove stated there are many roadblocks, and this is a long-term vision. She added she understands the importance of getting some funding, but she questions whether it will be possible to get support.

Councilmember Musgrove stated she is not interested in Mr. Tinklenberg's research on the North Star commuter rail to St. Cloud. She added she is interested in Highway 47 capacity and access, as well as the potential river crossing. She noted, with regard to deferring the City's portion of the \$4 million, she would support that rather than adding in more components.

Mr. Tinklenberg stated the most likely outcome of the additional money is there may be a shared reduction in terms of the commitment from the project partners.

Councilmember Specht stated he heard that the initial quotes for Highway 10 came in lower than expected by approximately \$15 million. Mr. Tinklenberg agreed.

Councilmember Specht asked how that could result in savings for the City of Ramsey.

Mayor Kuzma stated these are preliminary cost estimates.

Councilmember Woestehoff stated the City is in an interesting position with potential extra funding for a fully funded project. He added he had an idea related to Highway 10, that the City could potentially use some of the funds to assist Highway 10 businesses with beautification and Code compliance through City-sponsored grants. He noted the City Council talked about the history of the corridor, when nobody invested or made improvements because they were told that the City would be taking property. He noted this could be an opportunity to get a Gateway to Ramsey that looks better.

Councilmember Heineman stated that is an amazing idea, and a good place to start.

Councilmember Riley requested clarification about the \$20 million, and whether that is the funding that the City already decided to pull the application for.

City Administrator Ulrich stated the City should take proactive steps to support the third lane project, and offer support as a community, to not be disingenuous to the County.

Councilmember Riley stated he agrees that is important, but the City Council said it wanted to do something, and still needs to do what it can to support funding partners.

Councilmember Specht asked whether the City Council can discuss whether the City will continue this contract for services, or whether that is a discussion for another time.

Mr. Tinklenberg stated the extension provided by the City Council runs through September 2021. He encouraged the City Council to discuss how they might want to proceed and put together a plan for approaching the river crossing project. He added he feels there is an opportunity there, and he wants to be productive for the City of Ramsey. He noted, once the gateway project is moving forward, the County's attention will move to the east, and the river crossing project will require a push from the City, through a coalition with groups across the river, as well as leadership from the City.

Mr. Tinklenberg stated the opportunity is there and it can make a difference for the City in the future.

Mayor Kuzma agreed, adding the Armstrong overpass would not have been built if the City had not stepped up. He added the river crossing project will not happen if the City does not step up.

Councilmember Heineman stated he is concerned about burning bridges with the City's former previous coalition by forming a new coalition and new partners to move forward with.

Mr. Tinklenberg stated he is not saying that the City should abandon its current coalition, but the combination of shared interests will be different. He added Coon Rapids and Andover might be interested in the river crossing project, and the City can maintain those relationships.

Mayor Kuzma stated he does not see any of the \$20 million going to the bridge.

Councilmember Riley asked whether the House is working on a bill that includes the bridge or third lane projects. Mr. Tinklenberg stated they are not. He added, at this point, the City would need to indicate to Senator Klobuchar that they want that, and he would encourage the City not to do that.

Councilmember Specht stated he would like to have more conversations about the value of Mr. Tinklenberg's firm for the City, and the future of the contract, and what it might look like financially for the City. He added the City recently gave them an increase, and maybe that would go back down.

Councilmember Specht stated it would be great if the \$20 million comes through, but he would not recommend doing anything at this point.

Councilmember Heineman asked when the bill was passed.

Mr. Tinklenberg stated the bill was passed on August 10, 2021.

City Administrator Ulrich stated it is a good idea to show on record the City's support for the funding in the House.

Councilmember Musgrove stated she agrees with Councilmember Specht about having a conversation about Mr. Tinklenberg's contract, after hearing about the river crossing project. She added there is not enough time to address it now.

2.04: Continued Discussion on 2022 Budget/Levies

Finance Director Diana Lund stated the City Council expressed a consensus regarding the 2022 budget at the last meeting to pursue a 5% increase over last year with 15% for roads. She added City Staff are reviewing other items in the budget including non-union wages, contracts and current charges on building related permits.

Administrative Services Director Lasher stated tentative agreements were reached with the Sergeants group and the Captains group, and hopefully an agreement with AFSCME is forthcoming. She added the Patrol group has not yet scheduled a meeting. She noted that is a big part of the budget.

Administrative Services Director Lasher stated the City's non-union employees continue to fall below comparable cities in their pay grades. The patrol captains and sergeant groups have strong union representation, and they negotiate for comparable wages; however, non-union staff do not have that bargaining power and have fallen below comparable wages. She reviewed a list of 16 positions recommended for wage increases figuring in 3% COLA and other annual costs. A supervisor position was given the lowest possible increase with a net cost to the city of \$3, to move them to the next step for the following year. There are 10 positions on the list that do not warrant a market rate adjustment.

Councilmember Riley asked how the comparable cities were chosen, and who picked them.

Administrative Services Director Lasher stated City Staff used a League of Minnesota Cities salary survey, looking at positions with similar duties, using 2021 data.

City Administrator Kurt Ulrich stated the purpose is to demonstrate whether jobs are falling behind, and to make the City Council aware of the issue.

Councilmember Howell asked whether the City Council could get a list of the comparable cities that were used.

Administrative Services Director Lasher agreed, adding it will vary, as not every city has the same positions or job titles.

Councilmember Riley stated there would be a \$32,000 increase in 2022 if the City Council moves forward with this. He added, for purposes of transparency, this plan would build in salary increases for the next several years.

Administrative Services Director Lasher agreed.

Councilmember Woestehoff stated there is a lot of turn over happening in every industry and we have to do everything we can to retain city staff. He added turnover itself is very expensive. He stressed the importance of supporting staff and having reasonable expectations.

Councilmember Musgrove asked whether there is another metric that can be used for comparison purposes, like the Minnesota Department of Labor. She asked for clarification regarding the \$3 pay raise.

Administrative Services Director Lasher stated that will get the employee on track and into the appropriate pay scale. She stated it is important to get employees on a corrected pay scale for the job they are doing.

Councilmember Specht asked whether other benefits the city offers could be put into effect, such as more vacation or better retirement matching, to make Ramsey a more valuable employer.

Administrative Services Director Lasher stated cities are incredibly comparable across the metro area in terms of benefits.

Councilmember Heineman stated he wants to be as fiscally conservative as possible, but would rather do it in the budget and not staff compensation. He added City Staff are appropriately important, and when paid correctly can help us ensure a balanced city budget.

Administrative Services Director Lasher stated, in response to Councilmember Musgrove's question, there are many other salary surveys that can be reviewed. She added private sector businesses are not comparable, and public sector employers are not allowed to give bonuses.

Finance Director Lund stated building permits and related fees were reduced greatly and are not covering the service of providing the permit. She added income from permits was down by \$186,000 in 2019 based on the same valuation because of the reduction of fees. She noted this issue will have an effect on the budget and will be reviewed at the City Council's October work session.

Councilmember Heineman asked whether the permits are mostly being pulled by contractors for building developments or by individual residents.

Finance Director Lund stated that would be building permits, and that is a different formula. She added building permits are the same for individuals and builders.

City Administrator Ulrich stated City Staff can provide information regarding building permits for new construction vs. existing homeowners.

City Administrator Ulrich stated the majority of our revenue comes from new construction.

Mayor Kuzma stated it sounds like we are not charging enough.

Councilmember Specht asked why the fees were reduced in 2018, and what was the desired outcome. He added he would not want permit costs to dramatically affect residents.

Finance Director Lund stated the idea was that if the permit fees were reduced, people would pull permits and be compliant.

Councilmember Heineman agreed that individual homeowners could be affected by high building fees.

Finance Director Lund stated she would like to work with the building official regarding permit amounts.

Councilmember Musgrove stated a sewer permit is \$25, but window replacement is \$75. She asked if that is a per window cost. She added she would like a breakdown of fees from the building inspector for review by the City Council.

Finance Director Lund stated the window replacement fee is a one-time fee.

City Administrator Ulrich stated the City Council can decide if there is a consensus to get closer to costs by covering that with fees while being sensitive to existing residents. He added City Staff can pull some fees for typical residential projects.

Councilmember Specht asked whether there will be public comment on this matter. Finance Director Lund stated the issue will be introduced in November, and will require a public hearing, as it is an Ordinance.

Councilmember Riley stated that 15%, which gives us \$1.673 million, is less than the \$1.9 million we are bringing in now. He added he can support it if the roads are fully funded with the 1.9 million.

Councilmember Heineman stated roads were only fully funded by franchise fees for two of those eight years. He added, under this plan, the City will need to dip into the slush fund but there will be 6 years of consecutive surplus starting in 2023.

Councilmember Riley stated there is only extra if you build in an increase.

Councilmember Heineman stated there is currently a balance.

Councilmember Riley stated it is growing because we are anticipating a 5% increase.

Councilmember Heineman stated the 5% increase is actually quite a bit lower than the average 7.5% increase that we have had since 2014. He added, by doing this, if we can keep it to 5%, we will have a 2.5% year after year general increase in savings, and we will also fully fund the roads and end 2030 with a surplus of \$1.9 million. He added he can provide the numbers.

Finance Director Lund stated the City has to do a 15% increase every year based on the 5% levy increase. She added, at the end of 2030, the balance would be \$2.8 million.

Councilmember Heineman stated there would be a deficit of \$712,000 with the franchise fee.

Councilmember Riley stated you are not building a 5% increase into the franchise fee. He added it will not be fully funded in the first year, and we do not know what will happen in the coming years. He noted it is assumed it will increase by 5%, and that assumption was never used for the franchise fee.

Councilmember Heineman stated the only way this doesn't work is if future City Councils do not pass an average of 5% going forward. He added these numbers are based on the CIP, and the franchise fee will only fund the City for 2 of the next 8 years.

Councilmember Riley stated he does not like to make decisions assuming there will be an increase every year, although he agreed it is likely.

Councilmember Heineman stated the franchise fee represented a 15% tax increase for many residents. He asked whether the City Council wishes to fund roads through the 10th year.

Councilmember Woestehoff stated that 2022 budget issues and funding for roads are the current objective.

Councilmember Heineman stated it is not fiscally irresponsible to maintain 5% growth.

Councilmember Woestehoff stated he would prefer to fully fund the roads without dipping into savings.

Councilmember Heineman stated the savings account is there for a reason, and as tax capacity grows, we will be better off financially. He added there would be a surplus in 2030.

Councilmember Woestehoff stated this budget discussion pertains to 2022, not 2030.

Councilmember Heineman asked why the City would raise taxes when there is a surplus in the savings account that we can use to get us through the time period when it is needed.

Councilmember Specht asked how much is left in the roads fund.

Finance Director Lund stated the fund will have approximately \$1.5 million at the end of the year. She added tax capacity for 2022 would be about 43%, and capital equipment requests for 2023 are not known but could be approximately \$400,000. She noted this takes into consideration 15% for roads based on a 5% levy.

Councilmember Musgrove asked whether the bond levy will be a separate issue.

Finance Director Lund stated the bond levy falls outside the scope of the budget. She added a rate increase in 2023 takes into consideration capital equipment certificates, municipal center debt, and a reduction in the debt due to reissuance of \$100,000. She noted \$300,000 will be applied this year that will not be there in 2023.

Councilmember Howell asked whether this discussion can be continued after the regular meeting.

Councilmember Specht asked what is planned in the CIP for roads for 2022, and what would be the impact of the tax levy increase to \$1.9 million instead of 1.673 million for this year.

Councilmember Heineman stated, with the franchise fee, 2022 roads are under-funded. He added, with the tax levy, they will be fully funded by 2024.

Finance Director Lund stated the tax capacity rate would provide approximately \$200,000.

Councilmember Musgrove asked whether any roads are projected to be done with MSA funds, under the CIP in 2023.

Finance Director Lund stated she is working on the CIP items and will present that to the City Council in a month. She added the road are not MSA-Eligible.

Councilmember Heineman stated he would not support passing anything that does not fully fund roads. He added that was not done with the franchise fee, and a deficit was run for 2023-2029 with the exception of 2025.

City Administrator Ulrich stated he believes there is a consensus to go with 5% plus 15% for roads, and to continue the discussion after tonight's regular meeting.

Councilmember Musgrove asked whether the 5% will help with \$32,000 for wage adjustments.

Finance Director Lund stated there would be a \$50,000 reduction to go from 5.45% to 5%. She added the new personnel request and building permits have not been taken into consideration. She added, at the next budget meeting, City Council direction is requested with regard to fully funding roads at \$1.9 million, keeping the general levy at 5%, and leaving the debt service as is.

Finance Director Lund stated this is the 5%, roads at 15% over last year's levy, and then the EDA and the bond. She asked are we looking at keeping the general fund constant and adding to the road levy.

Councilmember Heineman stated we are only dipping into savings by approximately \$250,000 out of 1.5 million, and from that point on, we grow savings through 2030 and end with \$2 million in surplus. He added he does not see dipping into savings for the first 2 years as a negative.

Councilmember Musgrove stated she supports keeping it at 5% and 15%, and seeing whether adjustments can be made to the building fees. Councilmember Howell agreed.

There was a consensus to continue the work session after the regular meeting.

RECESS TO REGULAR MEETING

Motion by Councilmember Heineman, seconded by Councilmember Musgrove to move the work session into recess at 7:00 p.m.

Motion carried. Voting Yes: Mayor Kuzma, Councilmembers Heineman, Howell, Musgrove, Riley, Specht, and Woestehoff. Voting No: None.

RECONVENE THE WORK SESSION

Acting Mayor Riley reconvened the City Council Work Session at 10:15 p.m.

2.05: Discuss Community Development Staffing

Administrative Services Director Lasher reviewed immediate staffing needs in the Community Development Department. The first vacancy is a 20 hours/week permit technician position that must be filled temporarily due to a leave of absence. She stated Ms. Nicole LeBlanc, Happy Days

intern, could be hired to cover this position on a temporary basis at \$18.00 per hour. She added Ms. Laubach is currently in school and is eager and motivated to work.

Administrative Services Director Lasher stated the other vacancy is a 16 hours per week Community Development Assistant position that will be vacant when the current employee retires. She added that this position could be downgraded to an Administrative Assistant position working from 8:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m., Monday through Friday which is 20 hours per week. She noted this is staff's recommendation, so recruitment can begin as soon as possible.

Councilmember Heineman asked whether the two positions could be combined for a total of 36 hours, which would revert to 20 hours when the employee on a leave of absence returns.

Administrative Services Director Lasher agreed, adding that would be phenomenal. She stated Ms. Laubach is very interested in that position, and it would save staff from doing an external recruitment.

There was a consensus of the City Council to combine both open positions into a 36 hour/week position on a temporary basis.

2.06: Discuss City Meeting Minutes and Video/Audio Archiving Recordings of City Council Work Sessions

City Administrator Ulrich stated the City Council discussed the issue of archiving minutes and/or televising special meetings. He added meetings are recorded and audio could be made available to the public. He noted a policy for retention should be considered, as the current requirement is a minimum of 3 months' retention per State retention policy.

Administrative Services Director Lasher stated the State's retention policy, which has been adopted by the City of Ramsey, allows that new versions of the policy can be adopted as written. She added an amendment to the Resolution could specify that files are retained for a longer period of time.

City Administrator Ulrich stated once official action is approved, it is not beneficial to keep audio or video longer than necessary, and in fact, in some cases can create liability issues.

City Administrator Ulrich stated work sessions can be recorded on Zoom, and QCTV has indicated that work sessions can be recorded and archived if they are moved to Council Chambers.

City Administrator Ulrich stated a retention period has not been defined.

City Administrator Ulrich stated the City Council has discussed options for meeting minute-taking, including verbatim, detailed summary, or executive summary. He added this could have a budget impact.

Administrative Services Director Lasher provided a spreadsheet showing transcription charges for City Council regular meetings and work sessions for the first 6 months of 2021. She added the

projected cost for 2021 would be \$10,565 under the current structure. She noted near verbatim would cost an additional \$9,489.51.

Administrative Services Director Lasher stated TimeSaver Off Site Secretarial has indicated that it would be difficult to get high quality verbatim minutes for work session audio recorded in the conference room. She added the recommendation for verbatim minutes would be to move the work sessions to the Council Chambers.

Councilmember Heineman stated audio storage is a minimal cost compared to video storage, with 12 hours of audio at 1 gigabyte of storage. He added the best solution is to archive audio recordings done in the conference room, and make them available to the public.

Councilmember Howell stated video recording does not cost anything.

Councilmember Heineman stated he would rather have the work sessions in the conference room than Council Chambers, if there are costs associated with storage of audio files. He added anyone who questions the minutes can download audio files from the archives. He noted this is an inexpensive option.

There was a consensus of the City Council to retain audio recordings of City Council work sessions in the conference room.

Councilmember Heineman stated the audio recordings should be retained for 4 years, which would be one City Council term, as opposed to 90 days.

Acting Mayor Riley stated audio taken in the conference room could be kept for 4 years.

Councilmember Howell stated she likes the clarity of meeting recordings.

Councilmember Heineman stated residents can download the audio files themselves.

Administrative Services Director Lasher stated the City maintains CDs with every QCTV video recording.

City Administrator Ulrich agreed to check with QCTV regarding a 4-year minimum storage plan.

Councilmember Musgrove stated the meeting recordings will be retained and can be referred to if necessary.

There was a consensus of the City Council to stay with the current method of minute taking.

3. TOPICS FOR FUTURE DISCUSSION

3.01: Review Future Topics/ Calendar

-None.

4. MAYOR / COUNCIL / STAFF INPUT

-None.

5. ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Councilmember Musgrove, seconded by Councilmember Specht to adjourn the work session at 10:35 p.m.

Motion carried. Voting Yes: Acting Mayor Riley, Councilmembers Heineman, Howell, Musgrove, Specht, and Woestehoff. Voting No: None.

Respectfully submitted,

Kurtis G. Ulrich
City Administrator

ATTEST:

Katie M. Schmidt
Deputy City Clerk

Drafted by Mary Mullen
TimeSaver Off Site Secretarial, Inc.