

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

The Ramsey City Council conducted a City Council Special Work Session on Tuesday, March 1, 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 Dan Specht
Councilmember Matt Woestehoff

Absent: Councilmember Chris Riley

Also Present: City Administrator Kurtis Ulrich
Deputy City Administrator/ Community Dev. Director Brian Hagen
City Attorney Fritz Knaak
Administrative Services Director Colleen Lasher
Deputy City Clerk Katie Schmidt (attended remotely)

1. CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Kuzma called the City Council Work Session to order at 5:35 p.m.

2. TOPICS FOR DISCUSSION

2.01: Discuss Redistricting City Wards and Precincts

Administrative Services Director Lasher presented the case for discussion for the City Council to establish or reestablish ward and precinct boundaries in order for an ordinance to be introduced on March 8, 2022 and adopted on March 22, 2022; in time for the March 29, 2022 deadline. She presented the staff report along with proposals and the supportive response from the County.

Civil Engineer IV Linton stated he has been doing the technical work behind the maps in the staff report and is present to answer questions. He referenced an example which was circulated and has sent a letter to the judges that decide the master district redrawing because in looking at it, he thought they could have done a better job. He noted Hwy 10 by the mobile park where, they came in the west driveway, went up the railroad tracks and then back out the east driveway to Hwy 10 enclosing a small area in Congressional District Three with the remainder staying in Congressional District Six. He believed there was a lot of ridesharing there so people have to go to two different polling places on election day. He wrote a letter to them but he understood it may take a year to resolve. He stated the judge and staff were just looking at numbers and didn't realize that this area is a tight knit mobile home community with a lot of dependencies in it.

Mayor Kuzma asked if that could get changed.

Civil Engineer IV Linton stated it is possible to get changed, he sent something similar to an appeal process, but they are dealing with the whole State so it may take a while. He referenced an exhibit with a rectangle with Elk River School District inside District 11, north of 173rd Ave. He stated the line looks like it may go through an existing house which is around 40 acres. The school districts do their lines after the City gets done. He stated he thought it would be a good time to ask the School District to clean that up. By giving up some land, there isn't enough land for the Elk River School District to achieve 100 houses to bolster their population. It is also outside the MUSA so it is guided by large lot development so not very many lots could go there. He stated if it stays where it is, it requires having two sets of ballots at the polling place and determining which district the voters live in to ensure they get the right ballot. He stated he has spent a lot of time on this.

Councilmember Musgrove asked Civil Engineer IV Linton if he thought that could be resolved with the next election or if that is also a long-term discussion between the school districts.

Civil Engineer IV Linton replied he thought it should be simple. He stated he knows school districts are very possessive of their territory but he didn't feel there was enough there.

Councilmember Musgrove commented it would require a good argument as to why that would be a good thing for both districts and the Ramsey voters.

Civil Engineer IV Linton confirmed this.

Administrative Services Director Lasher commented that the deadline for the school districts to get their maps done is 15 weeks before the primary which is April 26, 2022. She also followed up on a comment she had made the last time they met regarding. She stated she had commented that one of the polling places, Independent Baptist, is a little tight with there only being one entrance. She stated she talked to Paul Linnell at the County about this and he felt that to introduce as little change as possible, with this change would be the wisest thing to do. Given all of the circumstances right now, she asked that that be delayed.

Councilmember Woestehoff asked if the polling places set on an annual basis.

Administrative Services Director Lasher confirmed this.

Councilmember Musgrove referenced the information provided listing the population numbers for each ward. She commented that Ward Three and Ward Four are pretty close but Ward One and Ward Two are not. She asked if the numbers proposed acceptable.

Administrative Services Director Lasher confirmed this.

Councilmember Musgrove asked even if there is a wide swing between two of them.

Administrative Services Director Lasher replied they have been reviewed by Paul Linnell, the manager, at the County and he felt it is an excellent layout and within the allowable spread.

Councilmember Musgrove commented that Administrative Services Director Lasher had forwarded an email from him with the wording “as much as practicable.” She thought there was a section of Ward One that could easily go to Ward Two but she wasn’t sure how the percentages were worked out. She thought there was a difference and recalled him staying within 5%.

Councilmember Specht replied he called that the numbers should be a little closer.

Councilmember Heineman commented he thought it was around 5%.

Councilmember Musgrove agreed and stated they are at 6% and 4% so maybe it is close.

Councilmember Specht asked if future development was considered or if it was only from the current census. He stated he was thinking about the Riverstone South development coming in and if there are other areas of Ward Three that would be changed.

Councilmember Musgrove thought it was based on current census numbers.

City Attorney Knaak confirmed this, and added although when they are doing the adjustments they can anticipate a likely population increase if they can articulate it. If an increase is being seen in one particular ward because that is where the development is, it can be accounted for within reason.

Civil Engineer IV Linton referenced a sheet and stated they could see where changes were made to get to where it is now. He stated regarding Ward One when all the Councilmember’s suggestions were received in an email, instead of having the boundary go up Hwy 47, north of Green Valley Road, the boundary between Wards One and Two, shifts and goes across Green Valley Road which balances things out. He stated along the river in Ward One, Precinct Two, the boundary moved down farther south. He stated in Ward Four, Precinct One the boundary was shifted west to move population into Ward Four, Precinct Two. In Ward Three, Precinct One, the boundary was shifted south to put more population into Ward Two. He stated roads were used as a deciding factor.

Councilmember Howell commented that there is a big variance between Ward One and Ward Two, and between Ward Two and all the other wards. She stated how she reads it is a 10% spread.

Civil Engineer IV Linton confirmed this but stated all of these are compared to the average. He stated he took 27,646 and divided that by four and that works out to about 6,000 people. He stated from the standard they are plus or minus the average, not between each one.

Councilmember Musgrove referenced the map in the case and asked if they are close to the boundaries they had before regarding Ward Three and Ward Four.

Councilmember Specht pointed out where they were changed.

Councilmember Musgrove referenced the greater portion of Ward Four into Ward Three and asked why that was done if it is anticipated that Ward Three is going to increase in potential housing over the next ten years. She also asked why it wasn't left where it was so those residents in Ward Three, Precinct Two, and Ward Four, Precinct One don't have any changes. She proposed that be kept the same, noting there would still be an awkward boundary line area but there would be consistency for those residents with existing boundary lines. She felt there would be growth in Ward Three and Ward Two to the north so the proposals are calculating for some growth in Ward Two but not in Ward Three. She noted that Ward Two is six points lower than the average and they will see an increase in growth over the next ten years but Ward Three will see growth but it is a plus one. She didn't want to take away from Ward Four any more than what is already being done and why it would need to be changed.

Civil Engineer IV Linton replied that before the adjustments, Ward Four was greater than 5%, closer to 10%, above the average. By doing the adjustments and moving some of it to Ward Three brought it below that. He stated continuous streets were used as much as possible in making the adjustments. He stated it is known that Ward Three is growing and will continue but it isn't known how much. He emphasized that the City Attorney recommended to be reasonable in the estimates.

Councilmember Woestehoff asked what the population break would be.

Civil Engineer IV Linton replied he didn't know off the top of his head.

There was brief discussion among the Council with Civil Engineer IV Linton as they looked at the map together.

Councilmember Woestehoff stated the population counts are listed in each of the districts on the previous case. He agreed with avoiding as much change as possible but expressed concern that in keeping that particular piece in Ward Four it looks roughly like an additional 400 or so.

Councilmember Specht replied that it looked to him like he would be losing.

Councilmember Heineman agreed, Councilmember Specht would be losing and Councilmember Musgrove would be gaining.

Councilmember Heineman commented that in looking at the map, when it comes to Ward One, they have north of Alpine and that triangle north of Alpine between Sunfish and County Road 5, that is a chunk that Ward One could give up to lower the number that could go to Ward Four.

Mayor Kuzma replied that is a lot of people.

Councilmember Heineman replied or Ward One could lose some to Ward Two because in looking at south of Nowthen Blvd, west of Sunfish Blvd that is a new addition to Ward One that used to be a different ward.

Councilmember Specht asked if it would make sense to give a little bit of Ward Three to Ward Two, given the addition of the Riverstone South development, even the stuff that borders it.

Councilmember Woestehoff stated that he felt other areas are under development and will continue to grow and Ward Two will end up with all of the Trott Brook North which is a sizable jump.

Councilmember Heineman commented that the biggest discrepancy is between Ward One and Ward Two so to give some of One to Two based on what is proposed would even it out the most.

Councilmember Specht added that Wards Two and Three are most likely going to grow the most at least short term so that is something to think about. He thought giving Ward Two Ward Three and take the whole river section.

Councilmember Musgrove proposed keeping Wards Three and Four the same given the division between them, noting it is easier with the Alpine line straight as a nice clear cut break. She had one other suggestion that would bring Ward One to 7,014 and Ward Two to 6,723 so it would balance by 172 houses but wasn't sure if that was enough.

Councilmember Woestehoff commented that one thing he liked about the map as presented is a lot of the main artery roads are really good dividers now instead of little side streets.

Councilmember Howell stated that she liked Councilmember Musgrove's idea.

Councilmember Musgrove replied she didn't know if that was enough but tried to stay to main streets and some of the other areas had too many houses.

Civil Engineer IV Linton asked for clarification that the Council is comfortable with Wards Three and Four as they are drawn but would like to see more balance between Wards One and Two to see if they can cut out the 10% between top and bottom.

Councilmember Woestehoff replied the discussion that yes, Wards One and Two need a little bit of a shift and it seems the consensus is to keep the border between Wards Three and Four as similar to what it was before, just that particular line.

Councilmember Musgrove replied one for the voters and two for the potential growth.

Mayor Kuzma asked if this is adjusted if it needs to go back to the County to get reapproved so a timing problem is created.

Administrative Services Director Lasher replied it does not have to go back to the County but she would send a courtesy email to get their buy-in so there isn't an issue as the deadline approaches.

Mayor Kuzma commented that it seems like it's pretty simple.

Councilmember Specht asked why does Ward Two go passed Hwy 10.

Civil Engineer IV Linton replied that is the school district boundary. Ward Two, Precinct One, followed the school district boundaries so they don't have a precinct with two separate ballots.

Councilmember Specht commented that it makes sense to get a big development and he is getting a big development but to play with the line probably doesn't really matter.

Councilmember Woestehoff commented that it may have less impact on voters because they may have not voted in an election because they are newer houses.

Councilmember Specht referenced the map and asked how many areas are in the area and if a couple hundred are shifted from Ward Three to Ward Two in the area of Puma Street to balance it out a little more depending on how the numbers come out.

Civil Engineer IV Linton replied that could be possible.

Councilmember Woestehoff replied it would be around 200.

Civil Engineer IV Linton suggested starting at where Ramsey Blvd comes off Nowthen Blvd and down southeast, then to the west, move some of Ward One over into Ward Two, and look at moving Ward Three west of Puma Street into Ward Two. He stated that based on what he was seeing with the numbers, Ward Four was top heavy. He referenced the map and stated this represents the compromise to bring Ward Four down closer to the others. He went over to Sunfish Lake Blvd with the boundary the first time, and that dropped Ward Four way down. He stated he will look at it.

Councilmember Musgrove commented that one of the maps was in the case but she thought it would be good to have them all included or to make a note that updated case files will be in the presentation when they come before the Council so that they have this information for the record.

Civil Engineer IV Linton asked if the Council would like to see three different alternates of numbers. The next meeting to stay on schedule is for introduction of the ordinance.

Councilmember Musgrove agreed with three because that would have more opportunity for discussion and choice.

City Administrator Ulrich stated one would be the original, two would be the amendments made tonight.

Civil Engineer IV Linton agreed they could do that.

Councilmember Musgrove asked if the one with the census numbers could be added to the case and maybe a note that it isn't 100% accurate.

Mayor Kuzma asked if he had the discussion notes on Ward Three and Ward Four.

Civil Engineer IV Linton confirmed this.

Councilmember Woestehoff asked regarding the polling places and using the municipal center for the destination for two different precincts. He stated he could see it being efficient but also confusing at the same time. He asked if the County gave any feedback on it based on what they have seen across the rest of the County.

Administrative Services Director Lasher she didn't have information on that nor has she gotten any feedback on it. When she talked to Paul Linnell, he thought it was a good plan and but didn't comment on that. She stated with early voting, people are used to coming to the municipal center. She stated there may be some confusion but none she was aware of.

City Administrator Ulrich replied the County is planning to mail a postcard to every voter explaining their polling location and asked if it could be taken down to the level of which room to help clarify it. He stated there would probably be a map at the entrance with the two different precincts.

Administrative Services Director Lasher confirmed this.

Councilmember Woestehoff stated that it shows Ward Three, Precinct One and Precinct Three, yet precinct two is the Fire Station which looks like it is outside of the mile boundary. He asked if Precinct Two should be at the Municipal Center instead of the Fire Station.

Councilmember Specht replied he has always voted at the Fire Station and it would hard for people to change.

Councilmember Woestehoff asked if it has changed.

Councilmember Specht replied it has been like that.

Councilmember Musgrove commented on the two precincts being at the same location and that if people are go to the wrong location for their precinct that they would be happier not to have to drive somewhere else instead of just walking down a hallway. She thought that kind of confusion could be easily managed.

Councilmember Woestehoff agreed.

Deputy City Clerk Schmidt commented that the one mile boundary is per ward, not per precinct, so the boundary should be okay.

The consensus of the Council was that the Council was comfortable with Wards Three and Four as they are drawn but would like to see more balance between Wards One and Two. Also to include maps and information associated with this case in the ordinance introduction case for the next meeting.

2.02: Discuss the Recruitment Timeline and Advertising for the City Administrator Vacancy

Administrative Services Director Lasher stated the purpose of this discussion is to consider a detailed recruitment process and timeline for the City Administrator position. In addition, the City Council may wish to look at ways to consider a shortened recruitment schedule in order to reduce the amount of time the city functions without a city administrator. She reviewed the staff report including the advertising outlets. She stated that given Staff capacity the position has not been posted yet as outlined on the timeline in the case.

City Administrator Ulrich stated he received comments from Councilmember Riley who asked if the requirements could be tightened up, the education and experience acceptable to Council in that it is really broad. He stated Councilmember Riley also asked if the number of days in the position is the number of the days that the position is advertised open enough.

Councilmember Specht replied he is comfortable with the education requirement and with the timeline, as it made sense. He stated he appreciated the work that went in to that.

Councilmember Howell commented that she liked Councilmember Riley's point in making sure it is open long enough. She asked if there was a way to extend applications through the entire month of March to ensure everyone is captured. She read where it says "agreement negotiated" and there is a five day window after that between May 5, 2020 May 10, 2022 if there is a way to tighten that up to gain days on the front end.

Administrative Services Director Lasher replied that negotiating the agreement would include the City Attorney and asked if the request was to shorten the negotiation.

Councilmember Howell corrected she is asking if there is way to shorten the days after the negotiation when the person is actually hired.

Administrative Services Director Lasher replied they have to align the authorization to hire with a Council meeting, which is how she arrived at that date.

Councilmember Howell thanked her for answering her question.

Councilmember Musgrove commented that she liked how the City profile was done with the use of the City photos, which was a nice way of presenting the information. She felt it was really done well. She agreed with Councilmember Howell to leave the application window open through the end of March. She cited two reasons, one being to accommodate Staff time to get all of the positions posted on the different sites acknowledging that the different sites have different deadlines; and, closing it on March 20, 2022 versus leaving it open another week would open another week that people could potentially see the ad and apply.

Councilmember Heineman commented that if the process is being moved along, going from March 2, 2022 or March 3, 2022 to March 20, 2022 is still 17 days, over two weeks and is two weeks too short.

Councilmember Musgrove replied the question is if the paper doesn't publish it until a week later then how many days is that, so then its more like ten days.

Councilmember Heineman replied he didn't think two weeks was too short a period of time.

Councilmember Musgrove asked how long the City Planner position was posted for.

Administrative Services Director Lasher replied she believed it was four or five weeks.

Councilmember Musgrove asked how many hits and how many applications did it get.

Administrative Services Director Lasher replied she estimated 350 hits and six applicants.

Councilmember Musgrove replied that is another reason to have a longer time frame to have people see it in the different sources.

Councilmember Woestehoff asked when the six applicants apply, if it was early in the process.

Administrative Services Director Lasher replied of the six applicants she thought two or three applied early in the process and the others applied close to the deadline. She stated they were hoping to have a few more applicants if it was extended a few more days, and letting applicants know about the extension, but no more applications came in.

Councilmember Woestehoff asked about the Deputy City Administrator position, how long that was open and what the application distribution was.

Administrative Services Director Lasher replied she didn't remember, but thought it was typical to get several at first and more at the end.

Councilmember Woestehoff replied that was fair.

Administrative Services Director Lasher commented that originally when she was looking at a way to shorten the recruitment period, she didn't cut down the amount of time the application was open nearly this much but the best she could get it was that the applicant would start on or near June 27, 2022. She stated if the Council's direction is to extend this eleven days to bring it though March 31, 2022, that is going to get it around the end of June.

Councilmember Howell commented she had an idea to work around that. She suggested proposing a start date but for the right candidate, they could start as much as a month later. She asked Administrative Services Director Lasher for feedback.

Administrative Services Director Lasher replied absolutely, that is how it would be done. As soon as they have authorization to hire, it could be the next day or as long as they would require. She stated some people at this level may be required to give a 30-day notice.

Councilmember Musgrove asked what if it was extended to March 25, 2022, which would give Administrative Services Director Lasher until Thursday March 3, 2022 for posting and then have it open for three weeks instead of the end of the month but it would still allow for more time.

Councilmember Heineman replied he liked that idea and added that there may be a good amount of people who wait until the end to apply because they are trying to figure out their options. He thought people would apply before the deadline, whenever that is set.

Councilmember Woestehoff agreed but stated the problem is that on the calendar, there are two weekend days between that so that gives March 27 and March 28, 2022 to schedule interviews. Depending on the number of applicants, it could be a stressful time to schedule the applicants.

Councilmember Musgrove suggested the evening of March 23, 2022.

Administrative Services Director Lasher replied normally they like to allow through 11:59 p.m. Sunday evenings because if it is closed on a Friday, Staff is not there over the weekend and a lot of time Fridays are busy with other activities. She likes to give ample opportunity for people because most applicants are home over the weekend to complete it. Then Staff can get into in Monday morning.

Mayor Kuzma asked if it would be March 27, 2022.

Administrative Services Director Lasher confirmed this, or March 20, 2022 but that was discussed as not a good idea.

Mayor Kuzma recommended March 27, 2022 as being fair.

Councilmember Musgrove asked if that would allow enough time to do first interviews on March 29, 2022.

Administrative Services Director Lasher replied no, that would have to be adjusted.

Councilmember Musgrove asked if it was closed Wednesday March 23, 2022 that would still give more time on the front end to get it posted, a little more time for people to see it and apply and then still be able to do interviews on March 29, 2022.

Administrative Services Director Lasher replied depending on the makeup of the interview panel that is too tight. When it is determined who would want to sit on the panel, those individuals may want to come in and because Staff doesn't know exactly who Council will want to interview from the applicant pool it takes time to schedule. She stated she couldn't go from closing the position to interviewing within four days.

Mayor Kuzma suggested going to March 27, 2022 and adjusting the timetable to what is needed because this has to be done right.

Councilmember Howell referenced the timeline where it says second interviews and the assessment where there is a ten-day window and asked if that is the window during which the work style assessments occur and then answers come back on April 15, 2022 or do the assessments start on April 15, 2022 according to the schedule.

Administrative Services Director Lasher replied she thought she could tighten that up because she listed it “by April 15, 2022.” She stated sometimes appointments are not available but she could request a placeholder appointment so it could possibly be shortened to say “by April 12, or April 13, 2022.”

Councilmember Howell replied that would save a couple days.

Councilmember Woestehoff agreed that it would save a little time but thought because of when Council meetings are, it wouldn't change the end date.

Councilmember Howell stated it would save time on the front end to allow anyone to apply who wanted to.

Councilmember Woestehoff agreed.

Administrative Services Director Lasher stated Council may want to consider a special meeting at the beginning of May 2022.

Councilmember Musgrove stated she wasn't opposed to a special meeting. She commented that April 15, 2022 is a holiday weekend so it may be easier to make the deadline April 14, 2022 because work style assessments may not be done.

Administrative Services Director Lasher replied she indicated “by April 15, 2022.” She understands and wants to expedite this so tomorrow she could call to see what their schedule looks like.

The consensus of the Council was to extend the application deadline to March 27, 2022.

Councilmember Howell commented that in thinking about March 8, 2022 and establishing the process, the meetings they have before the regular work sessions are time constrained and not very many people like to stay late when that happens. She wondered if the process could be set up now as far as who wants to be on the panels. She thought the more that is done now, the more direction Administrative Services Director Lasher would have going forward.

Councilmember Musgrove replied she thought that was going to be included tonight and not just the deadlines.

Administrative Services Director Lasher replied she is open to that and thought it would be helpful for her in terms of who wants to serve on the interview panel. She stated it would be similar to Deputy City Administrator/Community Dev. Director Hagen's hire. She suggested not having a quorum as with the first time with Deputy City Administrator/Community Dev. Director Hagen's position. She wouldn't want to lose candidates because their names are public from the beginning and asked that the interviews be done during the day so Staff are not working 14 hours and it is also difficult for candidates.

Councilmember Woestehoff left the meeting at 6:40 p.m.

Councilmember Heineman commented he thought the process worked well last time.

Mayor Kuzma asked if there will be two rounds of interviews. Administrative Services Director Lasher confirmed this.

Mayor Kuzma stated he would like to sit in on the second round of interviews.

Administrative Services Director Lasher replied it was her assumption that the full Council would sit in on the second interview.

Mayor Kuzma replied then he would want to be in on the first round then.

Councilmember Howell commented she would be on the first round if no one objects.

Councilmember Musgrove stated she would be willing to be in on the first round also and asked about the dates.

Administrative Services Director Lasher replied she wasn't able to work that out yet that she doesn't have her calendar. She asked if it would be acceptable to email dates and times tonight or tomorrow.

Mayor Kuzma confirmed this and asked that they just be given time to set their calendars.

Councilmember Musgrove asked if Administrative Services Director Lasher had the framework that was used for Deputy City Administrator/Community Dev. Director Hagen's position. She thought it was part of the record.

Councilmember Specht asked who all was there.

Councilmember Musgrove replied there were three on the first and five on the next. She asked if inclusion of the department heads would be done the same as last time.

Councilmember Heineman commented last time there were three for the first one to not have a quorum and then seven for the second one.

Councilmember Musgrove commented that for the second interview there was a set of department heads.

Councilmember Heineman replied they interviewed with the Council and the Staff separately.

Councilmember Musgrove asked if the same Staff members would be there for the first round. Administrative Services Director Lasher confirmed this.

Councilmember Musgrove asked if the question was who from the Council would want to be on the first panel.

Administrative Services Director Lasher confirmed this.

City Administrator Ulrich commented the Planning Commission Chair was also included.

Administrative Services Director Lasher replied the Planning Commission Chair and EDA.

City Administrator Ulrich suggested a Commission Chair or two, or a community member, and EDA member, someone outside of the Council and not Staff be included to give a different perspective.

Councilmember Specht asked City Administrator Ulrich if he would want to be included.

City Administrator Ulrich replied he wouldn't and unless Council really wanted him to, he would step back.

Councilmember Howell summarized, that last time the process for the first round was three Councilmembers, Staff, the Planning Commission Chair, the EDA Chair. Councilmembers were allowed to review all of the applications with the understanding that two Councilmembers could move someone forward even if Staff didn't recommend them as an option. After the first round, Council could put through who they wanted for the next round, and then it goes to the full Council. She asked if that was correct.

Administrative Services Director Lasher confirmed this.

Councilmember Howell suggested adding this time that two Councilmembers sit in on the negotiation process for salary and benefits.

City Administrator Ulrich suggested that a model contract be developed that would be presented to the candidate. If there are things that the Council would want included in the new contract that Council or a subcommittee work out the new details to be negotiated.

Mayor Kuzma replied he liked that, that it be pulled together.

Councilmember Musgrove agreed.

Mayor Kuzma stated it could be done during a special Work Session and Staff could pull together what is currently being offered and it could be worked on from there.

Administrative Services Director Lasher asked that if it is correct that two Councilmembers would like to be involved in negotiating the agreement and the City Attorney would draft it.

Councilmember Musgrove asked if that will be discussed at a Work Session.

Mayor Kuzma replied they will pull together at a Work Session what would be offered.

Administrative Services Director Lasher asked if it would be a closed meeting because it is a contract negotiation.

City Attorney Knaak asked if the individual would be present.

Administrative Services Director Lasher replied no.

City Attorney Knaak replied they could do that.

City Administrator Ulrich asked to clarify that they are not talking about specific candidate agreement at this point, just a model contract.

City Attorney Knaak replied a general contract would be a public document and public conversation, but if talking about negotiating terms with someone that would be done more discretely.

City Administrator Ulrich commented when the candidate is identified if they push back on a couple of items on the model contract it could be brought back to the Council during a closed session, just as when negotiating a union contract.

City Attorney Knaak commented that Administrative Services Director Lasher had pointed out there is a standard contract that people are going to know and what the parameters are from the beginning. He thought the process should be quick.

Councilmember Musgrove asked about a policy that says the salary of the top three employees needs to be public and asked if that negotiation needs to be public record or just the salary posting.

City Attorney Knaak replied the salary posting would be, yes, but they could decide whether or not the negotiation would be.

Administrative Services Director Lasher stated the public profile lists a salary range progression and the home page of the website lists the top three wages earners. She stated it is not the wage scale but the actual wage that is posted.

The consensus of the Council was to extend the application deadline to March 27, 2022 and direct Staff to draft a revised schedule for the Council, to include Mayor Kuzma, Councilmembers Howell and Musgrove on the first round of interviews, with the full Council being present for the second round of interviews, and that two Councilmembers would like to be involved in negotiating the agreement that the City Attorney would draft. Terms of the model contract will be discussed at a Work Session.

3. ADJOURNMENT

The Special Work Session of the City Council was adjourned at 6:53 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.