

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

The Ramsey City Council conducted a City Council Work Session on Tuesday, October 12, 2021, at the Ramsey Municipal Center, 7550 Sunwood Drive NW, Ramsey, Minnesota.

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

Also Present: City Administrator Kurtis Ulrich
Building Maintenance Supervisor Dan Bray
Administrative Services Director Colleen Lasher
Public Works Superintendent Grant Riemer
City Engineer Bruce Westby
Police Chief Jeff Katers
Zoning Code Enforcement Officer Bria Raines
Building Official Jesse Szykulski

1. CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Kuzma called the City Council Work Session to order at 5:31 p.m.

2. TOPICS FOR DISCUSSION

2.01: NW Metro River Crossing Presentation

City Administrator Ulrich introduced Sarah Barnes and Jennifer Wiltgen from MnDOT and Paul Morris from SRF Consulting. He also mentioned that Councilmember Musgrove was the City representative on the Study Committee and City Engineer Westby was also involved. City Administrator Ulrich stated Anoka County Commissioner Matt Look and Representative John Heinrich were also in attendance.

Jennifer Wiltgen, MnDOT, stated she will be presenting the Northwest Metro River Crossing Feasibility Analysis, which was completed in July, including findings, study conclusions, and potential next steps. She provided project background and overview, noting in 2019, the Minnesota Legislature commissioned a study to look at river crossings in the northwest metro area. The analysis looked at population growth and resulting regional traffic demand to understand mobility on the system and within the region and help guide future investment in the area.

Ms. Wiltgen stated they wanted to look at previous studies, such as the 2002 Origin Destination Study and 2004 Scoping Decision document that looked at a river crossing and location. Since then, there has been population growth and changes in the system so they wanted to update what has been learned and reengage cities and counties on the processes. Ms. Wiltgen reviewed goals and expectations of the study, noting it was a fact-finding investigation, and technical analysis to look at mobility and river crossing capacity needs in the region. This is the first of several steps if any of the improvements are to move forward and are feasible for further consideration. She explained that because they are not in a decision-making context, it does not include recommendations and any future phases, should improvements be warranted to consider further, it would require a greater analysis, including a technical and safety analysis, as well as environmental review and more community engagement. Ms. Wiltgen reviewed a list of participating agencies, counties and cities in the study.

Paul Morris, SRF Consulting, reiterated that this was a fact-finding investigation to determine the issues and challenges which would guide solutions. He reviewed the context analysis, origin-destination analysis, and a congestion analysis.

Mr. Morris stated with the context analysis they reviewed all of the City Comprehensive Plans and Transportation Plans in the area to understand what the different cities were envisioning with their growth over the next 20 years. There are a lot of growth projected in these areas on both sides of the river, with 30% more population and 20% more jobs. This is anticipated to put a lot more pressure on the highway system. Mr. Morris agreed with Ms. Wiltgen that a lot of the highways surrounding the study area either have had improvements or are expected to in the coming years, including I-94, Highway 101, Highway 610, and Highway 10. Mr. Morris explained there is going to be a need to make improvements on local roads as well to help move the traffic. He continued that a lot of commercial and retail growth and on the employment side, are clustered around the highway corridors. This makes sense because that's where the people and businesses are, which has pros and cons when it comes to planning for transportation. On the plus side, the facilities are there and can serve the freight needs of the developments and on the downside, it puts a lot more pressure on the roadway system. This is why the analysis looked 20 years out.

Mr. Morris explained the Origin Destination Analysis, looked at where trips are coming from, where they are going, how are they getting there, and impact on the roadways. They used modern technology including GPS information to understand the movements of trips through the study area. Some of the key findings were that Highway 610 carries the most traffic, Highway 101 sees about one-half of that, and Highway 169 serves a smaller amount of traffic when compared to the other two. In this analysis, they wanted to understand which communities rely on the current river crossings.

Mr. Morris stated the analysis found that Highway 101 serves regional trips which are longer, with people from outstate coming to the Metro area. Highway 610 showed patterns of commuter type trips because there are a lot of employment and population on both the Anoka County and Hennepin County side. With Highway 169 there were shorter trips, which may be used for shopping or other activities. Another finding looked at Fridays before summer holidays and found the Highway 101 crossing had four times as many trips and much longer trips which leads to congestion during these times. The analysis looked at rush hour times and how balanced the

northbound and southbound traffic is as it crosses the river. If the traffic is balanced, over the course of a day the bridge can carry a lot more traffic. However, if the traffic is heavier in one direction, it creates more pressure and congestion. Mr. Morris stated the analysis found that Highway 101 had the most unbalanced traffic pattern with the heaviest volume in the morning going southbound and the reverse in the afternoon. The other two highways were more balanced.

Mr. Morris stated that the Congestion Analysis looked for three things: the severity of how slow traffic gets, the duration of how long congestion lasts, and the extent or how far back the que extends from the congestion. These are conditions the average commuter experiences. The analysis found that in the morning, there was major congestion on Highway 169 in Elk River, Highway 101 in Rogers, I-94 heading towards the city, and most of Highway 169 between Highway 10 across the river and to Highway 610. The causes of this congestion included issues with merging, traffic capacity, and traffic signals. In the afternoon, the reverse is true as it relates to congestion. Mr. Morris described the highway projects coming up in the next few years that may help with congestion. He provided a summary, noting most of the major highways in this area have some degree of congestion and explained that by identifying bottleneck areas, it will give a target of where to look for solutions and make improvements.

Mr. Morris stated when addressing solutions, they considered improvements already in the pipeline or programmed in the next few years. He presented a list of solutions generated to alleviate congestion, noting one of the first solutions is to address traffic signals. He explained they separated solutions with merit from those not feasible to move forward and looked at each through several lenses. The considerations were whether the solution improved traffic across the river, were consistent with local planning, and residential and community impacts in terms of already developed areas and natural resource impacts. He stated the list of solutions they will carry forward for more analysis include improvements to Highway 10 going west in Ramsey to Elk River, Highway 10 in Coon Rapids, Highway 101 in Rogers, and Highway 610.

Mr. Morris noted they packaged the solutions into several concepts: Concept 1 includes project areas on Highway 10 and Highway 101 in Rogers; Concept 2 adds the additional segment of Highway 610; and Concepts 3 and 4 focus on the addition of a new river crossing between Highways 101 and 169. They looked at a four-lane, 45 mph-type of road with traffic signals every one-quarter mile versus an expressway in Concept 4 that is a highway design of 55 mph with farther spacing between signals. They evaluated that with a benefit-cost analysis that showed the total benefits including societal benefit to save time, savings in crashes, and vehicle operating costs by reducing total miles traveled. Mr. Morris explained the present value of costs is a rough indication of capital costs required to construct each alternative; however, it only looks to a 20-year horizon.

Councilmember Riley asked about a four-lane expressway and if I-94 would connect with Zanzibar.

Mr. Morris answered yes, and as far as the analysis it roughly aligns with Zanzibar and ties in with Highway I-94 at the Dayton Parkway interchange. He noted this is one alignment that has already been studied but these are illustrative concepts and if the corridor moved it would not have a big bearing on the economics.

Councilmember Riley stated there were some concerns about a new river crossing with the exception of the Zanzibar alignment.

Mr. Morris answered there are other river crossing alignment concepts that might come across at Sunfish or Ramsey Boulevards and tie into Dayton River Road and funnel down to Highway 169. They also looked at locations east of Highway 169 and are interested in the impacts as the areas in Champlin and Dayton are fully developed so they did not make sense. That is why there were concerns, because the community impacts would be high.

Mr. Morris stated the key takeaway is that in a benefit/cost analysis, they are looking for a 1.0 or greater, meaning the benefit to society is at least worth the cost of investing the improvement. He noted they all meet that threshold, suggesting they are feasible improvements or at least merit further investigation. Mr. Morris summarized that the four concepts all produced a cost/benefit ratio that is feasible but before advancing the concepts further, more detailed analysis would be needed.

Ms. Wiltgen explained that from conversations with agencies, they found a common understanding of the opportunities and challenges to implement improvements considered in the analysis. Conversations around next steps included identifying a leader with the next phase of analysis and there was a general openness to participating in a corridor coalition which could start with casual conversations between elected officials, making presentations, and provide a venue to prioritize improvements and identify next steps. She stated there was a recognition that a new river crossing is a long-term endeavor that could span years or even decades to move forward. In addition, any improvements need to address local activities, development patterns, local roadway improvements, community context, and follow land use development and regional traffic growth.

Ms. Wiltgen stated this analysis was a good first step but further analysis and community input would be needed. She stated that next steps would include identifying local leadership, a corridor coalition, and adopting a vision to determine improvements that align with local goals from a mobility standpoint, whether a river crossing or system needs. Ms. Wiltgen stated they need to look at it through a regional context, understand local needs, goals, and desires, and then establish a prioritization plan to implement those projects within that vision. She addressed facilitating public involvement to incorporate additional voices including businesses and freight, and building consensus on next steps.

City Administrator Ulrich asked for an update on the meeting with the City of Dayton about this topic and Dayton's position on the project.

Ms. Wiltgen answered they did a presentation and there is some interest to make sure it aligns with local goals and development. In those conversations, there was an understanding in all communities that this will be a challenging endeavor, it will be long-term, and require a lot of consensus building. She thinks Dayton has a long-term plan for growth and that is the main point she heard, that a river crossing needs to align with local growth.

City Administrator Ulrich stated he spoke with the Dayton City Administrator who indicated they do not want to be a champion of the effort, but are willing to be part of a corridor coalition and continue the discussion.

Councilmember Musgrove thanked those who presented tonight and asked about the Zanzibar and Armstrong alignment and if Dayton does not have it in their CIP or long-term planning.

Ms. Wiltgen answered that it is in Dayton's Comprehensive Plan.

Councilmember Musgrove stated that is good to hear. She asked in regard to the projections, what things are the Highway 10 Coalition working and focusing on.

Ms. Wiltgen answered there are active community members with the Highway 10 projects and the grade separation at Ramsey and Sunfish Boulevards is moving forward. To the west of there, a planning study is being conducted on Highway 10 up to the Highway 169 interchange and some of the long-term improvements identified were focused on building out the grade separated vision for Highway 10 up to Highway 169. She stated there was an understanding that that would require a lot of effort and funding so they are looking at some mid-term implementation solutions and have a technical advisory meeting coming up.

Councilmember Musgrove stated that she thought it was a good idea to get a coalition together to keep this topic going. She heard from a member of the Dayton community who said they would definitely appreciate a bridge as it takes them longer to get to the Ramsey side for family events. She asked about discussion with cities that have been presented to already related to a timeframe.

Ms. Wiltgen answered she hasn't heard any timeframes.

Mr. Morris agreed and added that conversations have been at the city staff level and with a few elected officials.

Councilmember Woestehoff asked about the large differential in the cost/benefit analysis, noting a cost of \$89 million for the bridge was mentioned but the packet information indicates a range of \$140 million to \$200 million.

Mr. Morris stated the benefit/cost analysis uses a 20-year horizon and all the improvements have a lifespan, depending on what it is. He noted bridges have a 75-year lifespan so 20 years is only a small portion of that and with purchase of right-of-way, they use 100 years. He explained that when you reach the end of the 20-year calculation period, you get a credit for the remaining life of that asset, which reduces the present value of costs as shown on the slides presented tonight. Mr. Morris explained the dollar numbers shown in the meeting packet are the sticker price and that is the cost to construct.

Representative John Heinrich asked if a threat analysis had been done on delaying a decision and ending up with a corridor that is no longer available noting that occurred in Champlin where some areas are no longer available because of development. He asked when that would happen here.

Ms. Wiltgen answered they didn't do that kind of analysis but as she mentioned, this study was to illuminate the needs, address what river crossing capacity means, and brainstorm ideas and determine if they are technically feasible for further consideration. She stated when holding one-on-one conversations, they wanted to learn where the different stakeholders were coming from, their different needs and perspectives. Ms. Wiltgen noted that with a large project like a river crossing, there needs to be a lot of consensus building and this may be a point where local stakeholders come together and start the long process of consensus building.

City Administrator Ulrich asked if analysis was done on collector roads farther north and what happens to traffic on Armstrong Boulevard and roads north of Highway 10.

Mr. Morris referenced the illustration in the meeting packet that shows travel patterns and projected trips to use a new bridge, noting that once they cross the river, many go east or west along Highway 10, a much smaller portion would continue along Armstrong Boulevard, and by the time you are a mile north of Highway 10, traffic dissipates.

Anoka County Commissioner Matt Look commented that his observations would suppose that MnDOT is supportive of Concept 1 and 2 or a variation and that Ramsey and significant users of the Highway 169 Champlin bridge are supporters of Concepts 3 or 4. He assumes that Anoka County would be supportive of this project but it has to be understood that Highway 65 is the County's top priority right now, that it is well underway with the studies, grants, and funding. Commissioner Look stated having this project drafting a concept behind Highway 65 might be well positioned for the next project in line. He noted it will take some time to tell the story, express the need, and gather support with the legislators that will help to fund the project at the State and federal levels.

Commissioner Look stated he reached out to Senator Robbins and suggested getting together with Representatives Lazzaro and Heinrich to discuss opposition. As it relates to the Highway 10 Coalition, he found members have been very helpful in advancing the Highway 10 projects but may not be as enthusiastic about advancing this river crossing project. He noted Coon Rapids and Andover may not show interest, but Anoka and Ramsey would be interested because it impacts people coming through their areas. He stated assuming that Ramsey is supportive of this project, if funding is traditionally the way it has been with MnDOT, the locals will need to take control, get together with those across the river, and determine a time frame.

Commissioner Look pointed out that about every 14 years, project costs double. He estimated that time to design, find project costs, pay for it, and construction time will use 10 years at least so time is of the essence. He stated it depends on when Ramsey wants to push as funding is the key. He stated again that Anoka County would be supportive and willing to be a champion with the understanding that Highway 65 is next in line.

Councilmember Riley asked Commissioner Look about the County priorities with Highway 65 being next in line and asked if a third lane on Highway 10 is also high on their list of priorities as most could get behind that project.

Commissioner Look answered that a third lane on Highway 65 made sense to address before getting Highway 10 started but that will not happen now and they don't want to do the Highway 10 work and add a third lane on Highway 65 at the same time because it will cause even more congestion. He explained the third lane on Highway 65 would be a post Highway 10 project with completion around 2026. He noted these roadways are not functioning very well under today's conditions but they need to be done and account for the increased growth. He noted every city to the north of us has a main revenue source in selling permits and building homes, so there is a guarantee that more traffic will be coming into the system and we have to respond to that situation.

Representative Heinrich stated the third lane project on Highway 65 seemed to be the most shovel-ready project they have discussed because room is there and the bridges were built originally to accommodate a third lane. He noted it would help if MnDOT could help get that project done before starting other projects. Representative Heinrich stated next year, the County Road 47/Highway 10 interchange, the Rum River Bridge, is slated for spring of 2022. Then Fair Oak/Thurston/Sunfish/Ramsey Boulevards is scheduled so that is a long time to then come back to a lower cost project that is shovel ready. He asked if the third lane project on Highway 65 could be put in front of these others projects.

Ms. Barnes answered there was zero chance of that happening because construction on Rum River and Fair Oak/Thurston start in the spring. With regard to the funding that Commissioner Look spoke of, she explained it was for creating final plans for the third lane project so once they are through the final plans phase, it could be more shovel ready at that point. She explained it is moving towards being completely ready but right now they don't have final plans.

Representative Heinrich asked if not during the timeframe of Fair Oak/Thurston, could a third lane project be considered in Sunfish/Ramsey timeframe or at the same time.

Ms. Barnes answered that the impact to Highway 10 traffic during the Ramsey/Sunfish construction will be much less than with Fair Oak/Thurston which will be very impactful, which is a big difference in construction impact.

Ms. Barnes asked to respond to Commissioner Look's comments about the river crossing, Mn/DOT's stance on priorities, and preferred alternatives. She stated Mn/DOT does not have a position on it and this study was in response to a request from the Legislature. The priority of Mn/DOT is maintenance of our pavement and bridges. She stated through this analysis, they found with the spacing and amount of traffic on this road, it very likely will not be a Mn/DOT or State roadway and possible it could be a City or County roadway. She wanted to clarify that they are happy to start talking about it but they wouldn't be the lead or champion on the bridge.

Councilmember Musgrove asked if bridges are typically the responsibility of City, County or State.

Ms. Barnes answered that bridges are State owned, County owned, or City owned depending on whose road it is and sometimes it will involve interstate ownership.

Councilmember Musgrove asked in this case, where there are two cities and two counties, where the ownership would fall.

Ms. Barnes answered, as with Minneapolis and St. Paul, sometimes the cities or the counties have to come together. When going across State lines, as in the Stillwater area, half the bridge belongs to MnDOT, half belongs to Wisconsin, and they share the maintenance costs.

Mayor Kuzma thanked Ms. Wiltgen and Mr. Morris for the informative presentation.

2.02: Discuss Maintenance of the New Public Works Facility

Administrative Services Director Lasher reviewed the staff report including options for cleaning and maintaining the new Public Works Facility. She noted that during 2021 budget discussions, staff was asked to put on hold the hiring of a part-time Building Maintenance Worker. Staff researched options and found the cost to outsource the work was a greater cost and not fulfill needs. At this time, current staff does not have the capacity to do this work, so staff recommends adding 15 hours a week to part-time Maintenance Worker Benson. She noted Mr. Benson is a high performing employee and in need of full-time employment. The cost from now until the end of the year is \$6,960 which would be funded by the significant savings incurred from an unanticipated unpaid leave in the department. Administrative Services Director Lasher recommended Mr. Benson remain full time through the 2022 budget.

Public Works Superintendent Riemer added that the cleaning isn't the biggest issue, it is the maintenance of the heating and air conditioning ventilation systems along with regular monitoring and inspection of the boiler system.

Building Maintenance Supervisor Bray explained that the boilers, under State standards, have to be logged every day in addition to logging any work done on the boiler. He supported the recommendation of Administrative Services Director Lasher.

Public Works Superintendent Riemer added that another task is on the roof to check the belts and heating and cooling units that are inspected once a month.

Building Maintenance Supervisor Bray continued that this position also includes HVAC maintenance, snow removal around the gate areas and sidewalks, building security, cleaning five days a week, checking the boilers, and setting up for meetings.

Councilmember Heineman asked about Mr. Benson's currently scheduled hours and whether 25 hours a week means he is there 5 days a week and 5 hours a day.

Public Works Superintendent Riemer confirmed this is correct.

Councilmember Heineman asked if Mr. Benson currently has time to check the boilers daily, log the belts and timers, and do some of the tasks but needs additional time for cleaning.

Building Maintenance Supervisor Bray answered that cleaning is for a separate huge building and that would be the first stop before anyone is in the building. This is something he is not currently doing.

Councilmember Heineman asked who is currently doing the cleaning.

Building Maintenance Supervisor Bray answered this is a new task and no one was currently assigned to these tasks.

Councilmember Musgrove asked if the cost indicated includes benefits and wages, or just wages.

Administrative Service Director Lasher answered the amount is the total budget impact for everything to bring Mr. Benson to full time including health insurance for November and December, plus the additional PERA and additional hours.

Councilmember Musgrove asked about maintenance by the maintenance crew versus the duties listed as staff duties and if there is some overlap. She asked how they determine which maintenance tasks are covered by the different departments.

Building Maintenance Supervisor Bray answered that inside the building, he would be responsible for cleaning the offices and restrooms. In the summer, they do the mowing and irrigation duties. Mr. Benson's main duties would be cleaning, taking care of the boilers and the heating and air conditioning.

Councilmember Musgrove asked about other duties listed including landscape maintenance, snow removal, and a wide range of tasks.

Building Maintenance Supervisor Bray answered that was not necessarily at the new Public Works facility.

Administrative Services Director Lasher commented that the job description included was a general job description that all building maintenance workers do and not necessarily specific to Mr. Benson.

Councilmember Specht stated staff recommendation makes sense to him because the he is a high performing employee who is looking for more hours so he supports it.

Mayor Kuzma asked if this cost is covered in next year's budget.

Administrative Services Director Lasher answered if this was approved, the Finance Director would make an adjustment as it would impact 2022 but would not be considered a new change for 2022 if it were approved now.

Councilmember Musgrove referenced the unanticipated unpaid time off for a staff member and asked what step Mr. Benson would be at if his hours were increased to full time.

Building Maintenance Supervisor Bray answered Step 1 or 2.

Councilmember Musgrove asked if that would be the same for 2022.

Administrative Services Director Lasher answered that going from part time to full time would not impact Mr. Benson's pay scale or anniversary date.

Councilmember Musgrove commented that she is supportive of this because it is in the budget for this year, there are specific tasks to do, and Mr. Benson has a good work ethic. She stated if this will help alleviate some of the other needs for maintenance staff at other facilities, she thinks that is a benefit.

The consensus of the Council was to approve maintenance worker, Mr. Erick Benson, moving to full-time employment.

2.03: Discuss 8106 Alpine Drive NW

City Administrator Ulrich stated this property started with complaints about garbage and cat feces and bags piled 15 feet high in the yard, which was taken care of but the property continued to be an issue. At this time, staff may have found a resolution, which will be presented.

Zoning Code Enforcement Officer Raines reviewed the staff report updating the Council on the efforts by staff to resolve State Building Code, Property Maintenance Code, and Ramsey City Code violations at 8106 Alpine Drive NW. This case started with an inspection with the police and focus on the welfare of the cats and public nuisance violations. The current issues with the property include not having running water, an electrical hazard, and water intrusion into the structure. These are safety hazards that renders the structure uninhabitable. On October 1, 2021, the Building Official posted a notice on the property and on October 7, 2021, the property owner came in with a signed contract to have a well installed and applied for and was issued an electrical permit.

Mayor Kuzma asked about the status of the dwelling and if considered uninhabitable, if the resident is staying at the property.

Building Official Szykulski answered the resident has been staying there. He explained this item was brought to the work session because staff was surprised that during the October 7, 2021 meeting the owner presented a signed contract for a well to be installed. Up to then, he was going to issue an order to vacate on November 1, 2021. Because of that, this report is more of an update than ordering the property owner to vacate. Staff is hoping the well contractor will get started on October 18, 2021 to put in the well, the line to the house, and get running water to the faucet. After that staff will determine how the septic system reacts. During the October 7th meeting, the resident insisted on doing the electrical work himself and a permit for that work was pulled that day.

Building Official Szykulski stated he talked to the lead inspector for electrical and he will meet with City staff at the property on October 13, 2021, at 9 a.m. to determine what needs to be done and talk with the homeowner. He explained by November 1, 2021, there is running water, the septic system has been inspected, and the electrical system has been improved to prevent a fire hazard. After that, the leak in the roof needs to be addressed before moving on to numerous code violations. He stated this is a better outcome than had been expected.

Councilmember Riley commented that the resident is cooperating and City staff are working with the resident. He stated that no one wants to see anyone get kicked out of their home but it is understood that safety and sanitation are issues that need to be addressed. He appreciated everything he has been hearing and the flexibility shown on the part of staff.

Building Official Szykulski answered that Zoning Code Enforcement Officer Raines has been trying to find loans for this homeowner, there has been discussion about splitting the property and selling two lots. Staff has spent time motivating the homeowner to make improvements.

Councilmember Riley commented that the carpet has been on the roof for at least five years.

Councilmember Heineman asked if the homeowner plans to drill a new well, the cost of the well, and how the homeowner will get a loan.

Building Official Szykulski confirmed there will be a new well, which will cost around \$18,000.

Councilmember Musgrove asked if the homeowner was aware that he could be spending a lot of money on a home that may not be a solid dwelling.

Building Official Szykulski answered that the homeowner is aware of the cost and estimated that to get to the house up to code could be close to \$50,000 to \$60,000, plus the cost for electrical and to fix the roof.

Councilmember Musgrove asked about the issue with water intrusion and if the frame and floor are solid.

Building Official Szykulski answered that the water intrusion is in a makeshift workspace that is separate from the main house, noting the main house is small, about 800 square feet.

Councilmember Musgrove stated she wanted the resident aware of the investment into a house deemed uninhabitable and asked again about the habitability of the home and the condition of the structure. She stated she is glad the resident is able to stay in his home, noting each have a different concept of a home.

Mayor Kuzma asked if staff needs anything from the Council tonight.

Building Official Szykulski answered this case is more of an update due to the turn of events and if the improvements are made with the well and electrical work, they can address the other issues. He explained the home remains uninhabitable until the water intrusion issue is addressed but the City would not issue an order to vacate as the property owner is making progress.

City Administrator Ulrich added that when the meeting was originally scheduled, staff anticipated having to issue an order to vacate but things have changed

Councilmember Heineman asked if the resident is actually living in the house or in any of the other structures on the property.

Zoning Code Enforcement Officer Raines answered that staff asked that question during an inspection because the other structures were full of items and there is no way he could be living in any of those structures.

Building Official Szykalski stated the resident was invited to the meeting but staff did not receive a confirmation that he would attend.

Mayor Kuzma thanked staff for the update.

3. TOPICS FOR FUTURE DISCUSSION

3.01: Review Future Topics/ Calendar

City Administrator Ulrich added the next work session will include budget discussions.

Councilmember Musgrove noted the November 9, 2021, meeting topics includes discussion of the 10-year Capital Improvements Projects (CIP) but she thinks it would be helpful to have that information prior to budget discussions. She noted there is a CIP to look at but there have been changes so she wanted to bring it up to get feedback.

City Administrator Ulrich answered the CIP would be presented for additional discussion prior to the budget in that case. He noted the levy for next year is only impacted by the first year of the CIP so at least for the budget, staff wants to focus on the first year, what the impacts are, and then take a look at the long term.

Councilmember Musgrove asked if there were significant changes to the 2022 CIP information.

City Administrator Ulrich answered they made significant changes, there may be additional changes, and they could look at it during the next work session.

Councilmember Musgrove stated that would be helpful for budget discussions.

Councilmember Musgrove asked for information about road funding, noting the franchise fee had the \$1.9 million and \$50,000 for pay back of assessments. She would like to the City to keep that program going and asked where the \$1.9 million fell with the levy request and reserves.

Councilmember Specht noted it would be hard to know how much to rebate back if just based on the percentage of tax increase based on house value.

City Administrator Ulrich commented that it is worth a discussion, that the process would have to change, and that is a policy matter whether the people assessed for roads in the last 5 years should be paying for roads for the next 20 years or should they get a portion of that assessment rebated.

He agreed that every property tax is different so it is not quite as clean as it would be with a franchise fee.

Councilmember Heineman clarified the Council was asking Finance Director Lund to troubleshoot a few mechanisms to see what it looks like and bring forward potential options.

Councilmember Musgrove asked for staff input on continued reductions for additional savings. She added that having the CIP would be helpful for knowing planned expenses for projects.

City Administrator Ulrich answered that staff is following the Council's direction to make the budget as lean as possible while still achieving the goals they have.

4. MAYOR / COUNCIL / STAFF INPUT

None.

5. ADJOURNMENT

The Work Session of the City Council was adjourned at 6:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kurtis G. Ulrich
City Administrator

ATTEST:

Katie M. Schmidt
Deputy City Clerk

Drafted by Joni Helmeke
TimeSaver Off Site Secretarial, Inc.