

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

The Ramsey City Council conducted a City Council Work Session on Tuesday, January 11, 2022, 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 (attended via Zoom at 5:32 p.m.)
Councilmember Dan Specht
Councilmember Matt Woestehoff

Absent: None

Also Present: Deputy City Administrator/ Community Dev. Director Brian Hagen
Administrative Services Director Colleen Lasher (attended via Zoom)
Building Official Jesse Szykulski
Planning Manager Chloe McGuire Brigl
City Engineer Bruce Westby
City Attorney Fritz Knaak

1. CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Kuzma called the City Council Work Session to order at 5:30 p.m.

2. TOPICS FOR DISCUSSION

2.01: Discuss Council Organization

Deputy City Administrator/ Community Dev. Director Hagen introduced the resolution and stated this will be discussed at the next meeting as well. Changes to appointments from 2021 to 2022 are being reviewed and the items to focus on are the one-year appointments.

Mayor Kuzma stated that although Councilmember Riley had not yet joined via Zoom, he had spoken with him and he was fine with being Acting Mayor for another year.

Mayor Kuzma asked the Council about any changes they wanted to see, if there were any objections, or if they were okay with what they had.

Councilmember Specht referenced Quad Cities and asked if that is typically a City Administrator and a Councilmember or if it is usually two Councilmembers.

Councilmember Woestehoff replied the board, which is all the cities, is a City Administrator and a Councilmember. He wasn't sure if it was designed to be that way but that is how it has been for a long time and from his experience, it is a lot more administrative than a typical board.

Councilmember Musgrove commented that she didn't have any recommendations for changes and added that some of the appointments are two-year commitments.

The consensus of the Council was to accept the organizational structure of the Council.

2.02: Discuss Community Development Staffing

Deputy City Administrator/ Community Dev. Director Hagen stated that Planning Manager McGuire Brigl submitted her resignation so there will be some staffing changes coming to the Community Development Department. He stated they will be looking to fill the Planning Manager position and have several in the department who are becoming marketable to advance their career. From a retention standpoint, in the Planning Division, they will be seeking Council direction on a restructure of the department. From a staff position standpoint, the Planning Manager position would be retained, they would implement two City Planners, and fill the Senior Planner role. The idea behind filling the Senior Planner role is that there are two individuals on staff who are qualified to move up to the City Planner role and the current City Planner has experience to allow him to move into a Senior Planner role. The current Code Enforcement Officer and Planning Technician would remain vacant. From a position standpoint, there would be no changes, it would just be some title changes and job responsibilities would shift slightly but from a task and responsibility standpoint, everything would remain covered by the staff in the department right now.

Councilmember Specht questioned when Planning Manager McGuire Brigl's last day is.

Deputy City Administrator/ Community Dev. Director Hagen replied February 4, 2022. He commented that she has given a four week notice recognizing everything going on and hoping to make the transition as smooth as possible so restructuring can happen as far as who is working on what projects.

Councilmember Musgrove questioned if the Council could get an updated organizational chart. She stated she has a copy of one but she didn't believe it was current. She felt it would be helpful for discussion. She also asked if there will be a position that will be open and need to be filled.

Deputy City Administrator/ Community Dev. Director Hagen replied at this point the open position would be the Planning Manager. He reviewed the organizational chart and explained the Community Development Director oversees all three divisions of the Community Development Department. With the Planning Division, there is the Planning Manager, Chloe McGuire Brigl, who oversees the other staff in the Planning Division. As it is currently structured, there is one City Planner who is Chris Anderson, a Code Enforcement Officer who is Bria Raines, and a Planning Technician who is Brian McCann. Those four positions are full time. There is also a part-time, 20-hour a week Planning Assistant position held by Nicole. The number of positions aren't proposed to be changed but instead, retaining the Planning Manager, promoting from within

to implement the Senior Planner position again, as well as promoting from within for two City Planner positions who would share equal responsibilities. The Planning Technician and Code Enforcement Officer positions would not be back filled. The Planning Assistant would be retained at 20 hours a week.

Mayor Kuzma questioned who would be handling Code enforcement.

Deputy City Administrator/ Community Dev. Director Hagen replied it would fall under the City Planner roles.

Councilmember Musgrove commented that Administrative Services Director Lasher just sent an email with an organizational chart.

Administrative Services Director Lasher stated that she just sent the current org chart, not one that reflects the changes that are being proposed. She agreed that this would not be an addition in FTE's or personnel, it would be title changes.

Councilmember Specht commented that he is newer to the Council than some others but he questioned what the reason was for bringing on a Code Enforcement Officer. He remembered it being more recent.

Mayor Kuzma replied Tim Gladhill was elevated to Deputy Administrator to get him out of Code enforcement so someone else was needed in that role.

Councilmember Specht commented that it seems like it is going back to the structure it was before, which may not be a bad thing but he questioned why it was changed initially.

Councilmember Woestehoff commented that retention is really important right now, losing a handful of key staff in the department wasn't good, so trying to keep the current employees would be important. He stated that the institutional knowledge that has been lost and is about to be lost again is tough so he favors trying to retain as much of the staff as possible.

Councilmember Musgrove questioned for clarification, that consensus is sought now and that these will come through as cases in the next meeting.

Deputy City Administrator/ Community Dev. Director Hagen confirmed this adding that right now Staff is looking for direction and consensus of Council on how to proceed forward. Resolutions would be brought back at the following meeting to implement the changes officially. At that time, compensation adjustments could be discussed. From a budgeting standpoint, estimates are dependent on filling the Planning Manager position and where they come in with experience. Current estimates reflect about a \$5,000 shortfall in the budget.

Deputy City Administrator/ Community Dev. Director Hagen next spoke about the Building Inspection Division, noting currently there are full-time positions for a Building Official and Building Inspector. There is also a standing contract for a contracted building inspection services. The notion was that when an in-house building inspector was hired, the contracted building

inspector service would be reduced. However, what was seen this year was that building permits are still high and 1,900 hours were contracted over the last 12 calendar months, which equates to a full-time position. Looking ahead to what is coming up in the future regarding preliminary platted lots and final platted lots, ready to build new homes, and commercial projects, there is work that is coming that would support another full-time position. Also, if contracts need to be adjusted for various reasons, the new contracted hourly rates are nearly double what is being paid now. Firms are also starting to ask for multi-year commitments. If the City were to bring in a second full-time building inspector and considering what that would do from a budgeting standpoint, there would be a cost savings to bring in an in-house building inspector versus a new contract.

Mayor Kuzma commented if a move would have to be made to a multi-year contract and the rates are being doubled, it makes sense to bring in an in-house person.

Councilmember Howell questioned if the standing contract is good to continue or is the firm asking to revisit it.

Deputy City Administrator/ Community Dev. Director Hagen replied right now they are operating under the existing contract which has been unchanged for a few years. The individual that is being received for those services is very competent and does the work with little or no guidance but it is unknown how long he will continue to work. If a different employee does the work, they have been told the rate will likely go up. That would also pose a time to look for another company that would provide that service, maybe more efficiently or effectively. Preliminary investigations have shown that the hourly rate for some companies is close to \$100 and up to \$150 with other companies. If someone were hired who could come in doing all residential, commercial, and septic reviews, that person would be higher in the pay range. Calculations were done at Step 6 with wages and medical coverage, it would be just under \$120,000 a year. If 1,900 hours of contracted service at \$100, it is right in line.

Councilmember Musgrove referenced the case where it is written a full-year hire is \$120,000, as mentioned, but the contracted is \$95,000. She questioned if that is how the numbers in the case are supposed to be understood. She also questioned if the current contracted worker is no longer available are there other contract services for inspectors. She asked Community Development Director Hagen to talk about how difficult it is to find contracted services and if contracted workers are typically qualified to do all three types of inspections.

Building Official Szykulski commented that the \$95,000 included in the case is based off the 1,900 hours that was mentioned at a rate of \$50 an hour, which is in the current standing contract. If the contract were to change, that is where new contracted services are going to be substantially different. Bids last year that were in writing are not being honored now. If the current company is continued, it could easily go up to \$65 or \$70 an hour, which is an estimate based on last year's proposal.

Councilmember Musgrove questioned if the Council could get some more of that detail. She also asked how fees cover the inspection because the fees for inspections were increased.

Building Official Szykalski replied the changes in the set permit fees doubled but that is not the bulk of the revenue. The other changes in the valuation table and the permit valuation is not going to be a drastic increase. He wasn't sure how that offsets increases in other things.

Councilmember Musgrove commented that information would be helpful when deciding to hire a new employee. If the permit work goes down then she wasn't sure what the obligation would be to a contracted worker.

Councilmember Heineman questioned for these contracted workers, are they easily replaceable or would there need to be lead time for training.

Building Official Szykalski replied the request would be they would have to be at the higher level to be ready to work. For contracted services there is an assumption that training is needed.

Councilmember Heineman commented that currently money is being saved and questioned if a problem is being addressed that hasn't happened yet. If that is the case, there is going to be time to train in a new person. But if the current contractor quits tomorrow then they can move into the experience of an experienced full-time employee but until that situation occurs, money is being saved with the current program.

Deputy City Administrator/ Community Dev. Director Hagen replied that this discussion is based in what could come in the near future and putting this in front of the Council. A favorable contract is held for the City right now but that is likely not going to stay. The ideal candidate would be someone who is ready to work with maybe only needing to learn the software. They would also hopefully be able to provide mentorship to the other Building Inspector who is gaining experience but needs more guidance.

Councilmember Specht questioned if the quality of work of the current contractor was acceptable.

Deputy City Administrator/Community Dev. Director Hagen replied they are pleased with the productivity but there are some other items. That is why this discussion is being generated. It's a good time to bring both the Planning Division and Building Inspection Division together at the same time versus bringing them up separately a few months apart. He pointed out from the case that the Planning Division needs are more immediate where the Building Division has time to gather more information for the Council.

Mayor Kuzma questioned if the staff is asking to begin the process of looking for someone at this time.

Deputy City Administrator/Community Dev. Director Hagen replied if approval was given tonight, they would. However, it is more a matter of looking for direction and need for more information.

Councilmember Howell commented that Staff works with the current Building Inspector and asked how pressing it was to go with a different approach.

Deputy City Administrator/ Community Dev. Director Hagen replied that the time is good.

Community Services Director Lasher commented that staffing and recruitment are at an all-time high and Staff appreciated the direction of Council in order to slow that departure down. From an internal recruiting perspective, she thought she could tackle the starting as soon as March or April which would have someone on about eight weeks later.

Councilmember Woestehoff commented that knowing the timeline, that gets into prime season for a lot of this. He would like to see the numbers, but also acknowledged that if the quality of work matches the lower price and there is not a good experience for staff or residents or businesses. He didn't like the idea of paying someone \$75 to \$95 an hour when someone could be paid internally for the equivalent because then internally, there will always be a better experience. He added that in ten years if that inspector isn't needed full time, the position could perhaps be contracted out.

Mayor Kuzma asked if there was a consensus on starting the recruitment process.

Councilmember Specht commented that he supported starting the recruiting process.

Councilmember Musgrove commented that she would like time to get more information on the different contract costs that are out there for pricing. She felt there were a lot of unknowns right now, estimating, and it would be good to know what the range would be. If hiring someone, would it be more beneficial and it would be good to know the ranges.

Mayor Kuzma replied he sees that as the start of the process, figuring out what the recruitment process would be and a comparison of what the contractor might be.

Councilmember Musgrove commented that she thought the question for consensus was just go ahead with the hiring process, but if that can be done in conjunction, she would be more in favor of that.

Councilmember Heineman questioned if an RFP was done for this position last year and numbers were obtained for it.

Community Development Director Hagen confirmed this.

Councilmember Heineman continued, the numbers from last year were substantially higher and that is what the numbers for this assumption are based on.

Deputy City Administrator/ Community Dev. Director Hagen replied even if it is based off RFP's he got last year, they are definitely higher than is currently being paid. He had spoken verbally to the one of the contract providers and it had gone up another \$20 an hour.

Councilmember Heineman commented that last year the numbers were around \$75 an hour.

Deputy City Administrator/ Community Dev. Director Hagen replied the rates for the current company went to \$65 an hour, another was at \$75 an hour, and the next was \$85. The one that was at \$75 is currently at \$95 an hour. A two year contract is also required along with a

commitment for a number of hours. The one that was at \$85 an hour was a local company that was purchased nationally, they are now at \$100 an hour.

Councilmember Heineman responded to Councilmember Musgrove's comments about crunching the numbers and doing the math beforehand, but it sounds like that has already been done.

Councilmember Woestehoff commented that doing the math at 1,900 hours, the break even dollar amount is \$63 an hour. More than that means losing money, less than that means saving money, and with that may come a worse experience.

Mayor Kuzma summarized that it sounds like the Council is in favor of starting the recruitment process.

Councilmember Woestehoff commented his perspective is that he would be comfortable with the next case, as long as it has the details of comparable rates and a proposal to go out to hire as a part of the case so that a decision could be made after that. He didn't want to see things slow down but having some numbers behind it so show the value of it.

Councilmember Heineman added, not necessarily starting the recruitment process but preparing for it.

Mayor Kuzma asked if that was enough direction for Staff.

Administrative Services Director Lasher replied that is good direction. She stated she may have been optimistic on the timeline as HR is busy with recruitments right now. Staff would like the flexibility to get started by updating the job description and have a timeline for the actual recruitment.

Councilmember Riley noted it was mentioned that there are plats and final plats going but asked if this is a long term thing because hiring someone is a long term thing versus a contractor. He questioned if there would be many years of need anticipated.

Deputy City Administrator/ Community Dev. Director Hagen replied in 2021 there are around 500 or so lots. Knowing that and with the historic building permit data, there was an average of 150 new homes a year over the last five years. There is a handful of commercial projects coming in 2022 that does not include some of the projects that are early on such as Pact Charter School. There is a potential for more apartments in The COR that are in essence, one home but several in one building, which will require multiple separate inspections. In answer to the question, he felt that yes, what is preliminary platted right now and what is anticipated to come shows a multiple-year workload. This would be similar to a contract that is going to require a two- to three-year contract.

The consensus of the Council was to direct Staff to begin preparing for recruitment for a full-time Building Inspector and restructuring of the Community Development Department.

2.03: Discussion regarding Resolution #22-005 to Prohibit State and Federal Actors from Mandating Medical Procedures Upon Citizens Through Coercion or Force; and Providing Other Matters Related to the Subject

Deputy City Administrator/ Community Dev. Director Hagen reviewed the staff report.

Mayor Kuzma asked City Attorney Knaak if the mandates are still in the courts and if it was correct that there was no current mandate for the City to do anything.

City Attorney Knaak replied that because of what OSHA did nationally, which is in front of the Supreme Court, the MNOSHA has been using that to come up with some deadlines and requirements. The City have been under some of the deadlines as well. His understanding is that as long as the City is making progress with policies, if the appeal doesn't come back favorably for the City there wouldn't be any trouble. His best estimate is the OSHA requirement is what is in jeopardy and that decision should come through sometime this week. He guessed that this might not be even an issue for the City. In the meantime, the deadlines haven't been put on hold. If the Council wanted to go ahead with things they would still have to talk with the unions' term and condition of employment and nothing can be immediately implemented. He stated he has been in regular dialogue with fellow city attorneys to compare what other cities are doing and thinks there is a good chance that what is being mandated will be limited.

Mayor Kuzma commented if the Council were to implement a statement of pushback, would it create a position where Ramsey would be set as an example.

City Attorney Knaak replied there is nothing that would jeopardize the City legally.

Councilmember Woestehoff asked City Attorney Knaak to speak to the difference between passing a resolution versus an ordinance.

City Attorney Knaak replied it wasn't really drafted as an ordinance yet because it does not give any directive or impose any penalty to comply. Usually, an ordinance is a legislative act which imposes certain duties and obligations or prevents certain occurrences by its action and provides for penalties for failure to comply. The third one is a resolution in its form but it doesn't do those things. He advised that an ordinance could pose problems but a resolution stating the position of the City wouldn't cause any legal issues.

Mayor Kuzma asked City Attorney Knaak if it would be his advice to table this for a week to see what happens.

City Attorney Knaak replied they are in a discussion phase which isn't harmful. He added even directing Staff to do something in the future, as long as there is an understanding that this is in the context of a decision that is expected in the next couple of days which will provide information. The Supreme Court may decide OSHA has overstepped its bounds but may still decide to pass a resolution or statement.

Councilmember Specht questioned if it is likely that the Supreme Court would say that it can't be done at the Federal level but could MNOSHA still put something in place.

City Attorney Knaak replied the MNOSHA derives its authority from the federal as a state level enforcement mechanism of OSHA. If the underlying federal authority is gone, MNOSHA loses their standing in enforcing it.

Councilmember Howell commented that it was drafted as a resolution but was looking at turning it into an ordinance. She stated she added a couple of select sections which she passed out to the Council for review. She was unsure if it would be relevant based on the decision this week. She asked if there was no penalty for it not being implemented how would that work, could the City still implement something if Staff was directed not to without the threat of penalty.

City Attorney Knaak replied by asking if he understood correctly, if someone from the State or outside the City directs the City to implement, can the City refuse. He replied that depends on where it comes from. If there was a Supreme Court mandate that it was okay and therefore MNOSHA could do it, then there would be a situation where something should be in place. There is a lot that hasn't been debated yet. He explained the kind of policy that is required to be adopted may provide for some flexibility that would be enough but was unsure what it would look. If the City wanted to make a stand that a mandate wouldn't apply to City employees ever, that raises some legal issues potentially. He suggested waiting to see what happens this week rather than trying to anticipate.

Councilmember Musgrove referenced the federal OSHA mandate that says employers with 100 employees or more should require vaccination. She asked if the numbers could be looked at that wouldn't include unions because of the special contracts. She wasn't sure if there had been any discussion about that.

City Attorney Knaak replied he hadn't seen any updates from OSHA that excludes union employees. Where that becomes important is as a public entity with public employees represented by a union, it is not allowed to change a term and condition of employment with at least a conference. No one has been talking about that yet. He explained there are all kinds of things that the City would have to do in order to implement a policy. Right now, most of the opposition has been coming from unions and it remains to be seen what that will bring. In the meantime, Staff is trying to anticipate a worst-case scenario where there will be all these requirements and operating in good faith to put something in place in the event that happens. He didn't see the City being committed to doing anything yet but Staff has been preparing that this could occur even though he doesn't think it is likely.

Mayor Kuzma commented he feels it is a nonissue to try to prepare something that is unknown and suggested waiting a week to see how things develop. He wasn't sure what the rush was because nothing was being done at this point and Ramsey is in the same boat as every other city. He was not in support of it and recommended waiting.

Councilmember Howell commented as a counterpoint to Minneapolis and St. Paul and a few cities that are implementing all sorts of things. She brought up again, why it is geared towards COVID-

19, because it is either relevant to protect people's right to medical freedom or it isn't. She didn't see the point to narrowing it so much but wanted to see it more general and offer a counter point to cities like Minneapolis and St. Paul. She continued if it is hard to recruit employees, maybe some of them would want to come to Ramsey. She saw a lot of value in pursuing this, reframing it as an ordinance, and seeing what it would look like to be more welcoming to everyone and be different.

Councilmember Musgrove agreed with Councilmember Howell in having it be more general and understanding that other vaccinations can be mandated where before it was optional. Policies have been instituted in hospital settings, for example, in regard to the flu shot where there have been monetary incentives, which she opposes. She noted some of the statements in the resolution that are similar and recommended going through it as a Council to come up with a consensus.

Councilmember Specht commented that he thought it would be good to have a resolution out there as a statement to make it known that the City of Ramsey supports medical freedom. He felt it was important to have their voice heard as a majority of the Council being in support of this on behalf of the residents. He also felt that what happens with the Supreme Court would then decide if an ordinance would be necessary and what could be done.

Councilmember Heineman commented his opinion was that the vaccine mandate, according to the City Attorney, is going to be decided soon. What he is concerned about is this new era of executive orders that could be seen as overbearing and unconstitutional. He was not as concerned with some of the specifics of COVID-19 and would like to see something more general. He suggested wording along the lines that the City is not complying with anything that infringes on individual liberties as outlined in the Constitution. As far as the current resolution, he felt they could wait a week but didn't think it was going to stop with the COVID vaccine because it seemed to snowball after mask mandates. He felt there would be more based on an overbearing government and suggested keeping the wording more simple to not state the City will not comply with anything that is not constitutional.

Mayor Kuzma repeated that it is not an issue now and waiting a week would be better than trying to prepare for something that is unknown.

Councilmember Heineman commented he thinks that regardless of what the Supreme Court decides, strong language should be put forth on this issue and the next issue that comes up.

Mayor Kuzma commented that the other side of this is that if this comes down as mandatory, no matter the source, the law is the law. His personal opinion is that he is not ready to go against a law alone as a City and get into a court case which would be expensive.

Councilmember Heineman replied if the Supreme Court decides that OSHA has the authority to do that, unfortunately it would be a constitutional order at that point. He felt there would still be a need for something for the future.

Councilmember Howell questioned if this would be broad enough and not focus on the most contemporary issue or does it seem too narrow.

Councilmember Heineman replied he felt resolutions should be passed that are as short and decisive as possible. He felt the resolution language was broad but there is a lot of language about mandated injections. He suggested it simply read “The City of Ramsey shall not enforce unconstitutional mandates.”

Councilmember Woestehoff commented he is happy that the topic is broad but one concern would be potential issues with jurisdiction such as with schools, which require the measles vaccine or those types of things. When the language is this broad, he gets nervous about how it gets interpreted. The alternative that he drafted was intentionally narrow so that it talks about one topic, which makes a statement. That is what he would be more in favor of. He asked City Attorney Knaak to speak to issues of jurisdiction.

City Attorney Knaak advised that it depends on the intended effect of what is trying to be passed. If something is prohibited in an ordinance form, or if it is to allow something, then it gets into issues with schools and other possible conflicts. The resolutions that he has seen so far don’t do that. He stated if he is understanding correctly, the Council is looking for a strong statement, that could be done without causing problems. He noted even if it is a broad statement, even if it is a strong statement, as long as it is in a resolution format, it is not going to cause problems.

Councilmember Woestehoff clarified that the City Attorney was saying that if the Council would only be saying something rather than doing something, it is fine.

City Attorney Knaak replied, the Council would be stating a position, correct.

Councilmember Woestehoff stated the moment that the Council tries to apply pressure to private business which do have vaccine mandates, to schools or anything that has a vaccine mandate but the City opposes it, that is where there is an issue.

City Attorney Knaak replied if it is a statement of the City’s position, that is different than an actual ordinance that says, for example, “no business within the City of Ramsey shall permit the following” then there is an issue. This is very hypothetical but that is where the conflicts can occur. He advised it is not in terms of a statement or intended policy.

Councilmember Woestehoff referenced the handout that Councilmember Howell just passed out and asked if she would talk about the language in it that the City with holding TIF financing or TIF tax abatement.

Councilmember Howell replied that was an option she put in because to her, there is no value in saying the City is going to enforce something when they can’t because then people get angry. She stated she was very clear about not telling private businesses what to do because it would be difficult to enforce and asked if the Council wants to do that. She continued, however, that she doesn’t see value in giving incentives to businesses that discriminate or those that violate Title Seven. If the Council can make those options going forward, not with agreement, it was an idea for discussion. She sees a lot of discrimination and believes in fighting discrimination when it is seen even if it is not popular.

Councilmember Howell asked if the City was able to withhold funding for not complying with local regulations, would the federal government be able to withhold funding for Highway 10 if the City doesn't comply with this mandate. She wondered if that was a risk because there is a lot of grant funding with Highway 10.

City Attorney Knaak replied, thankfully, that scenario has not been put in front of them yet. However, that type of incentive is a commonly used tool to ensure conformity to federal mandates. He hasn't seen any of that in the resolution so far. It was simply a declaration of the administration that OSHA has this authority and therefore it is being done through OSHA. It is not clear that can be done without an express congressional authorization, which is a part of the problem. If Congress looks at this and thinks it is important, justifies it, and decides to tie federal funding to it, he didn't want to speculate on the legality of that. He noted this is a pattern that has been seen in past issues but is something that hasn't happened yet.

Councilmember Heineman commented on using incentives or punishment tactics but he would rather have a simple statement that says the City is not enforcing or using resources to enforce this. A private business mandating something for their workers is different than the federal government using power as a State actor to enforce things. He didn't think the City of Ramsey should say TIF funding wouldn't be awarded for not doing what the City says.

Councilmember Howell suggested striking the last paragraph about the TIF funding.

Councilmember Heineman agreed and added he wants to give people freedom, not punishment if they don't do what this Council wants them to do. He wanted to err on the side of freedoms instead of ultimatums.

City Attorney Knaak offered an analogy of the Sanctuary Movement where various cities declined to be an immigration site and doing something contrary to Federal policy. There is a wide variety of ways that that is done, often by resolutions like this and it has not as yet resulted in sanctions at any considerable level.

Councilmember Heineman commented it is the same as decriminalization of drugs like marijuana.

Mayor Kuzma asked for consensus to be able to move the meeting forward. He asked if it could be tabled for a week to see how things turn out.

Councilmember Musgrove commented she would like to see a statement be made, not necessarily this week, but to say that liberty and freedom and the Constitution are more valuable than government incentives.

Councilmember Specht commented that he felt there was consensus to continue discussion on this regardless of the outcome of the Supreme Court. He supported the one Councilmember Howell put forth with the ordinance.

Councilmember Heineman commented it could wait a week.

Councilmember Howell questioned if the second to last paragraph was struck, would it be generally amenable to the Council going forward and it could be adjusted as needed as a group depending on how things go.

Councilmember Woestehoff replied he would like more time with it.

City Attorney Knaak volunteered to assist in crafting some options and language that might work. Then it could circulate with correspondence without it being an illegal meeting if that is how the Staff wanted to do it.

The consensus of the Council was to continue discussion on drafting a resolution.

2.04: Consider Offer to Sell Portion of Outlot A of the Elmcrest Sanctuary, Anoka County Minnesota (this portion of the meeting may be closed to the public per MS 13D. o5 Subd. 3 (3))

Deputy City Administrator/ Community Dev. Director Hagen introduced the discussion regarding an offer the City has received to sell real property from Blackjack Farms, LLC consisting of a portion of Outlot A of the Elmcrest Sanctuary, Anoka County, Minnesota. The PID numbers are: PID #11-32-25-34-0012, and PID # 11-32-25-34-0011. Council was considering a counteroffer for purchase of a portion of those.

Motion by Councilmember Woestehoff, seconded by Councilmember Musgrove to recess to Closed Session at 6:42 p.m.

A roll call vote was performed.

Councilmember Heineman	aye
Councilmember Woestehoff	aye
Councilmember Specht	aye
Councilmember Musgrove	aye
Councilmember Riley	aye
Councilmember Howell	aye
Mayor Kuzma	aye

Motion carried.

The meeting reconvened to Open Session at 6:58 p.m.

RECESS AND RECONVENE

Motion by Councilmember Musgrove, seconded by Councilmember Howell to recess the Work Session until after the Regular City Council meeting.

A roll call vote was performed.

Councilmember Heineman	aye
Councilmember Woestehoff	aye
Councilmember Specht	aye
Councilmember Musgrove	aye
Councilmember Riley	aye
Councilmember Howell	aye
Mayor Kuzma	aye

Motion carried.

Work Session was recessed at 6:59 p.m.

Work Session reconvened at 9:13 pm.

2.04: Consider Offer to Sell Portion of Outlot A of the Elmcrest Sanctuary, Anoka County Minnesota (this portion of the meeting may be closed to the public per MS 13D. o5 Subd. 3 (3) (continued)

Motion by Councilmember Musgrove, seconded by Councilmember Heineman to recess to Closed Session at 9:13 p.m.

A roll call vote was performed.

Councilmember Heineman	aye
Councilmember Woestehoff	aye
Councilmember Specht	aye
Councilmember Musgrove	aye
Councilmember Riley	aye
Councilmember Howell	aye
Mayor Kuzma	aye

Motion carried.

Work Session reconvened at 9:38 pm.

3. TOPICS FOR FUTURE DISCUSSION

3.01: Review Future Topics/ Calendar

Noted.

4. MAYOR / COUNCIL / STAFF INPUT

None.

5. ADJOURNMENT

The Work Session of the City Council was adjourned at 9:39 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.

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

The Ramsey City Council conducted a Closed Session on Tuesday, January 11, 2022, 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: Deputy City Administrator/ Community Dev. Director Brian Hagen
Economic Development Manager Sean Sullivan
City Attorney Fritz Knaak
Planning Manager Chloe McGuire Brigl

1. CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Kuzma called the Closed Session of the City Council to order at 6:43 p.m.

2. COUNCIL BUSINESS

2.01: Consider Offer to Sell Portion of Outlot A of the Elmcrest Sanctuary, Anoka County Minnesota

Deputy City Administrator/ Community Dev. Director Hagen introduced the discussion in consideration of an offer to sell a portion of Outlot A of the Elmcrest Sanctuary.

The Council discussed the offer and consensus was reached to continue discussion after tonight's City Council meeting.

3. ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Councilmember Woestehoff, seconded by Councilmember Specht, to adjourn the Closed Session.

A roll call vote was performed.

Councilmember Heineman aye
Councilmember Woestehoff aye

Councilmember Specht aye
Councilmember Musgrove aye
Councilmember Riley aye
Councilmember Howell aye
Mayor Kuzma aye
Motion carried.

The Closed Session was adjourned at 6:58 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.

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

The Ramsey City Council conducted a Closed Session on Tuesday, January 11, 2022, 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: Deputy City Administrator/ Community Dev. Director Brian Hagen
Economic Development Manager Sean Sullivan
City Attorney Fritz Knaak
Planning Manager Chloe McGuire Brigl

1. CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Kuzma called the Closed Session of the City Council to order at 9:24 p.m.

Mayor Kuzma left the meeting at 9:24 p.m.

2. COUNCIL BUSINESS

2.01: Consider Offer to Sell Portion of Outlot A of the Elmcrest Sanctuary, Anoka County Minnesota

Deputy City Administrator/ Community Dev. Director Hagen introduced the discussion in consideration of an offer to sell a portion of Outlot A of the Elmcrest Sanctuary.

The Council discussed the offer and gave direction to staff.

3. ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Councilmember Woestehoff, seconded by Councilmember Musgrove to adjourn the Closed Session.

A roll call vote was performed.

Councilmember Heineman aye

Councilmember Woestehoff	aye
Councilmember Specht	aye
Councilmember Musgrove	aye
Councilmember Riley	aye
Councilmember Howell	aye
Mayor Kuzma	absent

Motion carried.

The Closed Session was adjourned at 9:38 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.