

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

The Ramsey City Council conducted a City Council Work Session on Tuesday, April 12, 2022, at the Ramsey Municipal Center, 7550 Sunwood Drive NW, Ramsey, Minnesota.

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

Also Present: Deputy City Administrator/Community Dev. Director Brian Hagen
Administrative Services Director Colleen Lasher
City Attorney Fritz Knaak

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: Discuss Updating the Policy for the Recruitment, Application, and Interview Process of Appointing City Board and Commission Members

Administrative Services Director Lasher stated the purpose of the case was to get feedback from Council regarding updating the policy for Boards and Commissions, including incumbent members and new members. She noted the attachment labeled A-2 is the case that was added late was not correct. She handed out an updated attachment labeled A-2 for Council consideration. She stated Councilmember Howell, Councilmember Musgrove, and City Attorney Knaak met with her today for two hours to go over another option for updating and improving this policy. She stated the handout is similar to version C-1 and A-1 but specifically requires incumbents to interview with the City Council every term, instead of odd/even numbered terms. She stated the handout lays out some clearer dates and states that effective for terms beginning April 1, 2023 incumbents would need to interview with the Council along with new applicants. She stated version B-1 allows for a much longer recruitment period in the event Council wanted to consider increasing the amount of applications, about nine months out of the year. She asked if there was interest in extending the amount of time that the application is recruited for.

Councilmember Specht replied that makes sense and thought it was a good idea because he has had people approach him inquiring how to get on a Board or Commission.

Administrative Services Director Lasher asked if he was saying yes, leave it up on the website but don't actively recruit all year.

Councilmember Specht replied yes.

Councilmember Woestehoff commented he echoed that and thought the more opportunity the better, even if it is promoted for a smaller window, there is no harm in that.

Administrative Services Director Lasher replied okay.

Councilmember Musgrove commented she thought there is a follow-up that automatically goes out.

Administrative Services Director Lasher replied there is.

Councilmember Musgrove continued she didn't know if the follow-up could reference any time frame or action going on and when it happens so people aren't waiting or wondering when they could anticipate hearing back on an interview process.

Councilmember Woestehoff agreed that is a great point. He stated right now there is a boards and commission website. He thought the application could be there the whole time but it could say terms start in April so there is some level of expectation but if an opening happens ahead of time they can apply earlier. He thought being able to communicate that is key.

Councilmember Musgrove commented if the application was going to be left up, she didn't want anyone to be discouraged because of a lack of communication. She stated she was in favor of leaving the application up passively with communication and having an active recruitment time.

Administrative Services Director Lasher replied she thought that is excellent. She continued when applications come in through the website a notification is sent to staff and the applicant gets an automatic response which would include a message and number to call with questions. She asked about the process for incumbents. She stated the discussion with Councilmembers Musgrove and Howell today was that for the current recruitment that is pending appointment of incumbents, it would be left as is and do the reappointments. For terms beginning in 2023 interviews of incumbents with the Council would be required. She asked for Council feedback on that.

Mayor Kuzma commented that if the interview was being slanted to say what did they learn versus interviewing them as if they were new. He stated it was hard enough to get people to serve on commissions so he wouldn't want to make them feel as if they are interviewing for the position for the first time. He thought asking incumbents what they learned and what could be done better was a good idea.

Administrative Services Director Lasher replied okay.

Councilmember Howell replied in the discussion this morning, as the Council changes and gets new members, there should be an introduction and communication with the Board and Commission members to get acquainted. It would also be a time to collect information.

Mayor Kuzma replied that is a good point and he liked that process.

Councilmember Woestehoff asked on average how many incumbents there are every year.

Administrative Services Director Lasher replied three to six.

Councilmember Woestehoff replied that wouldn't take too much administrative or Council time.

Administrative Services Director Lasher replied correct. She asked for clarity, up to this point the process has been to contact the members to inquire if they want to serve again, they would say yes or no, and if so they would submit a letter of interest. Feedback would be submitted by the Chair. She asked if the Council was still in agreement with that or if they wanted Staff to set up a new version of an application.

Councilmember Woestehoff replied if Council is going to see the incumbent, having them submit a letter seems like extra work. He thought it would be good to get the Chair or Vice Chair's input but any concerns or comments could be brought up during the interview.

Mayor Kuzma commented that four or five years ago the EPB felt the commission didn't feel like they were being heard. A restructuring of what they do happened and having a meeting helped. He thought this would be a very good process.

Councilmember Musgrove agreed with the points that were made. She thought there would be an opportunity for incumbents to ask the Council questions as well. She asked if that could be done on a Work Session night versus on a night for new interviews.

Mayor Kumza noted there wouldn't be that many of them and do them on interview nights. He thought doing a joint meeting with the commissions to talk about their work plans. He thought it would be awkward having multiple incumbents from different commissions and boards all at the same time.

Councilmember Musgrove corrected she meant not altogether but one at a time to share and introduce themselves, have the same interview type opportunity, but have it during a Work Session. She stated the Council knows the incumbents and they know the Councilmembers but not on a deeper level which may be helpful when approaching them about agenda items and bigger picture policy items.

Councilmember Specht expressed concern with the amount of time during Work Sessions which are typically busy and suggested something more informal on a different day.

Administrative Services Director Lasher commented that there is usually an annual Boards and Commissions interview night on the third Tuesday in March. That has always been a Public Works Committee meeting night but it has worked well for staff.

Councilmember Howell liked that idea for consistency.

Councilmember Heineman commented he thought if the incumbents are going to interview they should stick to the same schedule as everyone else but with different questions.

Administrative Services Director Lasher stated she will draft the new version of what was just discussed and bring it forward at a future meeting for formal adoption to be effective for terms starting in 2023.

Councilmember Musgrove stated scope was discussed during the morning meeting. She stated because the Charter Commission is separate they thought it would be valuable to have that stated and reference to it. She thought the Charter Commission appointments were made by the Chief Justice of the 10th Judicial District, if they state the policy, she thought that would be enough because the policy spells that all out.

Administrative Services Director Lasher replied currently it says the Charter Commission has a separate policy, Charter Commission appointments are made by the Chief Justice of the 10th Judicial District. She thought it didn't seem to fit in the middle of the paragraph to say the Charter Commission has a separate policy. She offered to play with the language so it flows better.

Councilmember Howell commented that they were to put where it says the Charter Commission has a separate policy, just say for applying to the Charter Commission reference this link to redirect them rather than having an abrupt statement. She also commented that during the morning meeting they discussed ideas around term limits for Commission and Board members. She stated she wasn't a fan of term limits. She stated that Administrative Services Director Lasher had mentioned that getting people to serve was an issue and didn't want to discourage people from serving by having term limits. She proposed having a hybrid which wouldn't put term limits in place but would put term limits on the Chair position to try to bring other people up and not concentrate knowledge in one person. She stated Councilmember Musgrove had pointed out that on the Lower Rum River Watershed Management Organization where someone had tons of experience but when they left no one knew what to do. She stated the idea of allowing two four-year terms as a Chair and then take a break for four years during which time they can provide mentorship and come back after that if they want to. Allowing people to serve on without term limits but promote stepping into leadership as the Chair to spread the wealth of knowledge.

Deputy City Administrator/Community Dev. Director Hagen asked if a Chair could serve as a Vice Chair so if a Chair is absent there would be some to step in to run the meetings.

Councilmember Howell replied yes, the idea is to push someone into leadership and change things around. She stated it wouldn't apply to this round of reappointments. She stated it would only happen once every eight years so it wouldn't take a lot of extra work.

Councilmember Woestehoff replied he thought Councilmember Howell had a good point. He asked what sets the rules, or what is the process, around appointing a Chair.

Administrative Services Director Lasher replied she believed it is just discussion within the Board or Commission to get a nomination of who would be good at it.

Councilmember Woestehoff asked if it was reviewed annually.

Administrative Services Director Lasher replied it is always looked at in April.

Mayor Kuzma replied he liked the idea. He asked if there was consensus on adding that in, then noted there was Council consensus.

Administrative Services Director Lasher thanked Councilmember Howell for bringing that up.

2.02: Discuss Developing a Charter Commission Recruitment Policy

Administrative Services Director Lasher stated this case is to discuss the first Charter Commission Recruitment Policy. She stated a draft of a policy of how to approach Charter Commission openings which occur on a calendar year basis versus April to March is attached to the case. She reviewed the draft policy. She stated it was based on ideas from the city of Northfield. She stated the Charter Commission recruitment is different from other boards and commission in that those are handled by Human Resources and the Charter Commission will be handled by the City Clerk. She asked for feedback from the Council.

Mayor Kuzma commented he thought the section on authority should be kept in.

Administrative Services Director Lasher replied okay.

Councilmember Riley asked if this met her approval in her role as the City Clerk.

Administrative Services Director Lasher replied it is getting there. She stated it was a real rush to do. She thanked Councilmember Musgrove and Councilmember Howell for giving her language for it because prior to this morning, she didn't have language. She thought the discussion was going to start the process but now they have a head start on it and it was good information. She wanted it to be refined because it isn't in good form right now but it is a good start.

Councilmember Musgrove referenced the section labeled "Terms" and the statement that incumbents will be allowed to serve until a successor is appointed. She asked if that is the same for the Charter Commission and the Boards and Commissions.

Administrative Services Director Lasher replied she would need to double check.

City Attorney Knaak replied it is statutory that they remain until a successor is appointed.

Councilmember Musgrove referenced the Terms again and stated that some are six-year or four-year terms so the duration was known. She asked if that was moved to another section.

Administrative Services Director Lasher replied she didn't know if the length of the term was addressed in this policy. She thought it was in the other one.

Councilmember Musgrove stated she thought under Terms if there was a statement that said terms would expire annually or at the end of four or six years.

Administrative Services Director Lasher replied Charter Commission terms are four years and expire on December 31 of the fourth year.

Councilmember Musgrove commented she thought it would be good to have in there along with a statement that Charter Commission members are not eligible for a stipend.

Administrative Services Director Lasher replied both of these issues are addressed in the middle of the document.

Councilmember Musgrove commented she wasn't finding it.

Councilmember Howell stated under "Terms and Conditions" the Charter requires that the applicant must be a registered voter, must not currently serve on the judiciary, and must not be a current City Councilmember. She thought that should be included as well.

Councilmember Musgrove commented she wasn't finding it.

Mayor Kuzma commented they are missing a page.

Councilmember Woestehoff noted it jumps from numbers one to eleven.

Administrative Services Director Lasher apologized.

Mayor Kuzma followed up on Councilmember Howell's comments by stating the Council wants to go in the direction of not having a Councilmember serve on the Charter Commission but he didn't know if that could be published until it gets changed.

Councilmember Howell asked for City Attorney Knaak's feedback on this.

City Attorney Knaak replied what can be changed is the method in terms of selection, what is forwarded to the judge, and the recommendations that the Council makes. He stated there is nothing that prevents the Council, even without the change in the Charter, saying in the policy that names of members of the Council are not going to be advanced without violating the law. He continued a Councilmember could still go to the judge unless the Charter is changed.

Councilmember Howell commented that it can't be enforced but that is the policy that is in place.

Mayor Kuzma replied he didn't want the Council to get in trouble.

Councilmember Howell thought having a line about the applicant being a registered voter and not being a current City Councilmember was important in getting where they want to go to move forward.

Councilmember Heineman commented there are obvious limitations to what the Council can control because it is a different appointing body, but theoretically under this policy someone sitting in a Charter Commission seat could run for City Council and serve on both. He asked if that was correct.

Councilmember Woestehoff replied if it is part of the recruitment policy, yes.

Councilmember Heineman stated if it is part of the recruitment policy the Council could disallow that, but he is saying if a current Charter Member ran for City Council they could still serve on both boards because they wouldn't go through the recruitment process because they are already in office.

City Attorney Knaak replied that is correct, as long as the Charter doesn't prevent them from doing that.

Councilmember Riley commented he liked the direction the draft is going but would like to see a cleaned up version with all the pages.

Administrative Services Director Lasher replied absolutely. She referenced a paragraph under the heading Mid-Year Vacancy. She asked if they had that page. The Council did not. She stated she will clean the document up and email it out so they can discuss it again. She stated it was ideas Councilmember Musgrove and Councilmember Howell had about looking for a candidate that had, and she read "an interest in history, government, philosophy, law, literature, political science and further understand that wisdom and knowledge are not solely possessed by those who have acquired degrees, the City Council requires each applicant to be evaluated on their own merits and quality of application rather than necessarily hold degrees in the afore mentioned fields." She stated what this meant when application information is sent to the judge there would be a cover letter that says these are traits Council is looking for in an applicant. She stated questions would also be added to the application to try to pull that out. She asked if she stated it correctly.

Councilmember Howell replied, yes. She stated the idea was to better inform the judge with things that would be relevant for someone applying for the position and not limiting an applicant who has a high school degree but has an interest in these areas to be able to serve and for the Council to be able to articulate that well. She stated she didn't want to limit anyone from applying but wanted the judge to take these things into consideration when making their choice that these things are important to the Council.

Councilmember Woestehoff replied he liked the overall idea of that but thought that as part of the policy, on an annual basis, for the Council to come up with a specific 20 minute Work Session to discuss what they are looking for in a Charter Commission that year so the letter is reflective of

what is needed at the time. He thought if the application process starts in October, during an October Work Session they would formulate what is being looked for so they are ready for December.

Councilmember Howell replied if it was kept broad, and all it says is that Council is looking for someone thoughtful and take that into consideration, which could be static.

Councilmember Woestehoff replied he didn't disagree but thought it could be something that is reviewed at least every year to affirm that is still what they are looking for.

Councilmember Howell agreed.

Councilmember Riley commented he didn't think it was a good thing to say what the City is looking for. He thought the fact that the applicant is willing to fill out an application shows they are thoughtful and willing to get involved. He thought the list sounded limiting, not all registered voters. He didn't want to see limits put on the type of people the City is looking for because it could seem they are looking for people who look like the Councilmembers.

Councilmember Howell replied she didn't think they are looking for people who look like them. She stated the idea is to say, if this person is going to be making laws, that they have an interest in it instead of signing up for something they don't understand on a whim. She thought the applicant should be able to at least define the Charter Commission and the relationship to the City Council. She didn't think that was trying to look for someone like her. It is saying that this is a serious position that has more power than the City Council. She stated anyone can apply and say whatever they want. She stated giving a list of desired characteristics would be helpful to the judge in making their decision but it wouldn't be telling them what to do.

Mayor Kuzma replied in his experience in the last ten years, the Council has very little interaction with the Charter Commission. He stated he couldn't say what the Charter Commission needs in terms of people because he doesn't know who is on it. He stated when there is an issue that is when Council hears from them, but otherwise the Charter Commission meets once a year and is otherwise pretty quiet. He thought it was the judge's responsibility to be looking for the well-rounded person that has some education that is going to be able to fill the seat. He thought it would be hard to narrow in on a specific personality.

Councilmember Howell replied asking the right questions is important to give people the opportunity to show themselves. She thought giving the judge more information through the application was important.

Councilmember Heineman commented he thought what Councilmember Howell was doing is not trying to limit people but to put ideas forward that would help shape a narrative of what makes a good Charter member. He understood Councilmember Riley's comments also and suggested instead of listing desired qualifications including in the Charter post that duties may include, for example review of legal documents, review of constitutional laws. He thought if someone had a relaxed idea of joining the Charter Commission and they see that duties may include a general

understanding of the law, that may serve as a filter and serve the same effect of letting people know what they are getting into. He asked if that is an acceptable compromise.

Councilmember Howell replied since there isn't interest in a cover letter going with the applications, to at least approve the application and the questions on it would ensure gathering quality information.

Councilmember Woestehoff asked Councilmember Howell what changes she would like to see to the application because he thought the application asked for the information she referenced. He stated in the policy under the heading Recommendations, that reads "the City Council wishes to preserve the distinct separate nature of the Charter Commission." He thought that was an important statement and the question was how to get quality candidates but stay completely separate. He wondered if there were ways to adapt the questions but he didn't see immediate areas that needed improvement on the application.

Councilmember Howell replied she didn't think the questions were very specific. She gave the example of the question that read "Describe the strength of Ramsey today" and stated she could say there is a very well oiled machine in getting permits. She stated she could answer all the questions without giving information about her ability or interest in governance. She hoped applications that were filled out poorly wouldn't be considered but thought that asking good questions would give good results.

Mayor Kuzma replied there is a Charter that is followed by the City so what happens with the Charter Commission when there is an issue or policy change that needs to happen is discussed between the Charter Commission. He stated that there is a number of people on the Charter Commission making decisions and it will ultimately come back to the City Council so there are checks and balances.

Councilmember Heineman suggested changing the question to read "briefly describe the strengths of the Ramsey City Charter" and "Briefly describe the weakness of the Ramsey City Charter" and adding a question stating "Please describe your understanding of the Ramsey City Charter and its purpose." He stated that would strengthen the questions to find out the qualitative answer, which is the City Charter stands as constitutional convention. He stated that is what he is looking for from applicants and what he wants the judge to see and rule on.

Councilmember Musgrove asked Administrative Services Director Lasher if the judge has any contact with the applicant other than the application.

Administrative Services Director Lasher replied not to her knowledge.

Councilmember Musgrove replied she thought it would be worth looking at the questions to round them out so the Council would be able to get more information from the applications for the Charter specifically. She thought in that way give the judge more information to evaluate and assess the applications without making the application too arduous a process. She stated she thought some of the questions could be revised to be specific to the Charter. She stated the intent was to convey a message of weighing interest in relevant areas equally with a degree.

Councilmember Riley suggested sending a list of questions to the judge and asking for feedback rather than speculating what information is wanted.

Councilmember Musgrove replied her thinking is based on the email received from the judge's assistant on the application process that cities have their policy and give direction and give recommendation, and the judge takes that into consideration.

City Attorney Knaak commented that the value of having the City's effort and policy in place and sending it to the judge asking for comment would be appreciated. He stated in the absence of direction, the judge has the authority and could appoint an applicant that is a friend or brother. He stated if it is done ahead of a time when a selection is needed to be made and interaction with the judge took place, there may be more of a chance the judge would follow a policy put in place if they have had input and approved it. He thought presenting a package including a policy for the judge to review and comment on would be better than going to the judge to ask for their ideas on what they would want. He thought some interaction with the judge so they don't think the Council doesn't respect their position of authority.

Councilmember Howell stated she has learned in 17 years of teaching and working with curriculums that things can always be improved. She stated it isn't a poor relation of what has gone before, it's just that there is always room for improvement and it is important. She thought if the application could be revised and sent off it would be good.

Mayor Kuzma summarized the consensus is to update the application and send it to the judge and then reconvene to set a policy.

Councilmember Woestehoff asked if they could get the missing pages before that happens.

Administrative Services Director Lasher replied yes.

Councilmember Howell suggested sending suggestions to Administrative Services Director Lasher and then see a revised version that everyone agrees to before it goes to the judge would be great.

Mayor Kuzma replied absolutely.

Administrative Services Director Lasher asked if Councilmember Howell was referring to the revised application as well as the updated policy.

Councilmember Howell replied yes.

Administrative Services Director Lasher referenced page one regarding the incumbents. She stated she thought there were some incumbents that were just reappointed because they said they wanted to be and that went to the judge and he or she reappointed them. She thought it has been a long time since those members have given information that was discussed on the application. She asked if the incumbents should fill out the application.

Councilmember Howell replied the members are already appointed so it is irrelevant.

Councilmember Woestehoff replied other Board and Commission members reinterview so he thought it would be consistent.

Administrative Services Director Lasher asked if incumbents are given preferential status over new applicants if they are sent all together.

City Attorney Knaak replied it depends on the judge. He stated the Council could recommend to the judge that they like people appointed who have experience and a judge would probably accept that but there is nothing under that law that says they be treated any differently at all.

Administrative Services Director Lasher asked if there is a stellar group of new applicants, can the judge appoint a new applicant over an incumbent.

Mayor Kuzma replied sure.

Councilmember Specht commented that since the Charter is appointed by the judge, he thought an incumbent on the Charter is different than the other Boards and Commissions so he didn't think having them do an application was an extra step that was necessary.

Councilmember Heineman commented that the difference between the Boards and Commissions and the Charter was the Council had authority over the Boards and Commissions. He stated the Charter is an overarching entity over the Council so he thought giving direction to people applying to Boards and Commissions makes sense but he thought they needed to be careful in dictating things without precedence in regards to the Charter Commission. He suggested leaving it as is for the incumbents.

Councilmember Howell agreed with leaving it as it is as well and focus on making the application better.

Councilmember Musgrove agreed with that adding the Council is trying give the judge insight into the Council's policy and process but it is the judge's decision. She didn't think it was a good idea to have incumbents reapply if they are willing to serve.

Councilmember Woestehoff asked if the policy could state experience would be favored. He asked how the Councilmembers felt about having incumbent reapply.

Councilmember Howell replied she hadn't thought about it before today but she has been reading about how Charter Commission applications are being done in other cities. She thought it was pretty unusual for a judge to remove a sitting Charter Commission member so it would seem odd to have incumbents reapply. She thought that would give the impression that there is dissatisfaction with the Charter Commission.

Mayor Kuzma stated he liked the idea of giving good information to the judge including a letter that has the policy. He liked the separation between the Charter and the Council and suggested that once the policy is sent off the Council doesn't have anything more to do with it.

Councilmember Heineman agreed with Mayor Kuzma. He stated he disagreed with Councilmember Howell that looking at this the judge may disqualify people which isn't what they want. He stated there are justified similarities between what they are asking the Commissions to reapply and the Charter to reapply but the difference was that it is within the Council's purview to ask the Commissions to reapply because there is direct oversight over them but not over the Charter Commission. He suggested leaving it up to the judge and not have the Charter Commission member reapply.

Councilmember Howell asked if Administrative Services Director Lasher were to send a letter saying an incumbent has reapplied rather than stating she would like the judge to reappoint them and if that would satisfy it somewhat because the judge could still decide whether to reappoint them.

Councilmember Woestehoff asked if someone's term is up, are they still sent to the judge.

Administrative Services Director Lasher replied she sends the request for reappointment.

Councilmember Woestehoff asked if that is what Councilmember Howell was referring to.

Councilmember Howell replied it is a shift in wording from a request for reappointment versus the City Clerk asking for reappointment. She thought a request from the incumbent was more neutral.

Councilmember Woestehoff replied the more neutral the Council could be the better.

Councilmember Heineman agreed.

Administrative Services Director Lasher asked if the consensus was to send a cover letter to the judge or not.

Mayor Kuzma replied he thought they were not going to do a cover letter.

Councilmember Musgrove replied she thought they were going to do a cover stating this is the new policy and request feedback on it.

Mayor Kuzma agreed the policy was going to be sent to the judge.

Councilmember Howell added in July behind what they are doing.

Councilmember Musgrove commented there would still be a cover letter saying these are the applicants, these are those that are requesting reappointment. She thought that is a standard cover letter.

Administrative Services Director Lasher agreed there would be a cover letter with the applications.

Councilmember Heineman commented they are going to send a cover letter with their preferences.

Councilmember Howell asked how does it work if someone sends a letter to the judge for appointment, for example tomorrow, do they print off the application. She also asked what happens if there isn't an immediate opening.

City Attorney Knaak replied it depends on the judge. He thought that most judges, after seeing the policy, would recommend doing the application process through the City and do the process with the others. He thought the email indicated they would like some direction and would follow a policy.

The consensus of the Council was for Councilmembers to send suggestions for revisions to the Charter Commission application to Administrative Services Director Lasher. She will make adjustments and present this and the revised policy to the Council for consideration before sending it to the judge for comment and approval.

2.03: Discuss Future Meetings for MUSA Boundary and COR Design Framework

Deputy City Administrator/Community Dev. Director Hagen stated it was suggested to develop a goal to determine what would be discussed regarding these two topics and develop a strategy. He stated that in a prior discussion the question was raised to have this as a stand alone evening meeting which wouldn't have time restrictions or to have one or both conversations prior to a 7:00 p.m. Planning Commission meeting. He asked for Council feedback on this.

Councilmember Specht commented he thought both topics could be discussed during a meeting on one separate night.

Mayor Kuzma asked if the idea is to have a separate meeting with just the Council to discuss the two topics.

Councilmember Specht replied a separate meeting with all the members there, so no one would have to leave early for something else.

Councilmember Musgrove asked if he meant with the Planning Commission.

Councilmember Woestehoff added, not a pre-meeting.

Councilmember Specht replied, right not a pre-meeting, just a meeting.

Mayor Kumza added a joint meeting with the Planning Commission.

Councilmember Specht replied right.

Mayor Kuzma asked if everyone felt comfortable with that.

Councilmember Musgrove commented that if the topics are discussed one at a time before the Planning Commission meeting if there would be more participation with them and not have a separate night taken away. She suggested doing one this month and one the following month and asked if that would allow enough time to incorporate the ideas. She wondered if one conversation would be enough.

Mayor Kuzma asked if both topics could be listed and if the discussion on MUSA went long, another meeting night could be set.

Councilmember Woestehoff suggested discussing The COR first as a priority this year because key MUSA development has been done in the past two years and this conversation may go more quickly. He also thought Staff needed time to plan for The COR design framework.

Councilmember Musgrove asked Councilmember Woestehoff if he thought it would be worth having the MUSA discussion prior to a Planning Commission meeting and The COR design framework discussion on a separate night because it would likely be a longer conversation.

Councilmember Woestehoff replied if the meeting started at 5:30 p.m. and had to be done by 7:00 p.m., that would be adequate time to get through them or at least start the conversation and get some guidance on one or both of the topics. He agreed with Mayor Kuzma that if another meeting was needed that could be reevaluated. He thought the last meeting got sidetracked by the PACT conversation which was unfortunate because there was a lot to talk about. He asked if this meeting would include the Council and Planning Commission or if it is scoped to include the EDA.

Deputy City Administrator/Community Dev. Director Hagen replied that is a question he had. He thought it may make sense to include the EDA on The COR framework discussion but for the MUSA discussion, the EDA didn't tend to get involved because it is mostly residential.

Mayor Kuzma suggested not doing the meeting on a Council meeting night so if the conversation goes longer the necessary time could be taken to get it done.

Councilmember Musgrove noted if The COR discussion included more people it would make sense to have it on a separate night, but the MUSA discussion could happen before a Planning Commission meeting.

Councilmember Woestehoff concurred adding he thought the MUSA discussion meeting could start at 6:00 p.m. or even 6:15 p.m. because he didn't think it would be a lengthy conversation.

Councilmember Musgrove replied she would rather start at 5:30 p.m. so the Planning Commission members aren't rushed for their 7:00 p.m. meeting.

Deputy City Administrator/Community Dev. Director Hagen asked what they are trying to accomplish. He felt with MUSA it was clear, to shrink the boundaries. He asked with The COR framework if they would be looking at completely revamping it or specific sections.

Councilmember Specht replied he thought the opinions on that would differ significantly. He felt some members are focused on getting any business in there that is possible. He thought the goal was to evaluate how important it is to have fancy landscaping and meeting lengthy specifications or looking at the big picture and wanting it to look nice but not be so specific. He stated he would be in favor of some major changes coming out of it.

Mayor Kuzma replied a lot of time was spent developing The COR standards. He opposed loosening it too much.

Councilmember Specht commented that is a discussion that could happen.

Mayor Kuzma added the Planning Commission are all going to be pretty hard on that because it has been discussed a number of times.

Deputy City Administrator/Community Dev. Director Hagen asked if the conversation would focus around allowed uses, or is it probably going to be aesthetics.

Councilmember Woestehoff replied design framework. He stated in the last Planning meeting 45 minutes was spent on a case with no decision about front porches in apartments in The COR. He stated according to the framework it says new apartment buildings have to have a porch and an awning but the developer questioned that. He stated there are things in the design framework for The COR that are very well intentioned but feedback is coming back now that is interesting. He pointed out that variances are allowed all the time that differ from the design framework. He stated there are a lot of topics to discuss. He thought signage was one the EDA was specifically interested in.

Councilmember Riley commented some of the drivers for this could come from CBRE, anything they are seeing that is holding the City back or standards that have been added that are making it harder to develop. That would come through the EDA manager. He thought that is where some of the questions would come from.

Councilmember Musgrove added for some things the Planning Commission may be in agreement with because hours have been spent but no development is happening. So the question is what are some little things that don't change the total look of The COR but still promote growth in the businesses and retail spaces. She thought there could be some positives.

Councilmember Woestehoff agreed adding it has been in place since 2014.

Mayor Kuzma thought it was even before that.

Councilmember Musgrove stated a builder brought up that the code on sod was very out of date from other cities and after discussion it was decided it was a good change. She stated the other item was the number of trees on industrial build lots because it was too many trees to fit on lots with a large building. She thought it was these kinds of things that are welcome changes, not that the whole design needed to be redone. She suggested having an updated map based on changes that have occurred because she didn't think she had the most current version.

Mayor Kuzma asked if there was a date.

Deputy City Administrator/Community Dev. Director Hagen replied he would need to look at a calendar. He thought the MUSA discussion could happen as early as the April Planning Commission meeting and early May for The COR special meeting.

Councilmember Specht asked if Highway 10 stuff would be separate.

Deputy City Administrator/Community Dev. Director Hagen replied yes, hopefully this summer.

Councilmember Woestehoff commented if they could talk through The COR they could apply some of those ideas to Highway 10 as well.

Councilmember Musgrove commented she has a conflict with the Planning meeting and asked if there was another day.

Councilmember Specht asked what day it is.

Councilmember Musgrove asked if April 28, 2022 was correct.

Deputy City Administrator/Community Dev. Director Hagen replied that sounds right.

Mayor Kuzma stated he wouldn't be available either.

Councilmember Musgrove stated she has a Joint Powers Agreement with the Watershed.

Councilmember Musgrove suggested May 26, 2022.

Deputy City Administrator/Community Dev. Director Hagen replied they will plan for May.

The consensus of the Council was to have a joint meeting with the Planning Commission to discuss the MUSA boundary before the Planning Commission meeting in May. A separate joint meeting with the Council, EDA and Planning Commission will be also be scheduled in May to discuss The COR framework.

2.04: Review Draft City Administrator Contract

Mayor Kuzma stated he thought they had agreed to use the template from the League.

Deputy City Administrator/Community Dev. Director Hagen excused himself given the topic.

City Attorney Knaak replied that is essentially what he did. He stated he merged some of his stuff with the League. He stated other things have been discussed. He stated he didn't know what the negotiation style was. He stated there is a certain framework that is in the contract and wanted the Council to be aware of that. He didn't know if they wanted to negotiate by asking the candidate

the opportunity to ask for things. He stated another strategy was to offer extras to try to lure a quality candidate.

Councilmember Howell referenced the heading Termination Benefits and asked if would be a big deal to switch “employee agrees to give employer 30-day advance notice if they are going to leave” to 60 days or is 30 days standard.

City Attorney Knaak replied it is not, he took the minimum out there. He stated it was however they wanted to do it. He stated City Administrator Ulrich suggested 45 days. He stated 60 days is certainly appropriate.

Councilmember Howell commented it would be nice to have more time if someone decides to leave.

City Attorney Knaak replied that is up to the Council. He suggested Councilmembers email suggested changes and he would consolidate them if there are a lot.

Mayor Kuzma commented he liked starting at a base because it may depend on the experience level of the candidates so the asks may be different.

City Attorney Knaak replied what he has is pretty bare bones. He thought they would get a quality applicant.

Councilmember Woestehoff agreed starting at 60 days and if there is push back go to 45 days. He felt 30 days was light for this position. He pointed out there is also a typo in the Professional Development section. He stated there is an 8 in the word continue. He asked if every signature line could include “Mayor Kuzma”

Administrative Services Director Lasher stated she will be sending an email out with draft interview questions and a proposed schedule. She asked if the Council would agree to having one collective interview panel in one room rather than department heads separate from City Council. She stated there are five candidates, having two separate interview panels has some challenges. She has been told it is redundant and is hard to manage and share information.

Councilmember Howell replied she was fine with it as long as the questions were good and allowed for an in-depth interview with having one group versus two.

Administrative Services Director Lasher asked if Council felt one hour was enough time.

Councilmember Howell replied with prior interviews with 14 questions, she asked if that was enough to be able to make decisions on.

Councilmember Woestehoff replied it depended on the questions.

Councilmember Howell replied the content would have to be really good.

Administrative Services Director Lasher stated she will send interview questions to the group and asked that they send feedback. She stated the schedule can be adapted to ensure there is enough time for the questions.

Councilmember Howell suggested having Administrative Services Director Lasher asking all the questions as she did for the first round.

Mayor Kuzma replied he was fine with it.

There was Council consensus that Administrative Services Director Lasher will ask all the questions.

Councilmember Musgrove asked what the date was.

Administrative Services Director Lasher replied Tuesday, April 19, 2022 all day.

The consensus of the Council was to send suggested changes on the contract to City Attorney Knaak and feedback to the interview questions to Administrative Services Director Lasher.

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 6:59 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.*