

December 20 ,2021 Regular City Council Meeting
Minot City Council- Scheduled Meeting- December 20, 2021 at 5:30 PM

ROLL CALL

Members Present

Evans, Jantzer, Olson, Pitner, Ross, Podrygula, Sipma

Members Absent

None

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mayor Sipma presiding and led the City Council in the Pledge of Allegiance.

MAYORAL APPOINTMENTS

It is recommended the City Council confirm the following Planning Commissioner appointments:

1. Todd Wegenast: Term Expiry: December 31,2026
2. Charles DeMarkis: Term Expiry 2: December 31,2026

Alderman Jantzer moved the City Council approve the recommendation of the Planning Commissioner appointments for Todd Wegenast and Charles DeMarkis until December 31, 2026one. Motion Second by Alderwomen Ross and Carried the following roll call vote: ayes: Evans, Jantzer, Olson, Pitner, Podrygula, Ross, Sipma; nays: none.

CITY MANAGER REPORT

The City Manager Provided a written update describing events and activities for various departments.

1. City Manager announced the hiring of our New City Clerk, Mikayla McWilliams she was been with the City for five years in the Finance Department. Thank you to Anna Schraeder for filling is as the interim City Clerk during this transition.
2. The City Manager with the Economic and Development Committee took a tour of the new Trinity Hospital. They were very please with the way everything is coming together and how well planned and designed the new facility is. Looking Forward to the completion of this project.
3. Community Survey was completed and Jason Morado from ETC out of Kansa City Area who does marketing research for local surveys, presented a PowerPoint presentation.

Alderman Podrygula Thanked Jason Morado for a wonderful presentation and for his and everyone's efforts to put the survey together and for the presentation.

City Manager thanked the City Council for letting us take part in this survey process for the needs and wants of our community. There will be a full report and dash board on our Website. City Manager also mentioned that, as you can see the citizens put a high priority is our streets and our highest concern is higher taxes, where do we find the funds?

Alderman Ross- Baseline- When will we revisit this again every 2 to 3 years? City Manager- We should look to budget this for every 2 years.

PUBLIC HEARING

5.1 Proposed Ordinance to increase Traffic Fines

Alderwomen Olson moved the City Council approve the ordinance to increase traffic fines Motion Second by Alderwomen Pitner and Carried the following roll call vote: ayes: Evans, Jantzer, Olson, Pitner, Podrygula, Ross, Sipma; nays: none.

5.2 Public hearing consider vacation of the portion of 13th Ave SE right- of way.

Alderman Jantzer moved the City Council approve the vacation of the portion of 13th Ave SE right- of way Motion Second by Alderwomen Pitner and Carried the following roll call vote: ayes: Evans, Jantzer, Olson, Pitner, Podrygula, Ross, Sipma; nays: none.

5.3 Public Hearing: Annexation of the outlot 33 less lot A & less portion of Belview 2nd Addition.

Alderwomen Olson moved the City Council approve the Annexation of the outlot 33 less lot A & less portion of Belview 2nd Addition Motion Second by Alderwomen Pitner and Carried the following roll call vote: ayes: Evans, Jantzer, Olson, Pitner, Podrygula, Ross, Sipma; nays: none.

6. CONSIDER THE REPORT OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION

Alderwomen Olson moved the City Council approve the report of the planning commission Motion Second by Alderwomen Pitner and Carried the following roll call vote: ayes: Evans, Jantzer, Olson, Pitner, Podrygula, Ross, Sipma; nays: none.

6.1 Public Hearing: Lot 7, Dakota Square second addition

Alderman Jantzer moved the City Council approve the Lot 7, Dakota Square second addition Motion Second by Alderwomen Pitner and Carried the following roll call vote: ayes: Evans, Jantzer, Olson, Pitner, Podrygula, Ross, Sipma; nays: none.

6.2 Public Hearing River Oaks 6th Addition

Alderman Pitner moved the City Council approve the River Oaks 6th addition. Motion Second by Alderwomen Ross and Carried the following roll call vote: ayes: Evans, Jantzer, Olson, Pitner, Podrygula, Ross, Sipma; nays: none.

6.3 Subdivision of Jefferson South Addition

Alderman Pitner moved the City Council approve the subdivision of Jefferson South addition. Motion Second by Alderwomen Ross and Carried the following roll call vote: ayes: Evans, Jantzer, Olson, Pitner, Podrygula, Ross, Sipma; nays: none.

6.4 Subdivision of Out lots 6&7

Alderman Pitner moved the City Council approve the subdivision of Out lots 6&7. Motion Second by Alderwomen Ross and Carried the following roll call vote: ayes: Evans, Jantzer, Olson, Pitner, Podrygula, Ross, Sipma; nays: none.

6.5 Subdivision of Out lots 8&9

Alderman Pitner moved the City Council approve the subdivision of Out lots 8&9. Motion Second by Alderwomen Ross and Carried the following roll call vote: ayes: Evans, Jantzer, Olson, Pitner, Podrygula, Ross, Sipma; nays: none.

CONSENT

7.1 City Council Minutes

Alderman Ross moved the City Council approve the Consent Agenda Items 7.1 through 7.5 and then 7.7 through 7.13. Motion Second by Alderwomen Pitner and Carried the following roll call vote: ayes: Evans, Jantzer, Olson, Pitner, Podrygula, Ross, Sipma; nays: none.

Consent Item 7.6- 3529.1 MI-5 Project Flood Control C&M Agreement with BNSF and SRJB – Pulled for another Meeting.

7.2 Administrative Approvals

Alderman Ross moved the City Council approve the Consent Agenda Items 7.1 through 7.5 and then 7.7 through 7.13. Motion Second by Alderwomen Pitner and Carried the following roll call vote: ayes: Evans, Jantzer, Olson, Pitner, Podrygula, Ross, Sipma; nays: none.

7.3 Alcoholic Beverage License Renewals

Alderman Ross moved the City Council approve the Consent Agenda Items 7.1 through 7.5 and then 7.7 through 7.13. Motion Second by Alderwomen Pitner and Carried the following roll call vote: ayes: Evans, Jantzer, Olson, Pitner, Podrygula, Ross, Sipma; nays: none.

7.4 Ordinances-

5682- Amend the 2021 Annual Budget – Traffic Capital Equipment Expense

5683- Amending Chapter 24- Personnel Code: Section 24-2, 24-31, 24-46, 24-48 of the Code of Ordinances

5684- 80.2021 BA-FY21 JAG Grant

5685-81.2021 BA- Drone Donations

5686- 7.2022 BA- PD Axon Contract

Alderman Ross moved the City Council approve the Consent Agenda Items 7.1 through 7.5 and then 7.7 through 7.13. Motion Second by Alderwomen Pitner and Carried the following roll call vote: ayes: Evans, Jantzer, Olson, Pitner, Podrygula, Ross, Sipma; nays: none.

7.5 2021 Concrete Pavement Rehabilitation- Final Payment (4551)

Alderman Ross moved the City Council approve the Consent Agenda Items 7.1 through 7.5 and then 7.7 through 7.13. Motion Second by Alderwomen Pitner and Carried the following roll call vote: ayes: Evans, Jantzer, Olson, Pitner, Podrygula, Ross, Sipma; nays: none.

7.6 3529.1 MI-5 Project Flood Control C&M Agreement with BNSF and SRJB – Pulled for another Meeting.

7.7 Approve Amending Identified CDBG DR/NDR policies, procedures, & contracts to delete specific staff names and change to titles

Alderman Ross moved the City Council approve the Consent Agenda Items 7.1 through 7.5 and then 7.7 through 7.13. Motion Second by Alderwomen Pitner and Carried the following roll call vote: ayes: Evans, Jantzer, Olson, Pitner, Podrygula, Ross, Sipma; nays: none.

7.8 NDDDES 2021 HMEP Training Grant(2021300006-FD0116)

Alderman Ross moved the City Council approve the Consent Agenda Items 7.1 through 7.5 and then 7.7 through 7.13. Motion Second by Alderwomen Pitner and Carried the following roll call vote: ayes: Evans, Jantzer, Olson, Pitner, Podrygula, Ross, Sipma; nays: none

7.9 2021 Interest Distribution

Alderman Ross moved the City Council approve the Consent Agenda Items 7.1 through 7.5 and then 7.7 through 7.13. Motion Second by Alderwomen Pitner and Carried the following roll call vote: ayes: Evans, Jantzer, Olson, Pitner, Podrygula, Ross, Sipma; nays: none.

7.10 2021 Watermain replacement- Final Payment (4567)

Alderman Ross moved the City Council approve the Consent Agenda Items 7.1 through 7.5 and then 7.7 through 7.13. Motion Second by Alderwomen Pitner and Carried the following roll call vote: ayes: Evans, Jantzer, Olson, Pitner, Podrygula, Ross, Sipma; nays: none.

7.11 24th ST NW Water and Sewer Replacement- Award bid (4614)

Alderman Ross moved the City Council approve the Consent Agenda Items 7.1 through 7.5 and then 7.7 through 7.13. Motion Second by Alderwomen Pitner and Carried the following roll call vote: ayes: Evans, Jantzer, Olson, Pitner, Podrygula, Ross, Sipma; nays: none.

7.12 Trailer Mounted Gate Valve Exerciser- Award of bid (4650)

Alderman Ross moved the City Council approve the Consent Agenda Items 7.1 through 7.5 and then 7.7 through 7.13. Motion Second by Alderwomen Pitner and Carried the following roll call vote: ayes: Evans, Jantzer, Olson, Pitner, Podrygula, Ross, Sipma; nays: none.

7.13 National Opioid Settlement

Alderman Ross moved the City Council approve the Consent Agenda Items 7.1 through 7.5 and then 7.7 through 7.13. Motion Second by Alderwomen Pitner and Carried the following roll call vote: ayes: Evans, Jantzer, Olson, Pitner, Podrygula, Ross, Sipma; nays: none.

ACTION ITEMS

8.1 Approval of 2022 Service Agreement with MACEDC

John MacMartin presented on Behalf of MACEDC

Alderwomen Evans So I am looking at 2020 ones that we approved this year. So, it was my understanding that perhaps a report on the objectives of 2021 was going to come in December, I talked to you earlier today, it seems like there'll be January 2021. But can you walk us through just generally the 2021 objectives. And what I'm looking for is just to feel confident that they've been met or will be met very soon. Before we move forward in you know, I'm going ahead with 2022.

John MacMartin- certainly Aldermen, Evans, and Mayor. She is absolutely correct. You know, the contract calls for it, I visited with the city manager and the city finance director about moving it, we found that when we were doing this in June and December, we start preparing those in November. And so, we missed almost an entire month of the six-month period we're supposed to be reporting on. So, looking at that. I have planned to bring a report to you in January, probably the second meeting in January, just to make sure that we've got all the data there. You'll hear in my report in January comments on the logistics park, we have secured the funding for the rail extension. The check is in the mail, hopefully. And where we're at 90% design work on the on the track for the track extension that we've talked about that you've heard us talk about in the press, we've spent money on a switch from BNSF. For all of the talk about inflation, I'm glad we ordered early because the there was one switch put in off of the tatman spur which costs 50% More than the switch we put in, that we're going to be required to put in and they're essentially the same switch. So, I don't know what happened to inflation on that. But I'm glad we ordered it and paid for it in advance. There's work being done on the Krissy grant, we've had several monthly meetings already we're progressing. That's a two year I believe a two-year process on that particular work that's being done. I'm pleased with the work that's been done to date. I've begun to involve Mark Lyman in that given the recent article you may have seen about me and my future. And that probably won't happen until sometime in August just so that you know, I'm around for a while. And then we're also providing some temporary, we call a temporary because we don't have long term leases with them for both the hoist which is your line provider for the city and with Farstad and both of those groups were doing transloading on the intermodal site. When we were able to come to an agreement with RMG to provide intermodal service out there. One of the requirements that BNSF gave us was that there would be no transloading on the site. And as it's come to pass all three tracks get fully used. When there are intermodal trains out there. We've continued to support the mine on Air Force Base. We've done the virtual symposium completely and in 2019 or 2020, We've done a virtual and a live symposium back in DC we've responded RFPs from the state. We have there has been a response sent to Colliers, which is a site selector company. And that's a follow up after one of Mark's meetings that Mark Lyman's meetings that he attended in Chicago. Two companies have asked for secondary information. And Mark has found some companies just to try to make cold calls with so We've been active in that arena. We've had two prospective clients over the last six months. And I think I mentioned this before in front of counsel, Eric Orion, who was a site selector, reached out to us for first information on our Industrial Park, in areas close to the airport. She eventually settled on and we put her in touch with the landowner, where you have approved a plat for the new FedEx Ground service. We've got a list of trade shows and conferences that we've attended. We are very close to completing 30. surveys which will comply with the contract. We've got a new project we've started,

startup might not which will be starting in the first quarter. That's an entrepreneurial, it's a startup might not Academy, and startup networking events. The first, the first event is on January 13. We've all talked about and celebrated the success with CTE. Our role in that was to bring the application of the map to the magic fund, provide the supporting information. And then there is also work done by our attorney in preparing all of the documents in conjunction with the city attorney Kelly, maybe not in conjunction, but preparing them and then city staff responds and we make the corrections. We've not completed a fam tour. In talking with the when Mark was down in Chicago, there were any number of site selectors there. And in talking with them, they really had not restarted. And we're revisiting how and if they do fam tours now. We're going to do our best to get one of those done this next year. And then Lois is up and running. And we keep adding properties. And we've started adding commercial properties. As the as the city manager and I have had questions. So, kind of in a nutshell, you've got at least a preemptive look at it. But you're going to hear from me a little bit more formally. And you'll have a full report next month. As I said, probably the second meeting in January.

Alderwomen Evens- I appreciate that. One more question is I see one of the objectives that's carried over, and that I think is even more important with the announcement of your impending retirement is the strategic plan. And getting that you know, because that's so essential to any organization to have that in place, regardless of staff transitions and stuff. So, tell me more about where the board is with that. And can we expect that to be done before you ride right off on your retirement?

John MacMartin- I would hope that we will have a fair amount of the work done. I'm not sure it will be completed and adopted Alderman Evans. The strategic plan was carried over simply because in the 2021 contract, it was listed as for a completion date, excuse me in 2022. So, we're just continuing that effort and would hope that we'll have some further action on it, at least in terms of securing a consultant and beginning to do some work towards that in the first quarter.

Alderman Pitner- Thank you, Mayor. Thank you, John, for showing up and answering the questions. In the future. Do you feel it'll always be a January a delay between the agreement being approved in December and then the report coming in January?

John MacMartin- Alderman Pitner I believe on our part that's I think that's the most pertinent. But I believe that that's the most prudent because I think we lose some valuable information is coming in and the conclusion at the end of the year. The reason for the contract being here is the city's contribution. We need the contract to have the city's contribution continued to support us. Okay. That's the reason we're here.

Alderman Pitner- I have no problem with that. And I completely understand that the timing issues I would like to as a council member and for council members in the future to have be able to maybe get a report a little closer to the approval, maybe a month before a week before I understand you'll lose information. But to give an update closer to the approval because I feel like my hands are a little bit tied with not having maybe a report prior to approving the agreement. Again, you've done a good job tonight have given us the highlights of what you guys have been up to and I have no problem approving it tonight. But again, if we could get maybe a report the meeting before with what you have in December, and when the second main meeting in December, we approved the agreement, I would feel that would be helpful for myself. And I feel other council members in the future.

John MacMartin - Mayor, Alderman Pitner I think we could, I believe we should be able to do that. And we would do that in regards to having a preliminary report like I just did. And then the final written report, the following month,

Alderman Pitner- And just to clarify, it doesn't even have to be something in person, even if there's something emailed out to council for us to review on an agenda, I think would be completely suffice. But just so that we have something tangible to review, prior to the agreement, I think would be helpful for myself.

John MacMartin-So just to just to clarify, you said something in terms of an email even highlighting the points.

Alderwomen Evans-So even like, John, what you just presented to us, like putting that in an email, just like, these are the sort of the highlights. I just want to let you know, when we were here last year, you know, we really, I think, pushed hard on, you know, increasing, and we have been with all of the recipients of I think taxpayer money on accountability and metrics and stuff. And I really commend you and your board for moving the needle and getting closer to, you know, having some really great objectives and meeting those objectives. And I look forward to continuing to see that even mature more, but I really appreciate how far in a short period of time that you'll have come and considering COVID and the merger and everything that's been going on. It's been great to see. So, thank you.

John MacMartin- Thank you very much, Alderman Evans. I would I would comment that I think at one of the conversations you and I had a year ago, you indicated to me, Well, you must be doing more things than what you've just talked about. And I have to tell you, it was one of those aha moments or the light going on over my head going. Yeah, we do a lot. We just don't talk about it, because that's not what we're used to doing. So, I appreciate your prodding, because, yes. And what you've been asking for, I think the council needs to ask for it.

Alderwomen Olson moved the City Council approve of the 2022 Service Agreement with MACEDC Motion Second by Alderman Jantzer and Carried the following roll call vote: ayes: Evans, Jantzer, Olson, Pitner, Podrygula, Ross, Sipma; nays: none.

8.2 Approval of Job Description for Landfill Attendant/Light Equipment Operator

Alderman Pitner moved the City Council approve the job description for the landfill attendant/ light equipment operator. Second by Alderman Ross and Carried the following roll call vote: ayes: Evans, Jantzer, Olson, Pitner, Podrygula, Ross, Sipma; nays: none.

8.3 P3529.5 MI-6 Anne Street Bridge Options

Dan Jonasson- Good evening, Mr. Mayor members, the council. With me tonight is Jerry Bents with Houston engineering. Their firm is in charge of the design of MI.6, which is part of the industry bridge that we're talking about now. Jerry has a brief presentation, similar to what he gave to the Souris joint board and some background information on what we've looked at for the Anne Street Bridge. So, I'll let him give that and after we're done. If you have any questions, we will be happy to answer them for you.

Jerry Bents- Thank you for the opportunity to present tonight on behalf of the Souris joint board. So we'll start off the presentation with just a copy of the letter that was provided to the council from the joint board, I really highlighted the portion of it that was provided by the joint board that's really action being requested by the Souris River Joint Board, which is a decision on the long term expectations for the entry bridge from the city side. Ultimately, within the flood control project, we would we would bring into account and the project either way, if the desire is to keep it long term, we would reconstruct the South in if there isn't a commitment to keep it long term, then the cheaper option is what I will show you so I'll walk you through a little bit of how we got there. The first image that's shown here is actually the preliminary concept for the area downtown. From the preliminary engineer's report completed by the Souris Joint Board back in 2012. Near the middle of the screen, I'm not sure if I can point or not. No, it looks like it. near the middle of the screen is the downtown area. As part of the preliminary engineer's report through that area, there was an intention to have South Side floodwalls through the entire roadway, and ultimately tied into a levee system that was proposed on the south side of the maple diversion. That was real early level planning done shortly after the 2011 flood. Following that preliminary design and based on additional review of what happened in the 2011 flood, including the image here you can see that

the area near Broadway and to the west as we get over towards the library, really some kind of limited impact structures in that area. And so, what was what's been done since that time is some updates to the protection and I'll show you that on the slide here. So, through the that downtown area, that current concept that was put together through the preliminary engineering prior to May of this year, really shorten the protection through downtown. So instead of having complete south side protection all the way to the maple diversion. Instead, we would have south side protection on the south side of the tracks shown in the green there as levees with the red being floodwalls over to about the location of the historic depot downtown, at which point the protection would come up the hillside to the south and really tie into high ground at that location. within that area, obviously, you know impacts the Anne Street Bridge happened within that area. This was the preliminary concept from back in May. Following that preliminary concept, fair amount of field work was done, things like survey of the sites, cultural reviews, environmental assessments, right away needs were determined in the downtown area. And ultimately, a couple of variations that original plan came out of that additional review. And I'll show you those, those three. The three that were on the table prior to the joint boards last decision we call options three b one three b two and three B three. Not a tremendous amount of difference between the two I'll walk you through one and then I think you'll be able to see the slight variations as we go to the to the last too. So, within this area that we call phase MI six, as I said on the left side of the screen protection would start near the location of the historic depot. At that point, it would be a levee system parallel to the existing railroad tracks on the south side, that levee system would, would come up to the point of the existing Third Street Viaduct, at which point protection would go under the Third Street bridge there, through means of a concrete flood wall very similar to what's on the north side of the river in that area currently, from there, a levee system would start from the east side of the Third Street Bridge, B Alevi down to the location, just to the west of Seventh Street Northeast, at which point we would switch back to a flood wall just due to limited setbacks between the property and the river at that location, the flood wall that didn't continue off to the east and just shy of the pool in the Roosevelt Park area. Why do we stop there really, the only reason we stopped there is because phase MI-7 picks up from there and will actually carry protection down to the to the Burdick and through the zoo area? So, MI six is this reached downtown, under the option that we call three b one with just being a levee system through that area, under the three b one option, we didn't include any reconstruction of the South Side portion of the and Street Bridge, and instead under the three b one option, the assumption was the bridge would be removed as part of this project. Because we do impact the south half so the bridge would be fully removed under this, this option of three verses one. The next variation of that and maybe I'll just flip back and forth a couple of times you don't see a whole lot of change except for right in the area of the Anne Street Bridge. So the second that really is the only real adjustment that happens here between three v one and three verses two, under three verses two, instead of fully removing the bridge, what we propose to do is from the location where there's currently a metal truss that crosses over the main lines of BNSF railroad, we would leave that metal truss in place, the metal trusses structurally sound per the review that that the prior consultant did in the area. But from the south end of that metal truss, we would essentially build a new bridge starting at that point, the new bridge would cross over the flood protection levee, it would cross over the relocated roadway in that area. And then when we get to the south side of that relocated roadway, we would build a new ramp and stair system at that location to provide access down for the community to the south. So that option three B three option isn't a whole lot different, same general concept. So, the concept would be reconstruction of the bridge starting at the south end of the metal truss come over the flood protection levee. But then at that point, do a combination of a new ramp system and stairway system to bring the public down to the to the elevation of the downtown area, the realigned roadway at that location then would stay to the south side. So, there would just be at grade crossings there for pedestrians to cross over the street, hit the ramp system come up and under the bridge at that location. So those were the three options that were

considered as part of those options. And due to the involvement that the Corps of Engineers has with permit authority under Section 408. We held two different consultation calls with the Corps of Engineers and Shippo really having to do specifically with the Anne Street Bridge to get an understanding of if one option was chosen over another option, what type of mitigation requirements would be there, and also maybe ultimately, you know, where the options permissible or feasible through their two organizations. So, the results of that were that from the position of the State Historical Preservation Office, the Anne Street Bridge is a contributing property to the historic district. It's however, it's its connection to the historic district isn't really architectural in nature. It's really connectivity in nature. So, as they explained that, and I'm not an archaeologist, or historic historian, but as they explained it, really the significance of that location is that, that it's provided access from the north side of the community, the south side of the community for a long time. And since it's been modified a number of times over the years, it doesn't have the arc textual relevance that that it takes to be on the register strictly for that purpose. So, a few of the pictures on the bottom were just intended to illustrate a little bit about how the structure has changed over time and certainly some interesting Here's where you can see it was fully enclosed that one point in history through that area. Out of those discussions, really what we took away were really three things. Number one was that if we chose the option or if the joint board, in in cooperation with the city chose the option of going with three v one removal of the bridge, that would be allowed. However, in order if that was the chosen option, documentation of his historic purpose and past usage would have to be put together. And there was discussion about maybe that would involve oral interviews, other things like that. But ultimately, there would be a document that could be passed on to future generations. If option three, b two or three B three was chosen, since it would continue to provide access to the downtown area, and only be only be temporarily disrupted, no mitigation from historic nature would be required. And then the third thing we took away was the Corps of Engineers Did, did lay out their recommendation to us. And their recommendation was really just in order to avoid or to minimize any impacts to the historic structure, their recommendation or preference would be that the joint board pursue options that wouldn't remove the bridge, they said they wouldn't stand in the way of it happening, but they did want to make their resume or their recommendation known. Other pieces of the puzzle that we thought should be considered before the joint board made their decision was, you know, existing rights for the bridge to be there. So currently, and for many years, there has been an agreement in place between the city of mine not and BNSF, rail, railway to have the bridge at that location. That agreement has a number of different provisions in there, we've highlighted two that we thought were relevant. The first one that was highlighted there, essentially says that the bridge can be there. But if it's ever raised, relocated, modified in the future, the agreement for it to be there becomes null and void at that time. So, I would assume the railroad was trying to, you know, really preserve their future operations on the site. So, the second provision that was that we felt was relevant was provision 11. there that just essentially says that if at any time it ceases to be used for its current purpose, that the easement becomes null and void under that option, too. So, I think our takeaway from that is, if we were to go in and do either the modifications under three b two or three, B three, we would likely have to enter into a new license agreement with BNSF Railway. Again, not a terrible not an impossible thing to do. But we would have to go through a new negotiation on that. Other pieces that we looked at, or another piece we looked at was just current condition of the bridge, obviously, the bridge is closed, been closed for some time here. So, we pulled in just a few excerpts from the original structural evaluation that was completed by AAPC. At that time, a couple of different options were laid out for reconstruction needs in the bridge, ranging from 1.2 to 1.6 million. What we wanted to point out to the joint board and ultimately to the council here tonight is that under Options, three, b two or three Verses three, the reconstruction that flood control project would do would start on the south end of the metal truss, reconstruct everything to the south. So, any structural deficiencies north of the metal truss would remain there. And obviously, you know, if only the south side

was reconstructed, the bridge would likely need to remain closed because of those structural deficiencies. But somebody else would be responsible other than the joint board for the for correction of the deficiencies to the north. We then tried to look at really the portions of the project directly associated with the bridge and how costs would compare between the options. So, we tried to really just focus on in on those that were comparable. So, under the three verses one option where we would remove the bridge, you know, the costs associated with removing the bridges, obviously, the demolition costs of the bridge itself along with that historic documentation. We're estimating that to be somewhere in the neighborhood of \$210,000. To do those two items, comparatively, if we were to switch to either the two options that would result in reconstruction of the bridge, basically south of the metal truss, depending on which of the two options were chosen, they're somewhere in the neighborhood of 1.4 to \$1.6 million dollars for those other things that we just highlight there in green. You know, like I said, at least expensive option three V one, really less per BNSF permitting because we would be so simply removing the bridge, under the three B, one option we can really keep our roadway reconstructed roadway close to the flood protection. So, it does limit some of the private property impacts to the south. It also requires less relocation of utilities and roadways there. So, some savings and costs there. But certainly, the downside is the historic piece and impacts to the community. So that being said. So out of that, as, as the mayor alluded to the joint board at their December meeting did select option three b one as their preferred option. There, their lens is different than yours, their lens is strictly looking at dollars and cents associated with flood control projects. So that was, you know, the basis for their recommendation there. And then they provided the letter to council. So, with that, I guess decision or path forward again, just kind of highlighting where we were at in the in the first two options, hoping to get some consideration from the council here tonight on preference, because we really, really need to choose which of those directions we're going to go so we can continue with the design of MI six, so I'll stop and answer any questions.

Alderwomen Olson- Thank you for the presentation. It was very informative. We've had a lot of information over the years. And I think that this has been because I'm most encapsulating. So, I appreciate that we have been approached by a group of individuals from downtown Minot asking for an opportunity to present some options to us. If we delayed a decision this evening, for two weeks, what would it do in your plans?

Jerry Bents- Alderwoman Olson Mayor, so up to two weeks, I think would be would really not be a problem from our end. As you can see there. You know, we're really targeting being at 100%. Design early in 2013. So, a couple of weeks of float. I don't think it's a problem at all.

Alderman Pitner- Thank you, Mayor. Mr. Bents, was it the core that said they were they against removing the bridge? I missed that.

Jerry Bents- Alderman Pitner Mayor, so I'll just go back to that. So, the Corps of Engineers, as part of their decision on the project, they're ultimately the ones that that make the decision on allowing it or not allowing it within the way that they operate, they certainly try to choose the least impactful option. So, the least impactful option would be to reconstruct the south end have the bridge there for the long term. So, for that reason, that is their recommendation but not requirement and they were clear on that.

Alderman Jantzer-Mr. Bentz. So, if the bridge in not being used. And looking at the terms of the agreement with the railroad. In your opinion, what are the odds of, of them feeling like this, if It's not being used. Are we in a situation where no matter what we end up renegotiating the grant of the easement there.

Jerry Bents- Alderman Jantzer and Mayor I don't know that I'm in a position to really answer that. Definitely the agreement. If you read it word for word, it's it says that, should it cease to be used that the agreement really goes Null and Void. I guess I don't have a good answer on how long can it seems to be used. But the agreement be available to the to the council if you'd like to see a full copy of it. Thank you.

Mayor Sipma- Mr. Bentz. One question. And if you're not the right person to ask by all means, just let us know, going through and renegotiating with BNSF, or either of the railroads has been somewhat of a lengthy process. Is there any indication from the railroad? Because I'm sure they're well aware of the discussion? Would that be impactful to the timeframe if they're negotiations ran into the typical timelines that they run?

Jerry Bents- Mayor I definitely would just say that negotiations with BNSF or either of the railroads for that matter, certainly take time. We've not had any direct discussions with them. Regarding the what happens with the Anne Street Bridge, we've been having discussions regarding right away needs for the flood control project, but we haven't had specific discussions about this

Alderwomen Olson- Thank you. There's been talk in the community when we have had the Anne Street Bridge on our agenda. And one thought that has been put out there is that maybe a portion of the bridge could be saved and relocated more as just for historical purposes, whether it's in a park or something that people could just enjoy it for its historical significance in the price that you are kind of giving us here to deconstruct it, would that be an option? Or would it be just in ruins and not be able to be involved?

Jerry Bents- Sure. Alderwoman Olson, Mayor I would say it certainly could be I guess the only thing that I would maybe point to was during the discussions with Shippo. That was one of the items that came up was how about if we were to demolish the bridge, but we preserve for example, the metal truss there to use it somewhere else in the community? Could we use that to offset some of the mitigation needs associated with removal of the bridge? And the answer was no. And the reason the answer was no was it really goes back to what's the historic value of the bridge. And in the eyes of at least the State Historical Preservation Office, the historic value is maintaining the pathway from downtown to North might not it isn't really architectural in nature. However, certainly the metal truss per the review that UPC did was found to be structurally sound. So, lifting the metal truss off of there to relocate it somewhere else to the community. I feel like that's a viable option. Thank you.

Mayor Sipma- Any other questions at this time? Thank you, Mr. Bents. And just for counselors for the public's understanding as well. I did personally reach out to BNSF for that specific request to see if Burlington Northern would have any buy in, if in fact that the bridge was to be removed? And would BNSF one a cost share in helping remove a portion to save it. Their answer was no. Their answer was also no in specifically asking because person does have to ask on whether BNSF would like to cost share in rehabilitating, that that walkway from Northeast might not into downtown Minot. Their answer again was no. So, the question has been asked and it was asked to the right people. And they did decline.

City Manager- kind of following up on that, in addition, if Council can recall, in the special session this year with when they reconvened looking at distributing state funds and ARPA funding from the federal government. This was one of the projects that we requested to be considered for funding as well and was not funded by the state.

Mayor Sipma- Thank you, Mr. City Manager, I believe we'd asked for 2 million if I remember correctly, to the state legislature. That was the house. helped me out here, Mr. City Manager, we testified in front of the House Appropriations Committee for that, which then went to the to the full consideration and that was not funded.

Mayor Sipma- We do not have a motion would look to the Council for direction on this item 8.3.

Alderwomen Olson- Mr. Mayor, Alderwoman Olsen prior to a motion? Is there anyone from downtown Minot that would like to discuss this, this evening? Is there anything they would like to present to us?

Mayor Sipma- we can certainly take a motion and then take comment. We are opened up for comment here as it has information or certain conversation in the past. So if anybody does want to come forward, I would just ask that you state your name your city of residence and try to keep the comments five minutes or less.

Josh Wolsky- Mayor Thank you for the time Alderman Olson, I am Josh Wolsky on behalf of the downtown business professional association, we reached out to each of you over the course of the day simply requesting two weeks to be able to digest what we learned here tonight, and offer some perspectives to each of you on the larger vision and the impact downtown that this is going to have. So, if there were a motion to postpone, we would be very supportive of that and would like to see this community conversation take place for just a little longer before ultimately the decision takes place. Thank you.

Alderwomen Olson- Thank you. With that, Mr. Mayor, I would move that we postpone this until our next regularly scheduled meeting.

Mayor Sipma- motion to postpone until our next regular scheduled meeting which is January 3 2022. motion to postpone then until our next regular scheduled meeting on January 3 of 2022. Is there a second thing second by Alderman Pitner? And motion to postpone. I believe you do have some comments on versus tabling. So, is there any comments?

Alderman Pitner- I think I can say what I'm about to say I'm supportive of the motion postpone. This is a big decision for our community, this is going to remove a landmark. And that will never come back whether through agreement to the railroad or anything. So again, any information anyone's willing to provide whether it be downtown or any other community members, I'm all ears in the next until our next scheduled meeting to digest any information. People want to provide.

Alderman Ross- Thank you, Mr. Mayor. I spoke with Mr. Wolski and Mr. Straight this morning on the phone and told them that I would be in support of postponing this for two weeks. And I'm still going to support and I know you guys have intentions of putting together something for us to view and I can tell you that. I put it on your shoulders. It's big. It's a big job. Big because right now, I'll support to postpone it for two weeks. But I really need to see something significant for me to support keeping this and funding it at a level that we're going to need to fund it that thank you.

Alderwomen Olson asked to postpone the P3529.5 MI-6 Anne Street Bridge Options until the January 3, 2022 meeting. Second by Alderman Pitner and Carried the following roll call vote: ayes: Evans, Jantzer, Olson, Pitner, Podrygula, Ross, Sipma; nays: none.

8.4 City Hall Rehabilitation Award Bid (4466)

Alderwomen Olson moved the City Council approve of the City Hall rehabilitation award bid Motion Second by Alderman Pitner and Carried the following roll call vote: ayes: Evans, Jantzer, Olson, Pitner, Podrygula, Ross, Sipma; nays: none.

Alderman Podrygula-Yes. I had some questions for the city engineer. We had a productive discussion this morning. And there were several issues that he had to research further. So, I wanted to ask Lance up and to talk about that.

Lance Meyer- Good evening. Mr. Mayor, before Alderman Podrygula begins, I did miss one thing and my recommendation that is to authorize you to sign the contract. So, if this does go tonight, if the council wouldn't mind adding that to recommendation number one for me,

Alderman Podrygula -Yes, I appreciate it the breakdown, I feel not so good that we weren't able to get more of the alternatives. But my particular concern had to do with the item number six, the HVAC air purification system from seven through 12. Based on our discussion this morning, it sounds like we can defer those and or possibly look for other sources of funding for some of the smaller items. I understand from our first discussion this morning that we probably should take these alternatives in sequential order. And we really pretty much have to go down the list. The problem I'm facing is that I'm very, very, very concerned about number six, which is only \$27,000. But before we can get to number six, we have to deal with this flexible opening nanowall to the tune of 118,000. So, if you could clarify a little bit more, you

said you'd be consulting with one of your colleagues in the air filtration business, clarify a little bit more about number six the air purification system. And also, if we could, because of the COVID emergencies and likelihood of further problems with airborne particles and viruses and bacteria. If we could jump number six ahead a little bit.

Lance Meyer- Mr. Mayor and Alderman Podrygula. What alternative six is an air purification system that essentially cuts a hole into the ductwork near the heat exchangers. And inserts an LED light that produces ultraviolet light that helps eliminate bacteria in things in the air. The system will currently have your typical air filtration systems that are in better in every building and are very suitable for the occupants of City Hall. This system is essentially an upgrade that would help protect Central Dispatch, it would benefit the entire building, but specifically it's in there for Central Dispatch. Obviously, keeping that facility safe in the event of some issue like we're going through right now is paramount. So that's why that was included as an alternate. The way that we have to award this bid, according to the Federal Rules is if you're going to have alternates you have to take a base bid. And then you have to tell the bidders exactly how you're going to select the alternate so that the bidding is fair. So, you can't pick alternates 123 And five, so that you can get the bidder that you want. And so, in this case, what we did is we said that will award the bid as the base bid plus the alternates in sequential order. So, you start at 1234 and on down the road. And so, if you wanted to stop at alternate three, you could do that. If you wanted to take no alternates, you could do that. If you wanted to take alternate nine, you'd have to take all alternates, one through nine, you couldn't skip the ones in the middle to get to what you want.

Alderman Podrygula- Following up on that, you recommended I believe Rolac as the low bidder. That's correct. Would that change would their position change if we for some reason decided to go with alternative six?

Lance Meyer- It would not there the base bid difference between Rolac and the next bidder is fairly substantial. And so, no matter which alternates are selected, that that would not happen. So as a as an option, what the city is allowed to do and we verify this today, if we were the contract to Rolac based on whatever options the council feels are appropriate at this time. In the future, we can add the air fuel filtration system by change order going through the appropriate process, if Council deems that to be warranted. So, assuming that we award the contract tonight at a later date, we could come back to city council with a proposed change order price that Council could order not a word. And we can include that work if council so desires.

Alderman Podrygula- At what point would this change order come during the construction of the building or after we're finished?

Lance Meyer- We would like it to come during construction and probably pretty early on so that if there are equipment items that had to be ordered that we could do that in short order, we can do this work after the project is completed. Essentially, what you're doing is you remove some ceiling tiles, it access the air ducts, and the electrical wires and everything will be there for this equipment, it would have to be installed. And some are easy to get to have been told and some are a little bit more difficult. So the work would likely cost more in the future if we wanted to do that. But the option would also exist to do this at a later date.

Alderman Podrygula- So it would it be safe to say that we could go ahead with alternatives one through four. And it would make it easier and safer in terms of bidding rules and things like that to very fairly quickly afterwards. institute that change order we might end up with paying 27,000 might end up paying probably a little bit more but that would kind of keep us out of trouble and make sure all the bidders are satisfied and happy and the federal government says satisfied.

Lance Meyer- Mr. Mayor and Alderman Podrygula in particular, if we want to award a contract tonight, then we have to follow the procurement rules that we said that we were going to follow so we would have to select in that numerical order. So, if you wanted to award alternate six tonight, you'd have to take

alternate five well, okay, if you didn't want to do that, then we could award or change order in excuse me alternate six at a later time.

Alderman Podrygula- Would we have to mess with the motion to do that have to be made tonight? Or could we defer that until a bit later in the process?

Lance Meyer- I think we should defer that till later on in the process

Alderman Podrygula- You've explained that they could be done later. It's no big deal. It's functionable. It's serviceable. And change orders are inevitable. But for me, heightened air purification is probably close to a deal breaker, I really, really need to see that for the people working in City Hall for the people coming to use the facilities, and especially for the safety and security of Central Dispatch, and so was moments away from being incapacitated during the ammonia spill. And I don't think we should be betting on it being immune from those kinds of agents in the future. Thank you.

Lisa Olson- I just simply had a comment. I'm glad that we are at this point that the bids have been opened. You know, I think all of us were probably a little concerned that the numbers were going to come in higher than we were hoping and, and they did. But I think that we have a reasonable proposal in front of us. And I just, you know, believe that it's something that we need to continue moving forward with. Sometimes delaying some of these decisions only costs us more. And I think that this is something that is so important to the city of Minot that we need to move forward, even with the cost increases.

Mayor Sipma- For the discussion on the motion. Just to put maybe an asterisk on that as well. We have seen that in the past word delay decisions have cost us more for any of the public that might be watching at home or might be rewatching. This, as a reminder, this is a substantial NDR national disaster resiliency project that is substantially funded through those grant dollars. That is not just moving City Hall, but also Central Dispatch into a more secure location. As City Hall does get to move into that transition. Any of those exact numbers then can be identified not only in some of the attachments, but in the previous meetings where City Hall numbers were discussed with the funding for the national disaster resiliency grant.

City Manager- If I may, Mr. Mayor, hopefully to preempt any potential concerns on the part of the public. So, this \$2 million amendment is proposed by staff to be paid for out of the general fund reserves, which means the taxpayers have already paid for this. So, there is no intention of city staff at any point in the future bringing forward a recommendation that would result in any tax increases to fund this difference for this project. I do just want to make that clear on behalf of the council and the public and the staff, that there is no intention of raising taxes to pay this.

8.5 Recycling Transfer Station- Award Bid (4580)

Alderman Pitner moved the City Council approve the recycling Transfer Station – Awarded Bid-. Second by Alderwomen Evans and Carried the following roll call vote: ayes: Evans, Jantzer, Olson, Pitner, Podrygula, Ross, Sipma; nays: none.

Jason Sorenson- Thank you, Mr. Mayor, not really details on this. Since you guys did recommend approving, I just thought I would bring you up to date. I've recently had some conversations with a company called closed loop partners. They're a large venture capital firm that provide grants and funding and different things to the circular economy as a as a refer to it and research recycling as part of that. back a couple years ago, when we did a feasibility study, we, you know, looked at whether this, you know, what we're currently looking at is collecting, compacting and hauling to Minneapolis. And you know, that, that hauling cost was always a big number and always, you know, gave a lot of people hard heartburn and understandable because we're, we're trying to be environmentally conscious, but then we're just burning fuel up and down the road doing this. But, you know, it has been, you know, analyzed by the

EPA, and there are still those environmental savings. But if we could collect and sort locally, that was one of the things that was looked at in the feasibility study. But back then, like the upfront costs for a sorting facility about like 10 to \$15 million of capital costs were so large, and then those facilities aren't really scalable for what we were looking at. And in the last couple years, what I found out is that's changed. There are some smaller modular plants that can be built. And really, they would fit in the existing footprint that is on the table for approval tonight. So, I just wanted to let you know that that discussion has happened, we are, what I'll probably do is if we decide to award the contract to Rolac, will probably ask them just to hold off on ordering a couple pieces of equipment that would go in that building, those would be the only two things would be affected if we decide to go a different direction. And then I want to sit down with these people and look at the dollars and cents, do another cost analysis and then probably bring that to you guys, probably within the next month or so and just show you and see if it's something that council would be interested in doing or not. Just an update.

Alderman Pitner- I think your suggestion by improving this is it just come down to swapping out equipment or having different equipment within the facility to have a sir serve as a sorting facility as well.

Jason Sorenson- Mayor, Alderman Pitner. Yes, that's basically what in the four point roughly \$2 million. There's an allowance in there for a compactor and a conveyor. So, we would basically just take those out, and then whatever this other piece of equipment is would replace that.

Alderman Jantzer- if a large-scale facility is 10 or \$15 million, how much is the mini version? or I mean, is it 2 million or is it 6 million? Or you know I guess we don't know quite what we're getting into then.

Jason Sorenson- Mayor, Alderman Jantzer. It all depends on how much automation you put into it. I think there's pricing less than 500,000 up to a million, a million and a half. So, they're much smaller and much less expensive then then those older systems.

Alderman Jantzer- So if we did that, then what do we do with the material? I mean, we still have to haul it somewhere, right?

Jason Sorenson- Mayor, Alderman Jantzer ultimate answer no. So now when you would be dealing with, you know, paper mills, plastic companies, they come up here and get it. So basically, we would get a price from them to buy our material from us. And that would be net minus their transport costs. So, we get out of the hauling business.

Alderwomen Evans- to be clear, right, we're not making that decision to No, we're not you just wanted to apprise us of a conversation that's happening, you know, that we then, the skeleton or the building of the transfer facility has to proceed regardless of you know, what pieces of machinery are in there. It's not being built next month, you know, like so in any additional changes would come back to us. If we were going to swap out the insides of it.

Jason Sorenson- Mayor Alderwoman, Evans, that that's correct. It's, basically just the facility as its planned, and as its presented tonight, would remain the same. And it would just be a swap over equipment. And then, you know, looking at that funding, like Alderman Jantzer mentioned, if it's more than the two pieces of equipment that we eliminate, do we want to put more into this? And just look at those the cost and the benefits.

Mark Jantzer- There was one other thing I was interested in, in clarification on. And that was, it seems to me that there was a intention to change the floor surface or something in and by change order, if I believe I read that correctly. Can you explain that and what the effect would be Jason?

Jason Sorenson- Mayor's Sipma Alderman Jantzer. So, like, I said, in the last memo, I basically spent the last month looking at why did this facility come in, you know, above budget the way it did, and, and really, there isn't anything that stood out other than one thing that was added into the project, when we got there schedule a value, there's a it's called a metal aggregate topping slab. So, it's a high strength concrete that has pieces of metal in it that's abrasion resistant, very durable to like having loaders and, and things

scraping and pushing on it, that that single line item was to be in the neighborhood of about \$340,000. I believe that I don't know exactly what the savings would be. We'll look at that. It's probably in the neighborhood of a couple \$100,000. I think we can adjust in our operation. We can use rubber cutting edges and things just so we're not beating on that floor with the equipment than I think we can I think we can get by without it. And if you look at this project in conjunction with the project that we awarded, last month, the interior roads in the entrance, we were planning on about five and a half million for the two so that one came in well under and this one has come in under so in the end, we're basically about where we are budgeting these projects to come in.

Lisa Olson- Thank you. This is somewhat related to this. With approval of this item tonight. We are saying yes to recycling if it is approved, if we you know, vote to approve it. So, after years of discussion, it all hinges on this vote. However, I'm in there's a lot of support. We get emails on a weekly basis on people who are in support of this. We know that there are some who are not. And long ago we'd had a discussion on whether we would have this opt in available for our citizens for those that did not choose to recycle. So, I just want to clarify for anyone that might ask now, will they still have that option of either opting in or opting out however it is will they have the choice when this is fully functional

Jason Sorenson- Mayor Sipma, Alderwoman. Olsen, Yes, we haven't really worked out all the details. But the opt out has always been on the table. I think that's probably the fairest way to go about it so that the people that don't want it, you know, don't necessarily have to participate. You know, we looked at opt in versus opt out. We've seen over the years when we ask questions of the community, it's very difficult to get that input back. So, I think if the opt in, I think it would be, it's just hard to get to everybody and find all those different ways to inform all the people that they need to decide or contact us. So, the opt out, I think we'll end up with a higher participation rate at the end. But those that feel strongly about not wanting to participate will have that opportunity to tell us they don't want to participate.

Alderman Jantzer- Thank you, Mr. Mayor. And this isn't so much a question for Jason, although maybe it kind of can be. I think, as Alderman Olson points out, this discussion has gone on in the community for a long time. And it really started in earnest, I think was the ad hoc committee that I believe was chaired by Alderman Schuler at that time. And the thought process was set in motion to go to automated pickup, and then ultimately beyond that to a recycling component that that would be that would be added. And, and I think it's important to note that this is a service, as we're a city involved in providing city services. This is a service that many people in the community feel is needed, that they that they desire. There, there is also component in the community who don't care, don't think it's necessary, don't want to be involved. And I guess I respect I respect both of those positions. But I think in order for us to make an impact with recycling, it has to be on a scale that works. And what we've seen from the studies and what we've seen from the information that Jason has given us, is that to scale it so that we're able to do this in a sufficient enough way to make an impact. That that has to be a little a little bit automated and a little bit easy for the citizens. And so, you will remember that we did a statistically valid survey that indicated that we would have sufficient participation. And that is what has essentially brought us to this vote tonight. And I agree with Alderman Olson, that it's kind of you know, it's not the chicken and the egg, we're in the we're in the pork stage here where we're, we're fully we're fully committing. So, I wanted to say those things, because I think the other component here is that this residential recycling program should really be looked at as step one, or a initial step along the path to affecting more of the things that are going into the landfill. And that down the road, I would hope that we are looking at what happens with the commercial refuse or recyclables as well as the other places in the city that aren't part of our 10,000 households that will be participating in this in this process. So, I look to the future for that and I hope that we are able to expand on this residential program as we go forward. Thank you.

8.6 Approve Amendment to sub- recipient agreement with Dakota College at Bottineau for Center for Technical Education

Alderwomen Olson moved the City Council approve Amendment to sub- recipient agreement with Dakota College at Bottineau for Center for Technical Education Second by Alderman Jantzer and Carried the following roll call vote: ayes: Evans, Jantzer, Olson, Pitner, Podrygula, Ross, Sipma; nays: none.

8.7 Approve Eminent Domain for 2719 29th Ave SW & 2723 12th Ave SW

Alderwomen Olson moved the City Council approve Eminent Domain for 2719 29th Ave SW & 2723 12th Ave SW Second by Alderman Pitner and Carried the following roll call vote: ayes: Evans, Jantzer, Olson, Pitner, Podrygula, Ross, Sipma; nays: none.

PERSONAL APPEARENCES

Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Shannon Straight 115 Eighth Avenue SE. I just wanted to express a thank you for the earlier discussion regarding Anne Street Bridge. I thought that was fruitful. And I did want to just comment that when I heard Mr. Bents say is the current M6 design is at 30%. And five was at 90%, when the railroad requested some additional changes. The M6 design, Mr. Bents stated he wanted to have approved in 2023. I think it's important to recognize that the answer a bridge is the responsibility of the city. And much like the Corps of Engineers punished us for the coffer dams being in place because of what happened after the flood. We're in the situation we're in right now, because the bridge has been there before any of us. So, to come to a solution in the next couple of weeks, it's probably going to take a little bit more time, the SRJ B's next meeting is going to happen after the city council meeting in early January. And I think it would be prudent to give us an opportunity to put together a little more of a thoughtful way that we might be able to proceed. So, I would just ask that you keep that in mind, when you think of scheduling. It's a pretty big lift and Christmas is upon us. So, I think putting together a presentation that might be able to make the mark for a project that's been here since long before any of us is, is probably expecting a lot. And we'd probably like a little more time, I can understand that. We're going to make that request be an hour in two weeks, I can imagine, well, we'll do our very best. But I think we're going to definitely want to get in front of the sRGB again, and talk about it. And it's highly unlikely we're going to have anything substantial put together before you would want to vote on this. And there's no reason to make the determination. I appreciate all the minerals and asking that question. It doesn't have to be determined immediately. And a community solution of this magnitude I think is going to take a little creative time. Mr. Mayor, you and I talked earlier today about NAWS and funding. If the design of this is not going to be put forward in its entirety until 2023, NAWS is probably going to be built close to that point. And when we start talking about where dollars going to come from, you know where the Naas dollar is going to go once the project is completed. So, keep in mind some of these issues as we think about how we can fund these projects. I appreciate the city manager's the presentation regarding pedestrian. Clearly, folks want pedestrian passageways in town, we want sidewalks, the city of Minot is also responsible for the Eastwood Park bridge. It's historic in nature, we're not doing really anything. And so what's the end result ultimately that happens? It gets condemned and has to get torn down. So, if we're going to talk about some of these projects, I think we also have to just look at the bigger long-term picture of how we can solve some of them because they're, they're elements that are part of the city's history. And it'd be really terrible to lose them. So, I appreciate your time and consideration as we bought a pathway forward. So Merry Christmas, y 'all. Thank you,

MISCELLANEOUS AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

No Miscellaneous and Discussion

LIASION REPORT

Alderman Podrygula- Thank you very much. I've been waiting for this chance for quite a few weeks. I have three major things to report on. The first is or for maybe the first is the ongoing struggles of the ward County Planning Commission. In addition to dealing with variances and things like that routine business, we have been plodding along, trying to get some clarification of right away requirements. And there is one bit of interesting news there. The county commissioners have directed staff to not enforce an ordinance that we have a zoning ordinance at the county level in terms of right away. And that's put staff in a very difficult predicament because you have to enforce an ordinance, you can't just ignore it. So, one of the things that came out of that meeting was that the county commissioners, at least two of them will be proposing something to come before the county commission. And it appears they will be trying to repeal that ordinance or modify it in terms of what right of way is required on various roads in the county. So, they're going to do an on the up and up and it's been very awkward to watch of them make ignoring in some ways, the advice of their attorney, one of the things I've learned in 20 years is, you know, you really take a big chance when you ignore the advice of your attorney on something like this. So hopefully things will be coming together. And I'll leave it to Carrie to talk further about that. But there is some improvement there coming in some sounds like some significant action emanating from the commissioners originally from commissioners. So, in terms of the that group, making some progress. The second group I sit on is the Madden commission on aging, and their things are going pretty well. They adopted a budget Things hiring new staff to replace people who have left. Congregate meals are still down people are again, I think they're more concerned about COVID. But they're delivering more meals to people, which is important. So, people aren't clustering together as much. But they are using those services more significantly, which is good. So, things there seem generally on control under control. And in connection with that, I wanted to single out a staff member of ours, Derek Hackett, during a previous meeting of the group, they were looking at their budget and pay increases for staff. And they asked how the city was handling this. And I was kind of at a loss. So, I called finance and I called HR and they were boos after lunch, it was lunchtime, so I don't blame them. And the person I managed to reach was Derek, and he looked it up online while I was waiting. And I was able to give that information to the group, and it greatly facilitated later making decision on their budget. So, I really wanted to express my appreciation. Normally, when I asked staff to do something I want to spec to do them it to them to do it in real time. And Derek did, and I appreciated it. And it really helped the board of the Commission on Aging. The next group, I have to report on as the emergency resource Council leave at two meetings and say last reported, and one of those representatives of the State Fire Marshal presented. Things are improving in terms of drought conditions, and they are actively planning to protect us keep protecting us from all sorts of misfortunes that may arise. One of the things we'll be having this summer is a full-scale disaster exercise at the airport. That has to be done every three years for FAA certification, I believe. So, the planning is in the works for that. And it's really gratifying to see all the all the people who get together on a monthly basis representing the organizations who are doing their utmost to try to keep us safe. And let's see here. I think that basically was it. Yeah, those are the formal groups. There. So that's my report.

Alderwoman Olson- Thank you, Mr. Mayor. If I may, I'm going to go back to agenda item 10, just briefly, the under miscellaneous in discussion items, because this this kind of popped into my head when we earlier had the results of the satisfaction survey. And I thought it this time of year, it's very important for us as a council to recognize our employees and for all the hard work that they have done in 2021. And

part of that survey, may have reflected poorly on some employees. And I am hoping that that was not the message that was being sent. I think that that survey is purposeful for us to look as we're budgeting and allotting for a number of employees in different departments and in paying for the equipment that they need. And so, I am thankful and grateful for all that our city employees do and I know that when the crews need to get out when we have a significant snow situation, they do their best, and they work around the clock. And so, I'm hoping that that survey does not reflect on them personally, it is more of just information for us as we go into the budgeting process for upcoming year. So, thank you and Merry Christmas to our employees. As far as liaison goes, just for brief committee meetings to report on the first was the Liaison Committee. Back in November, it was a pretty brief meeting, we did address the citywide planning item that we had actually dealt with here at council level, we had a little discussion, we're going to get some more information and in will be reporting back to us in January. We did have some updates on the school election that has now taken place. And so, the meeting was very brief. We do have our next meeting scheduled for January 13. city manager had mentioned this in the last meeting that I had helped with some of the pride rollout meetings with city employees. So, I did that I was able to attend the service base and Planning Council holiday event. And then just last week, we had the CTE kickoff meeting, which I think is rather ironic since we've been working on it for a number of years, but we're into the next process or next step. And so, I was part of that meeting as well and just know that we're moving forward on that project. Thank you.

Alderwomen Evans- I don't have anything to add about the planning commission. The library is so I just want to commend the library staff for getting through another difficult year with COVID and other related issues and still getting our numbers up and the community engaged as best they can. And we all appreciate it. This also was a record year for library staff in actually pursuing grant funding and getting it. So, I'd like to commend the different levels of staff, it's just not Jana, I mean, certainly, she's empowered her entire staff to apply for different levels of funding and grants for different things. And they have and got some so that is amazing. And I love that staff over there are doing that. Just a quick I am the City Council liaison to the NDR family shelter. As folks know, that was a project that LSS was the sub recipient for and then they went bankrupt. And so, we were fortunate to find the new sub recipient of a local organization, Project B, which used to be mine at YWCA. And we are working hard, they are working hard and the team to get moving forward on plans for both the shelter and the LMI. Housing. So, stay tuned for forward progress on that.

Alderman Ross- December 8, the zoning ordinance and steering committee, we met to review some changes proposed by staff. And we have a follow up meeting in January. And that's my report. Mr. Mayor,

Alderman Jantzer- Mr. Mayor, the liaison committee and whatnot that I've been involved in was covered so nothing further.

Alderman Pitner- Thank you, Mayor, Renaissance board, I am liaison for activity they're proving we just approved a one of our applications for Broadway project that just completed, had also had Stephen. At our last meeting to discuss first avenue downtown. And just some of the hardships there with getting some improvements done there. That's what I have for that committee visit might not visit might not again, good things are mine that's been selected for the second time is one of the few organizations in the country to receive the beta test for the latest updates and software for their data collection services. According to the company visit mine not is identified because of how they strategically utilize the information that they gather and strategically implement them into the community. Also, everything's a little delayed, but Canadian Visitor Information is available, everything gets delayed about a month or two. So, visit minute, we'll be traveling around the city to all the stakeholders to again, divulge that information to help them make more strategic and informed decisions when marketing and advertising their businesses. So, so that's all I got.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Alderman Pitner moved the City Council meeting to be adjourned. Motion seconded by Alderman Ross and carried unanimously. Meeting adjourned at 7:37pm.

ATTEST: _____ APPROVED: _____
Anna Schraeder, Interim City Clerk Shaun Sipma, Mayor