



City of Saint Paul
Mayor Christopher B. Coleman

700 City Hall
15 West Kellogg Boulevard
Saint Paul, Minnesota 55102-1658

Telephone: (651) 266-8800
Facsimile: (651) 266-8541

SAINT PAUL LONG-RANGE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT BUDGET COMMITTEE MEETING

Monday, January 14, 2013 at 3:30 p.m.
Central Library Fourth Floor Conference Room

MEETING MINUTES

Members Present:	Monica Bryand, Kellie Charles Connor, Jacob Dorer, Diane Gerth, Becca Hine, Deb Jessen, Melanie McMahon, Gene Olson, Dave Pinto, Paul Sawyer, Michael Steward, Darren Tobolt, D'Ann Urbaniak Lesch, Avi Viswanathan
Members Excused:	Mark Miazga, Carrie Pomeroy, Pat Sellner, Gary Unger
Members Absent:	
Visitors and City Staff Present:	OFS – John McCarthy Public Works – Paul Kurtz

1. Convene

Meeting convened at 3:33 p.m.

2. Approval of Agenda

Mr. Tobolt moved approval; Mr. Sawyer seconded. All approved.

3. Approval of December 10, 2012 Meeting Minutes

Mr. Sawyer moved approval; Mr. Viswanathan seconded. All approved.

4. Chair's Comments

Ms. Gerth asked committee members to help themselves to some homemade jam.

5. Action Items

Public Works – Paul Kurtz

RES PH 12-374: Amending the financing and spending plans in the Department of Public Works in the amount of \$ 252,574.83 for 2010 Major Sewer Repair Program changes in the Sibley Broadway Sewer Repair Project.

Mr. Kurtz explained the resolution, which would amend the budget in the 2010 major sewer repair program. He further explained that 2010 was the last year that sewer programs were run through the capital budget, noting that they are now budgeted directly through the sewer operating fund. Mr. Kurtz stated that Public Works needs to transfer \$252,000 of sewer funding to the 2010 sewer program due to some significant change orders on projects in the Kellogg Broadway/Kellogg Sibley area. Mr. Kurtz explained that in conjunction with the new depot, Public Works did some things to remedy potential for flooding in that area. He noted that these budget changes will allow Public Works to close out this project and get it off the books.

Mr. Sawyer moved approval; Mr. Dorer seconded.

Mr. Steward asked what impact these changes would have on other CIB projects.

Mr. Kurtz explained that the funding referenced in this resolution comes directly from sewer utility bills, so it can only pay for sewer projects.

Ms. Gerth asked why the sewer programs were moved out of the capital budget.

Mr. Kurtz explained that since sewer revenue is dedicated to sewer projects it was cleaner to have the costs in the operating budget rather than transferring funding from the sewer budget into the capital budget. He further noted that by transferring the money from sewers to CIB, we were double-counting the costs of sewer projects.

All approved.

General Government – John McCarthy

Administrative Order 13-1: Amending the 2013 capital improvement budget to allocate funding for capital maintenance projects to the appropriate departments, as recommended by the Capital Improvement Budget Committee.

Mr. McCarthy reminded the committee about the capital maintenance process. He also explained the need to adopt the 2013 projects, which had been tentatively recommended by the CIB Committee in early 2012.

Mr. Olson moved approval; Ms. McMahon seconded.

Mr. Sawyer asked if there were any changes to the list since they were recommended by the Committee.

Mr. McCarthy responded that there have been no changes.

All approved.

6. 2014 – 2015 CIB Process Discussion

- Task force appointments.

The Committee discussed task force appointments. (See attached for final list of appointments.)

Mr. Dorer suggested that in future CIB cycles task force meetings could shift to different days of the week to better fit with people's schedules (e.g., hold Streets & Utilities on Mondays instead of Tuesdays). Mr. McCarthy said he would make note of the suggestion for next year's CIB cycle.

- Task force member conflict of interest policy.

Ms. Gerth explained that following the discussion on potential conflicts of interest among task force members, she and Mr. Pinto worked to draft a conflict of interest policy document.

Mr. Pinto noted that the CIB conflict policy is modeled on the City's conflict of interest policy. He explained that the goal of the policy is to make task force members aware of relationships and roles that other task force members might have with an organization requesting CIB funding.

Mr. Pinto explained that under the proposed policy, if a task force member has a relationship with a proposer that will have a financial benefit from the proposal, the member must follow the necessary steps to disclose that relationship to the chair and the task force.

Mr. Pinto pointed out that under city policy if a person is going to be making a decision that would impact his/her own financial interest, that person needs to disclose the relationship and file an official disclosure with the Office of the City Clerk.

Ms. Gerth noted that the proposed CIB policy goes a little further than city policy, requiring members to notify the committee of their conflict. She explained that the goal is to identify the official role with a bright line. She cited the example of a task force member who is also an employee of an organization that is applying for funding.

Mr. Tobolt asked how the policy would actually play out at task force meetings. He asked if members would disclose conflicts at the beginning of each meeting or before voting began.

Mr. Pinto responded that he and Ms. Gerth deliberately made it open without a big formal process. He explained that it should be done in the easiest most efficient way possible.

Ms. Charles Connor asked if the disclosure should be made verbally or in the form of a written statement.

Mr. Pinto responded that he thought a written statement would be good so that there was a record. He noted that a written statement could just mean an email to the task force chair.

Ms. Urbaniak Lesch suggested a language change in the policy, changing "spouse" to "partner."

Committee discussed. Ms. Bryand suggested changing the language to read "spouse/significant other."

Committee agreed.

Mr. Steward asked how the full CIB Committee would be notified of conflicts within each of the three task forces.

Ms. Gerth responded that the disclosure process would happen again with the full CIB committee.

The Committee discussed additional language changes. Ms. Gerth noted that she would amend the policy with the agreed upon changes.

Ms. Hine moved approval; Ms. Urbaniak Lesch seconded.

Ms. Charles Connor asked if a task force member should recuse themselves from voting completely if he/she had an actual financial conflict of interest.

Ms. Gerth responded that in that instance the conflict would fall under the city policy. She further explained that since the task forces and CIB Committee's recommendations are advisory, the city policy doesn't require that members recuse themselves.

Ms. Gerth noted that we will need to explain this new policy at the task force orientation, covering both the CIB policy and city policy and when each is required.

All approved as amended:

1. Any member of the CIB committee or a CIB task force who in the discharge of official duties would be required to take an action or make a decision substantially affecting the financial interests of an association with whom the member (or the spouse/significant other of the member or any minor children within the custody and control of the member) has an official role (such as an officer, director, employee or the like) shall disclose the relationship by:

(1) preparing a written statement describing the matter requiring action or decision and the nature of the relationship,

(2) providing a paper or electronic copy to the chair of the CIB committee or task force, as applicable, and

(3) if there is insufficient time to deliver a written statement, verbally advising the CIB committee or task force, as applicable.

2. The chair of the CIB committee or task force, as applicable, shall verbally advise the committee or task force of any relationship under this policy of which the chair receives notice.

3. Terms used in this policy have the meaning set forth in chapter 100 of the City Administrative Code.

- Planning commission proposal review.

Ms. Gerth explained how the Planning Commission provides a review of all CIB proposals as an additional point of information to help task force and CIB Committee members make recommendations. Mr. McCarthy explained that he would be attending a Planning Commission meeting to discuss possible improvements to their review process.

7. Adjourn

Ms. Urbaniak Lesch moved to adjourn; Ms. McMahon seconded. The meeting adjourned at 4:21 p.m.